39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

Speaker Lang: "The House will be in order. The House will be in order. We shall be led in prayer today by Pastor Steven Heilmann, who is with Grace Lutheran Church in Morris. Pastor Heilmann is the guest of Representative Welter. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off cell phones and rise for the invocation and Pledge of Allegiance. Pastor Heilmann."

Pastor Heilmann: "Heavenly Father, each elected official here assembled by... excuse me... rise by You, Oh God, to the position they hold. So, let each one give thanks to You because You are the judge. You put down one and exalt another one. Please keep these assembled here mindful of the fact that there is no worldly rank that is anything but temporary. Each service... excuse me... each one serves in Your pleasure, Oh God. Let them do all they can while they're here to afford them to do for good for our state. Father, please remind every person here in our House that they are a minister of You, God, for their constituents for good. And now, God, grant Your wisdom, discernment and ease in sight to each elected official that whatever is done here might contribute to the good and prosper life for the citizens of our great state. Please hear us now in the name of the names once crucified but now living Savior and Lord, Amen."

Speaker Lang: "Be led in the Pledge by Mr. Davis."

Davis - 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. Mr. Turner."

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please let the record reflect that Representative Jones is excused."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Demmer. Mr. Andersson."

Andersson: "Thank you. Please let the record reflect that all Republicans are present and ready to work."

Speaker Lang: "Please take the record, Mr. Clerk. 117 Members have answered the roll, and we do have a quorum. The Chair recognizes Representative Winger. For what reason do you rise?"

Winger: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Winger: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to introduce three elected officials that I had the privilege of serving with as well in the City of Wood Dale. We have Alderman Tony Catalano, Alderman Sonny Sorrentino and Alderman Eugene Wesley with us today. Please give them a warm Springfield welcome."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andersson."

Andersson: "Point of personal privilege, please."

Speaker Lang: "Go right ahead, Sir."

Andersson: "I am pleased to introduce my Page for a day, Elyssa Jamaludin. Elyssa is from Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. She's a senior in high school. And she's here living in Geneva with a host family studying government. So, I'm very happy to have her here. But she does have the intention of becoming an engineer which is probably a better choice. So, please give... everyone please give her a round of applause and welcome."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome to Springfield. Thank you very much.

Representative Bellock."

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. And I also have a Page for the day, Max Pohlenz, who's here from the Clarendon Hills Middle School in my district. And he's here with his grandfather today. So, I'd like to ask everybody to give him a big round of applause and welcome him to Springfield..."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you."

Bellock: "...and his grandfather."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you for being with us on the House Floor today. Mr. Davidsmeyer."

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

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Sir."

Davidsmeyer: "I have a couple schools here with me today. Right behind me, up in the gallery, you'll see students from the Illinois School for the Visually Impaired. If they could stand up for me. We've got Tori Lynch, Colton Weimer, Kaitlyn Ryan, Dane Edwards, Lindsey Barris... I apologize if I mispronounce a couple of these names... Izayag Zadnichek. We got teachers Barb French, Dawn Chambers, Cindy Miller, and Principal Aimee Veith. We also have the Illinois School for the Deaf here. If you guys could wave for me. We've got Shavon Tate, Kristian Paradis, Jovany Car... Carmona, Hermilo Villazana, Victoria Brase, Principal Christine Good-Deal, Transition Coordinator Lynn Walter, Interpreter Laura Braucht and Cori Pate and Superintendent Julee Nist. I want to ... I want to welcome them here today. Many of these kids, they're not all from my district; many of them are from your districts. So, if you have a kid here today from those schools, I will let you know here in just a little bit. I've already contacted a couple of

39th Legislative Day

- you. But I... I'd hope that you can go up and meet these kids. They're great kids. And there's a lot of other kids that go to those schools that are from all around the State of Illinois. So, I hope we can give them a warm Springfield welcome."
- Speaker Lang: "We're glad you're all here. We appreciate it. Mr. Sommer."
- Sommer: "Point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Lang: "Proceed, Sir."
- Sommer: "Thank you. I also have two Pages today out... down front.

  And I'd like to introduce them; they're standing down there.

  They are Karli Nolen, Lucy Gardner. They are both seventh graders at Morton Junior High. Please welcome them."
- Speaker Lang: "Welcome. Thanks for joining us. Mr. Long is recognized."
- Long: "Thank you, Speaker. I'd like to make a point of personal privilege, please."
- Speaker Lang: "Go right ahead, Sir."
- Long: "Thank you, Sir. Like C.D. said that from the Illinois School for the Visually Impaired, I do have one of them students from my district in Izayag Zadnichek. And I'd like to give him a warm welcome to Springfield. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Welcome. Thank you, Representative. Mr. Swanson is recognized."
- Swanson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."
- Swanson: "I'd like to make two introductions. The first introduction is Patrick Carlin, who's here from Galesburg. He

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

escorted his son Izayag here today. And Izayag's participating in the Centered Weber Student Advisory Committee. And Patrick Carlin is standing up right there, you can see. Thank... Welcome to being here, Patrick."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome. Thank you."

Swanson: "I'd also like to recognize Kaitlyn Ryan who is here with the School for the Blind. She, too, is from Viola. She's a junior at school. It's her first year at the School of the Blind and she is enjoying it, and is benefiting from what services are provided through the school. So, Kaitlyn, welcome to Springfield."

Speaker Lang: "Happy to have you with us today. Representative Lilly is recognized."

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

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Lilly: "Thank you. Good morning, colleagues. Capitol Capers is two weeks out, May 10, and today at 4:30 in the Stratton Room 349-C we are having rehearsal. Capitol Capers, two weeks out, we need to rehearse. I ask that each of the acts please join us this evening at 4:30 in the Stratton Building, Room 349-C for your rehearsal. It's going to be an awesome, awesome performance this year. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Butler."

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

Butler: "I would like to join my colleague, Representative Jimenez, in encouraging all our colleagues, any advocates or visitors to the Capitol today, to go out on to Monroe Street and see the lineup of food trucks that we have here that are

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

featuring local foods and local businesses here in Springfield. It continues our monthly series of featuring Springfield area businesses. Today we have Twyfert's Barbecue, Field of Sweets, the Hy Vee food truck, Chadito's, the Itty Bitty Fashion truck, and Azteca out there with some great food and fun. So, I'd encourage everybody to go out there on to... on to Monroe, check them out. They're going to be here 'til at least 2 p.m. So, we hope everybody visits them. Thank you, Sir."

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

Davis: "May I respond to Representative Butler, briefly?"

Speaker Lang: "No. Yes, you may, Sir."

Davis: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm... I appreciate that.

I just want to make sure that if I go visit the food truck,

I'm not going to be accused of not working on the budget or

anything like that or... or maybe they'll deliver to the floor.

How about that?"

Speaker Lang: "We'll let Mr. Butler talk to you privately about that."

Davis: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, House Resolution 111, Mr. Costello. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Resolution 111, offered by Representative Costello.

RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ONE HUNDREDTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that we congratulate the 2014-2015 1818 Saint Louis History class from Gibault High School and their teacher, Matthew Schweizer, on winning the 2016 Richard H. Driehaus Foundation

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

Preservation Award, and that we appreciate their hard work, long hours, and dedication to the "Discovering the Buildings of Downtown Waterloo" project."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Costello."

Costello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. And I'd ask for Mayor Smith and Sean Driehaus as well as Matt and his students of Gibault. During the 2014-2015 school year students in Gibault High School's 1818 Saint Louis History course participated in a research project to trace the history of some Waterloo... some of Waterloo's most prized buildings. The Discovering the Buildings of Downtown Waterloo Project originated with the town's mayor, Tom Smith. He wanted to install plagues denoting historic buildings. After the project proved to be too time consuming for historians in the city, Gibault High School history teacher, Matt Schweizer, volunteered his 1818 Saint Louis History class to complete the project. The junior class of 16 and 17 year olds began writing historical plaques containing information about the buildings and people affiliated with them on approximately 50 of Waterloo's most important buildings. The students used municipal records, newspapers, biographies, conducted oral history with longtime residents in the course of this research. At the conclusion of the projects, the students presented their findings before the Waterloo City Council and the Monroe County History Museum as part of the bicentennial celebration. Everyone helping to compose the biographies are supporting authors of a published historical work. Waterloo Mayor Tom Smith nominated Matthew Schweizer and his class for the 2016 Richard H. Driehaus Foundation Preservation Award in

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

recognition of their extraordinary work of preserving stories of people and special places throughout the state and showing historic preservation has a positive impact communities, the environment and the people of Illinois, the Gibault Junior American History Project, Discovering the Buildings of Downtown Waterloo, was awarded the 2016 Richard H. Driehaus Foundation Preservation Award for their effective local campaign to preserve and protect historic resources. Number 1) I would like to thank Mayor Tom Smith and his assistant and economic developer, Sean, for pushing this project. Number 2) I would like to thank teacher Matthew Schweizer for bringing his kids in on a project that was too hard for a lot of the historians in the Waterloo area. And lastly, I would like to greatly thank the students of Gibault in what they did to help preserve Waterloo and the history of the town. Thank you all very much and congratulations on a job well done."

- Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Sir, and congratulations. Those in favor of the Resolution will say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. Mr. Clerk, House Resolution 138."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Resolution 138, offered by Representative Costello.
  - RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ONE HUNDREDTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that we congratulate Michael Rebholz on achieving the rank of Eagle Scout with the Boy Scouts of America."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Costello."

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

- Costello: "Thank you. I would ask Mike and his parents to please stand in the Speaker's locked Gallery. I'd like to congratulate Mike on achieving the rank of Eagle Scout with the Boy Scouts of America. Mike's a member of Troop 323. Mike's... and I'd like to have the Body's attention for one second here because I'm talking about somebody as a very young member of our community who's exuded true public service. Mike's 2016 Eagle Scout project was to restore the Potter's Field in Monroe County. A Potter's Field is a place of burial for unidentified or indigent people. There are 66 of these known to be buried in the Potter's Field in Monroe County. A dedication ceremony for the newly restored Potter's Field was held on July 16, 2016. So number 1) I'd like to congratulate Mike on becoming an Eagle Scout with this project, but number 2) I would really like to thank him for his service to our community and to the less fortunate in our community and in the State of Illinois. He's a true public servant at a very young age. And I would also like to congratulate and thank his parents for raising such a fine young man."
- Speaker Lang: "Congratulations, what an honor. Thank you. Those in favor of the Resolution will say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. Congratulations. Page 7 of the Calendar, House Bills-Second Reading, House Bill 1774, Mr. Martwick. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1774, 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. Mr. Clerk, Committee Reports."

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on April 26, 2017: recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 418, Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 471, Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 649, Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 1896, Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 2388, Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 2810, Floor Amendment #2 House Bill 2859, Floor Amendment #4 to House Bill 3462, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 3755, Floor Amendment #4 to House 3773. Representative Fine, Chairperson from Committee on Insurance: Health & Life reports the following committee action taken on April 25, 2017: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #4 to House Bill 1332. Representative Phelps, Chairperson from the Committee on Public Utilities reports the following committee action taken on April 25, 2017: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 1914. Representative Mayfield, Chairperson from the Committee on Elementary & Secondary Education: Licensing, Administration & Oversight reports the following committee action taken on April 25, 2017: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 261 and Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 459. Representative Chairperson from the Committee on Health Care Licenses reports the following committee action taken on April 25, 2017: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 313, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 1970, Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 2577, Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 3462. Representative Scherer, Chairperson from the

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

Committee on Business Incentives for Local Communities reports the following committee action taken on April 25, 2017: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 3032. Representative Williams, Chairperson from the Committee on Tourism, Hospitality & Craft Industries reports the following committee action taken on April 26, 2017: recommends be adopted is House Resolution 267. Representative Evans, Chairperson from the Committee on Transportation: Regulation, Roads & Bridges reports the following committee action taken on April 26, 2017: recommends be adopted is House Joint Resolution 42, House Joint Resolution 43, Resolution 290. Representative Sente, Chairperson from the Committee on Business Growth & Incentives reports the following committee action taken on April 26, recommends be adopted is House Resolution 277. Representative Moeller, Chairperson from the Committee on Aging reports the following committee action taken on April 26, 2017: recommends be adopted is House Resolution 274. Representative Chapa LaVia, Chairperson from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs reports the following committee action taken on April 26, 2017: recommends be adopted is House Resolution 223, House Resolution 281. Representative Thapedi, Chairperson from the Committee on International Trade & Commerce reports the following committee action taken on April 26, recommends be adopted is House Resolution 114. Representative Zalewski, Chairperson from the Committee on Revenue & Finance reports the following committee action taken on April 26, 2017: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 1125. Representative Hernandez, Chairperson from the

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

Committee on Consumer Protection reports the following committee action taken on April 26, 2017: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 1335. Introduction of Resolutions. House Joint Resolution 48, offered by Representative Barbara Wheeler, is referred to the Rules Committee."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Evans."

Evans: "Thank you. Just want to request a quick point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Sir."

Evans: "We had a lot of changes on the Southland and one of my mayors of the great Village of Sauk Village is standing up, I know a lot of our great local leaders are here. I want you all to look to the rear of the chamber for Derrick Burgess, stand up, the new mayor of Sauk Village. He's an executive now. Give him a round of applause for his new leadership."

Speaker Lang: "Congratulations. Thank you for being here. Thank you, Representative. Ladies and Gentlemen, we're moving down additional priority Bills. We're starting with Bills on Second Reading. You might note that it's Wednesday. We're getting near our deadline. So, if you're not in your chair, we do not know if we will get back to your Bill. So, be in your chairs and be prepared. The first Bill is House Bill 3502, Representative Conroy. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3502, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Conroy, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Conroy on the Amendment."

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

Conroy: "Hold on one second."

Speaker Lang: "We're holding. Representative, give me a wave when you're ready. Unless you're ready now, we can take it out of the record. Are you ready?"

Conroy: "I am ready."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Conroy: "This Amendment just changes who facilitates this task force to... to the mental... to the health department... Department of Human Services."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 3755, Mr. Drury. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3755, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Drury, has been approved for consideration."

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

Drury: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd actually like to table the Amendment and just run the orig... the regular Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, the Amendment is tabled. Mr. Clerk."

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

Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 123, Speaker Madigan.
Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 123, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Second Reading... This Bill was read a second time previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1,

39th Legislative Day

- offered by Representative DeLuca, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. DeLuca on the Amendment."
- DeLuca: "Mr. Speaker, I move to adopt the Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 123."
- Speaker Lang: "Could you give us one sentence about what's in it?"
- DeLuca: "Sure. It recognizes Indigenous Peoples Day in the State of Illinois."
- Speaker Lang: "Good enough for me. Those in favor of the Amendment will say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 198, Mr. Guzzardi. Mr. Guzzardi. Is not in his chair. House Bill 3157, Representative Harper. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3157, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. This Bill was read a second time a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments have been approved for consideration. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 3720, Representative Harper. Out of the record. House Bill 1970, Mr. Brady. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1970, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Brady, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Brady."

39th Legislative Day

- Brady: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Amendment seeks to create the Behavioral Analysis Licensing Act. Currently, behavioral analysis are not licensed by the State of Illinois. They provide special services for special need children such as autistic and others with disabilities. And I so move for the adoption of the Amendment."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 1952, Mr. Cabello. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1952, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Cabello, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Cabello."
- Cabello: "Mr. Speaker, we need to adopt the Floor Amendment #1 which provides for an ambulance assistance vehicle provider updates."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 459, Representative Ives.

  Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 459, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #2

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

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

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

Ives: "Thank you. This Bill helps redo the... the debt control on school boards when they go out for referendum. Currently, they only include principal. This Bill will require them to have level debt for 20 years. They can't refund debt past that time frame. It also does other things."

Speaker Lang: "Representative, the Bill's on Second Reading."

Ives: "Okay."

Speaker Lang: "It's just your Amendment."

Ives: "All right."

Speaker Lang: "Can you explain the Amendment?"

Ives: "The Amendment becomes the Bill. And it basically takes out Governor approval before you actually go to… exceed your debt limit."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 2390, Representative Kifowit. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2390, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Kifowit, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Kifowit."

Kifowit: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I ask that we adopt House Amendment #3. It clarifies language that we got from the

39th Legislative Day

- Attorney General's Office in the terms of when a person commits a hate crime upon the exterior grounds and clarifies the judgement with regards to a civil action."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 1252, Representative Lilly. Representative Lilly. Out of the record. House Bill 2802, Representative Mah. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2802, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Mah, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Mah."
- Mah: "The Amendment becomes the Bill. It addresses some of the concerns brought up by committee. It limits the applicability to the RTA service area and to employers with 25 or more employees."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 2461, Representative McAsey. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2461, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

39th Legislative Day

- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 2764, Mr. Moylan. Out of the record. House Bill 261, Representative Mussman. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 261, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment... No Committee Amendments. Amendment #2, offered by Representative Mussman, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Mussman."
- Mussman: "All right. So, the House Floor Amendment basically clarifies a couple of things and takes away all opposition. So, we're making sure that everyone understands we're only using state money to assist our homeless students. The schools have to go through a homeless assistance agency first. And it... it can only happen if it's the agreement of both the schools and the parents in writing. I'm happy to answer questions."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 2028, Representative McCombie. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2028, a Bill for an Act concerning wildlife. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments have been approved for consideration. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. House Bill 3817, Representative Nekritz. Please read the Bill."

39th Legislative Day

- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3817, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment 2 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Nekritz, has been approved for consideration." Speaker Lang: "Representative Nekritz."
- Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #3 includes a number of technical Amendments to alleviate the concerns of the Illinois State Police. And also, makes a number of forcible felonies no longer subject to automatic expungement. They would be... there would be a court proceeding before there could be expungement."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 2559, Representative Nekritz. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2559, a Bill for an Act concerning civil procedure. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #2 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Nekritz, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Nekritz."
- Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment 3 becomes the Bill. It is a Bill to make sure that when someone changes their name that the State Police are notified and the state's attorneys have an opportunity to object in order to keep people from changing their name to be able to do things that we would not want criminals to be able to do."

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 659, Representative Nekritz. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 659, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Nekritz, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Nekritz."
- Nekritz: "Thank you. Floor Amendment 2 is an agreement with the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District and the environmental justice organizations to make sure that this nutrient trading program that we are implementing does not adversely affect low-income communities."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 3004, Mr. Riley. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3004, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. This Bill was read a second time a previous day. Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Riley, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Riley."

39th Legislative Day

- Riley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #2 essentially adds language to allow the Treasurer or the Comptroller to recoup moneys owed to the state based on the default of working cash notes floated by the RTA."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 3001, Mr. Rita. Bob Rita. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3001, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment 2 was adopted... Correction. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Rita, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Rita."
- Rita: "Floor Amendment #2 was a concern for a couple of committee Members to... to address, to clarify the intent of the original Bill. So, it's just technical."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill... the Amendment will 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 1914, Mr. Reis. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1914, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Reis."

39th Legislative Day

- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reis."
- Reis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I ask for the adoption of House Floor Amendment #1, which makes changes to the Public Water District Act."
- 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 3298, Representative Scherer. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3298, a Bill for an Act concerning education. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendments 2 and 3 have been adopted. No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 418, Mr. Wehrli. Please read the Bill. Mr. Wehrli, it just came out of Rules, so we'll have to get back to you on that Bill, but we will. House Bill 189, Mr. Thapedi. Mr. Thapedi. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 189, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day.

  No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #3 is offered by Representative Thapedi."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Thapedi."
- Thapedi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the omnibus condominium Bill that has essentially seven component parts that includes the work from Representatives Fine, Cassidy, Gabel, Andersson, Williams, and Ives dealing with litigation surplus

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

and accounting. What is the status, Mr. Speaker, 'cause I believe that there may be an additional Amendment?"

Speaker Lang: "Is there an additional Amendment?"

Thapedi: "There's one forthcoming that had a technical change. I don't know what the status is at this point."

Speaker Lang: "Well, if you want, we can adopt 3 and do 4 when it gets here."

Thapedi: "Let's do that please, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor..."

Thapedi: "I move for its adoption."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andersson is recognized."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Andersson: "Just one brief question, Andre. So, our process in this was to include in 189 all of the agreed elements and none of the ones that were contested by the various interest groups. That's where we're at, correct?"

Thapedi: "That is absolutely where we're at, Leader. As you know, we've been working on this issue for several months now taking a hodgepodge of condominium related issues. This is, at this point, all of the non-contentious portions. As I mentioned in committee yesterday, that I felt that there were two particular components that should be included in the package. That would include Representative Drury's Bill dealing with attorneys' fees and litigation, and also, the portion that I included that dealt with the germane issue. We found that we were getting pushed back on both of those issues, so they will not be included in the omnibus Bill at this point."

Andersson: "I thank you for your hard work on it."

39th Legislative Day

- Thapedi: "Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of Amendment 3 will say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments have been approved for consideration. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Hold this on the Order of Second Reading for another Amendment. House Bill 140, Representative Williams.

  Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 140, 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 #1 is offered by Representative Williams."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Williams. Mr. Clerk, take this out of the record. We'll return. House Bill 3908, Representative Conroy. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3908, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Conroy."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Conroy."
- Conroy: "Thank you, Speaker. This Amendment just clarifies that this only affects elected part-time officials."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment will say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments have been approved for consideration. No Motions are filed."

39th Legislative Day

- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Returning to House Bill 140, Representative Williams. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 140, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Williams."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Williams."
- Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This simply provides for a single filing portal for Illinois charities that are required to be registered."
- 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 1252, Representative Lilly. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1252, 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 Lilly."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Lilly. Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. Ladies and Gentlemen, moving on to Third Reading Bills. If you have a Bill on your next priority, you should be at your chairs. There's no guarantee we'll be able to get back to your Bill. The first Bill on this Order is House Bill 3780, Mr. Burke. Mr. Burke. Out of the record. House Bill 3806, Representative Chapa LaVia. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3806, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

Speaker Lang: "Representative Chapa LaVia."

Chapa LaVia: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This Bill creates a task force that looks at different individual providers for once... when someone gets a DUI and the services are... or the state, Secretary White asks them to perform certain hours and services. So, it would be a task force created with all these entities that you see on your analysis that come up with a standard or... standardized form, a uniform curriculum, so the recidivism rate would be lessened. And I'll take any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Ladies and Gentlemen, we've got a lot of Bills to get through. Vote your switches. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'yes', 3 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3744, Representative Conyears-Ervin. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3744, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Conyears-Ervin."

Conyears-Ervin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3744 will provide jobs to those that need it the most, giving them an opportunity they otherwise may not see, 10 percent of manhours on construction projects to be performed by persons living in poverty-stricken areas. Poverty-stricken areas in some way, form or fashion affect everyone in this room. I want to be clear that this is not specific to any race and

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

appeals to all geographical areas, downstaters as well as urban communities as well as suburban communities are affected by poverty. Poverty touches just about every county in this state, some more than others. I ask for a 'yes' vote on this Bill that is important for us to work hard to put Illinoisans to work."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andersson."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Andersson: "So, Representative, you identify areas of poverty.

These are the areas where the employers would need to recruit employees for... to qualify for this 10 percent. Is that correct?"

Conyears-Ervin: "Not in those specific areas. It is for any area throughout the state of poverty."

Andersson: "Right. But you defined areas of poverty as determined by the federal census tracks where 20 percent or more of the individuals who live in the census track live at or below 150 percent of poverty level. So, those are the people that would qualify to be hired under this 10 percent rule, right?"

Conyears-Ervin: "If that was your question, yes."

Andersson: "Okay. That was my question."

Conyears-Ervin: "It didn't sound like that was your original question, yes."

Andersson: "I apologize if I was less than clear."

Conyears-Ervin: "No worries."

Andersson: "Now, although that's where we would recruit the people who would qualify for this 10 percent rule, the 10 percent

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

rule applies across the state to any construction project, correct?"

Conyears-Ervin: "Correct."

Andersson: "So, now, we have an existing contractor, let's say, in downstate Illinois in a fairly prosperous area, removed from one of the qualified areas of poverty. They have their own existing employees. This proposal would effectively require them to remove 10 percent of those employees, find 10 percent from a poverty area, bring them in... bring them in to qualify for this. Isn't that correct?"

Conyears-Ervin: "I don't know if you're aware, Representative, but there are poverty areas downstate. That's number one. Number 2) the intent of this legislation is not to bus anyone in to work at construction sites. The intent of this legislation is to provide opportunities to those that need it the most. And the Bill actually speaks to language that says 'to the extent practical'."

Andersson: "So, if... who determines if it's practicable?"

Conyears-Ervin: "That is based upon the department, number 1. And number 2) if you think that I can answer a question, do you think this situation will be practical, no I cannot. Don't know if you were going there, but I just want to make certain to say that."

Andersson: "No. I want to understand who makes..."

Conyears-Ervin: "Okay."

Andersson: "...the decision. Is it the department or is it the employer?"

Conyears-Ervin: "It will be between the contractor and the agency whom they contract with."

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

Andersson: "It..."

Conyears-Ervin: "So, it's not autonomous. It will be between the contractor and the agency."

Andersson: "I'm sorry. Can't hear you."

Conyears-Ervin: "It will be between the contractor and the agency from whom they contract with."

Andersson: "So, they both get to decide together? The contractor gets to decide practicability?"

Conyears-Ervin: "Yes. The contractor with the agency."

Andersson: "But... I understand them having input, but are you telling me that they get to decide or is the ultimate decision that of the department?"

Conyears-Ervin: "The ultimate decision is that of the department." Andersson: "Okay."

Conyears-Ervin: "And the department should be able to explain when the extent is not practical."

Andersson: "Okay. Thank you for that. Speaking to the Bill, certainly I did not use the term 'bus anyone in'. My concern though is, is that what will happen is we have small businesses in this state. In fact, they account for more business than practically any other industry, if you will, or category of business in the entire state. And what this will do is it will force some well-established businesses who have their own employees to now either terminate those employees or suspend those employees and then bring in new people, maybe remotely. It is possible. I understand that there are areas of poverty throughout the state; I recognize that, but that doesn't mean that they're everywhere. And so, what happens now is we're creating an impossible situation for our small

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

businesses, maybe for our large businesses, to be able to comply with this. In my opinion, what this is doing is making yet another hurdle for our businesses to prosper and do what they do best which is decide how to... how to profit and how to make their money. I respect the idea of finding employment for these folks. It's absolutely laudable. I don't criticize that at all. This is not the right way to go about doing it. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davidsmeyer."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Davidsmeyer: "Representative, we had a good conversation yesterday and I appreciate you coming over and talking. My concerns still remain. I ... I do appreciate what you're trying to do. But I think that we would be better served if we focused on job programs. Job... like Workforce Development programs for those specific areas of poverty because the issue that you're going to deal with specifically in the ... let's say, I noticed that IDOT was... was opposed to this... so ... and the Association of General Contractors, which are a lot of road contractors. So, the issue you're going to deal with... I know throughout the State of Illinois the amount of work out there for those contractors is probably 60 percent of a normal year. So, if in a normal year a gentleman... a gentleman or gentlewoman working out on the road is making \$50 thousand, you're giving them 60 percent of that this year. So, if you take away another 10 percent, you're getting them down below where they're... they're able to make a living as well. So, you're just trading off. What I would hope we can do and I do

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

have... I do have counties that have very high unemployment rates, very high poverty rates, so I do appreciate what you're trying to do. I just think it's misplaced. You're putting the burden on the... in the wrong area. If contractors or people providing these services cannot find qualified individuals, they're... they're not going to be able to do this work. And you also have to make sure that people can get to the worksite. So, that is... that is a problem that we're going to deal with and... and I don't know how IDOT or CMS or whoever else who is in charge of this is going to handle that burden. Do you have an idea on how they're going to do that?"

Conyears-Ervin: "You said a lot of things. What is your question?"

Davidsmeyer: "I... I'm trying to figure out how, you know, first off, the businesses are going to have a hard time. But how is IDOT or CMS or anybody like that going to be able to handle this extra burden right now?"

Conyears-Ervin: "Number 1) it's not an extra burden to put Illinoisans into work."

Davidsmeyer: "I... I'm not saying that."

Conyears-Ervin: "Okay. That's number 1."

Davidsmeyer: "I'm saying to review the paperwork and all that.

Currently, contractors have a ton of paperwork. They put more
people to work doing paperwork nowadays than they do actually
doing the construction. So, we're adding another level of
paperwork as well."

Conyears-Ervin: "So, let me answer this, Representative."

Davidsmeyer: "Yes."

Conyears-Ervin: "I was sent here... I... and I'm sure as well as you..."

Davidsmeyer: "Yes."

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

Conyears-Ervin: "...we were sent here to represent those that sent us here."

Davidsmeyer: "Correct."

Conyears-Ervin: "I don't represent who you're speaking of. So,
 I'm here to defend those that sent me here. I would assume
 you are here to do the same."

Davidsmeyer: "Correct. I'm..."

Conyears-Ervin: "So, you keep speaking about contractors..."

Davidsmeyer: "No, no."

Conyears-Ervin: "I don't hear you speak about how we're going to put the people we represent to work."

Davidsmeyer: "I'm... I am trying to pass a Bill that will work."

Conyears-Ervin: "Okay."

Davidsmeyer: "That's my point. And I want to work with you on that and I... I'm actually on the Illinois Workforce Development Board and that's what we're trying to do provide training programs for individuals so they can go out and get work so that they're properly trained. And I think that if we focus this 10 percent on... on maybe those programs, making sure that at least 10 percent of the enrollment in those programs..."

Conyears-Ervin: "So, you want more job training?"

Davidsmeyer: "I... I think... I think..."

Conyears-Ervin: "This... and we can work on that, Representative."

Davidsmeyer: "...I think focused... focused job training..."

Conyears-Ervin: "Okay."

Davidsmeyer: "...would... would provide opportunity for people in poverty to raise up. And I would be more than happy to work with you. I think this Bill... this... this requirement is a little bit misplaced. And we did have a good conversation..."

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

Conyears-Ervin: "We did."

Davidsmeyer: "...so, I don't want to... I'm not... I'm not beating you down. I don't want you to take it the wrong way. I... I just... this is an additional burden on contracts that are already extremely low right now. So, you're actually taking people who are making a certain level of wage and you're going to lower that by pushing other people into the system through this requirement. It's a... I think it's a... a noble idea. I just don't believe that it will work. And I'm... like I said, I'm more than willing to work with you on workforce development, things like that, to make sure that we provide opportunities for people that are in poverty because like I said I represent those people as well. But we have to do it in a way that will actually help people in poverty. So, I really appreciate it, but I will be a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Ladies and Gentlemen, moving to the two-minute timer. Representative Wallace for two minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Wallace: "Thank you. Thank you so much, Representative, for bringing this piece of legislation forward. Are you aware that there is a group of individuals right now in the Capitol rallying against poverty wages or lack of access to jobs?"

Conyears-Ervin: "I am aware of that, Representative, and listening to the debate on the House Floor I can understand why. And I appreciate those that are working very hard and diligent to put Illinoisans to work."

Wallace: "Thank you. To the Bill. There have been some comments about putting more into job develop... workforce development,

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

job training all of that, but training does not translate to an actual place of employment hiring you. In terms of the State of Illinois, one third of the individuals in Illinois are low-income individuals or living in poverty. Half of them ... half of the Chicagoans are low income or living in poverty. That actually translates to 13.6 percent of people live in poverty and 6.3 are in extreme poverty. So, I think that there is some corporate responsibility, some responsibility on this particular Body to make sure that the communities of individuals in which they are profiting in actually have an opportunity to live a fulfilling life. And again, as I asked when we talked about the minimum wage in the minimum wage subject matter hearing, at what point does the corporate responsibility end and the state responsibility begin? Because when individuals go unemployed or don't have a job that pays a decent wage, we are fighting here trying to figure out how to provide the resources for them. So, I would encourage those throughout the state to choose to vote 'yes' 'cause again, one third of Illinoisans are low income or in poverty and this is a way to help to put people to work. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Ladies and Gentlemen, it is very noisy in the chamber. We want to move through these Bills. Everybody in the chamber has Bills they want to call. If we move through this expeditiously, we'll get to more legislation. Representative Lilly for two minutes."

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

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

- Lilly: "Representative Ervin, did you share with them how this Bill originated?"
- Conyears-Ervin: "Great question. This Bill actually originated from Congressman Danny Davis, who's from Chicago. This is legislation that Congressman Danny Davis is working on at the federal level. And this is also legislation that is being worked on at the City of Chicago level, and now we're working on it at the state level."
- Lilly: "Representative, this legislation identify resources that help the disadvantaged community. Is that correct?"

Conyears-Ervin: "Correct."

- Lilly: "The 10... 10, 20, 30 program... the 10 percent, isn't that a reasonable amount of, I would say, identification or constr... reasonable amount of construction projects that are billions and millions of dollars to include or be a part of these projects in the... disadvantaged communities?"
- Conyears-Ervin: "Actually, that's a good question. There has been reference to the 10 percent as if that is the 10 percent of the workforce. This legislation actually speaks to the 10 percent of man hours. That is very different than 10 percent of the workforce. In addition, we have the... the language of 'to the extent practical' because we do want to make certain that while there are opportunities we do not push any undue burdens."
- Lilly: "Representative, the 150 percent federal poverty level that exists in communities throughout the west side of the City of Chicago, the State of Illinois, do they deserve this plan?"

Conyears-Ervin: "Absolutely. With the intent of this..."

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

Speaker Lang: "Please conclude your remarks."

Conyears-Ervin: "The intent of this legislation was to actually gain bipartisan support because we understand that poverty is race neutral. We understand that poverty exists throughout the state. And it is the obligation of all of us in this chamber to pursue and overcome poverty."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Lilly, can you bring your remarks to a close?"

Lilly: "To the Bill. Grass-root community groups, City of Chicago, State of Illinois, and our Federal Government, all have come together to present a plan to help communities that are below 150 percent of the poverty level. This is an emergency in our communities. We are presenting a plan that helps. I ask for your 'aye' vote. I plead for your 'aye' vote. I implore you to help these communities. Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ford: "Thank you. Representative Ervin, just a quick question. Is this Bill only for contracts with state money?"

Conyears-Ervin: "Yes."

Ford: "And so that..."

Conyears-Ervin: "Only for state-funded contracts."

Ford: "Only state... state-funded contracts. Therefore, people in poverty probably would be on state assistance. Is that correct?"

Conyears-Ervin: "That's absolutely correct."

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

Ford: "And so, if they have an opportunity to go to work, they probably will be less a burden on the state and become more independent in their lives. Is that correct?"

Conyears-Ervin: "That is correct."

Ford: "So, and that's good. I like it. And there are a few things that I want to say that this Bill does. It one, identifies the areas in the state of poverty. Is that correct?"

Conyears-Ervin: "That is correct."

Ford: "So, that doesn't cost anything. We should know what areas have poverty."

Conyears-Ervin: "It is divided."

Ford: "And it will... will this Bill help us collect that data?"

Conyears-Ervin: "Yes. That is the ... Yes."

Ford: "So, that's... so, there's no way we can help people if we don't know where they're at. Is that correct?"

Conyears-Ervin: "That's correct."

Ford: "So, we should all be for identifying the areas of poverty. That Bill... this Bill does that if it passes. It also establish a 10 percent man hour. Is there a mandatory... a mandate that we must hire people... let's say I have a contract with the state and everything is going great with my company. I have no openings. Do I have to interrupt my contract to hire someone under your terms?"

Conyears-Ervin: "That is a good question, Representative. The intent of this legislation is not to do that."

Ford: "And in fact, the Bill would not allow that. It simply says that if I have an opening, I could possibly bring someone in under the terms of this Bill, if it becomes law, if they qualify. Is that correct?"

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

Conyears-Ervin: "The intent of this legislation is to provide opportunity."

Ford: "So, if there are no openings for a contractor, there's no reason for them to worry?"

Conyears-Ervin: "If there are no openings for contractors, the purpose of this is to provide training opportunities that when they're..."

Speaker Lang: "Please conclude."

Ford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This Bill will not interrupt anyone's flow of business. And I urge an 'aye' vote."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Wheeler, K.: "Hi, Representative. I want to applaud the idea of who you're trying to do with all people. And I want to help you do that. I just don't think this Bill is the best mechanism to do that. And I'll give you a couple of examples of why. In my personal experience, this would be a very problematic situation. I grew up in a road building company and we had a union contract which meant that... that we had employees who were part of our collecting bargaining agreement. We just want to support them as often and much as we possibly can through project work, right? If we had to start trying to call our local business agent who's a good guy and wants to help us, you know, put our guys to work, now I've got to help... he's got to find employees that would only be in a certain areas to help us meet this quota. Do you understand how difficult that would... could be?"

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

- Conyears-Ervin: "I'm sorry. I hear you, Representative."
- Wheeler, K.: "You understand how difficult that could be come from everybody involved? You already have arrangements in place and now we've got to find employees that live in a certain particular geographic location. Even if they're not part of that, I don't understand where... how this is actually supposed to work."
- Conyears-Ervin: "So, the legislation... and I'm sure you've read it, Representative."
- Wheeler, K.: "I've read the legislation. It's right in front of me."
- Conyears-Ervin: "It... it speaks to... 'to the extent practical'."
- Wheeler, K.: "I understand, but who defines what's practicable?"
- Conyears-Ervin: "Do you want me to define it? Because if I define it, it probably will be stricter than what it is. So, 'to the extent practical' is there for those purposes that you mentioned."
- Wheeler, K.: "Okay. But this... who... which... the department decides that?"
- Conyears-Ervin: "And I answered that question. The former Representative asked me that question. Who determines that is between the contractor and the agency."
- Wheeler, K.: "The contractor and who?"
- Conyears-Ervin: "And the agency that..."
- Wheeler, K.: "And which... it... Okay."
- Conyears-Ervin: "...is representing the contract."
- Wheeler, K.: "Okay. So, that... you... don't understand how your..."
- Conyears-Ervin: "I mean, I don't know what else to tell you. I'm repeating my answers and I can continue to do that, but it

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

just sounds as if you're asking me the... I'll just continue to repeat. Go ahead."

Wheeler, K.: "I'm not trying to be difficult. I'm trying to understand..."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wheeler, please conclude your remarks."

Wheeler, K.: "Thank you, Sir. To the Bill. Again, I want to applaud the Sponsor's approach to the idea of how we help people that... that deserve an opportunity they may not have right now. I don't believe this is going to get it done in a way that will make a... a really positive impact. And I would love to work with her in the future opportunities to further the cause. And in this case, please vote 'no'."

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

Pritchard: "Thank you. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Pritchard: "Representative, would you refresh our memory whether this program is intended for the City or Chicago or for the State of Illinois?"

Conyears-Ervin: "It's intended for poverty-stricken areas which is the State of Illinois."

Pritchard: "So, if a contractor is trying to hire low-income individuals, how are they going to identify them in the rural areas where there aren't a lot of people to begin with?"

Conyears-Ervin: "So, as I mentioned to the previous Representative, I don't know if you're aware but there are poverty-stricken areas in the rural areas as well."

Pritchard: "So, if we know the poverty area, how can we identify the individual who may be interested in working on whatever the project is?"

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

- Conyears-Ervin: "So, CMS will provide the data of those povertystricken areas."
- Pritchard: "They'll just identify where the areas are. They don't know the people that live there."
- Conyears-Ervin: "Wait, wait, wait, you're speaking of the contractors?"
- Pritchard: "I'm talking about the workers we're trying to help."
- Conyears-Ervin: "Wait, contractors don't have outreach?"
- Pritchard: "They certainly don't consider that their main responsibility."
- Conyears-Ervin: "Well, wait. Hold on a second."
- Pritchard: "They generally go to the union hall."
- Conyears-Ervin: "Hold on, Representative. This is taxpayer money."
- Pritchard: "Correct."
- Conyears-Ervin: "And you're saying that the contractor doesn't have due diligence to outreach. Is that what you're saying?"
- Pritchard: "Well, certainly, they hire workers. They hire subcontractors. The subcontractors hire the laborers. Why don't we make your Bill applicable to the unions that may train these individuals so they're competent and ready to do the work? Why don't we focus on them?"
- Conyears-Ervin: "If you want to work on that legislation, Representative, feel free and I can work with you. But this legislation that we're speaking about today that I can speak to is putting Illinoisans to work asking for 10 percent of the man hours to be filled by those in poverty-stricken areas."

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

Pritchard: "So, if the contractor doesn't comply, what's the penalty?"

Conyears-Ervin: "There is no penalty."

Pritchard: "So, people are just supposed to..."

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

Pritchard: "It just seems like we're trying to increase the work and the responsibility and if someone doesn't comply, somebody, the Department of Labor, for example, will come in and say you're not complying with the law and impose a penalty. It's not a fair Bill. We need to look at the source of getting people trained and able to do the work."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Gordon-Booth for two minutes."

Gordon-Booth: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I want to commend Representative Conyears-Ervin for bringing such a critical Bill to the Illinois House at a time such as this. We are in a crisis in many of... in many of the communities across the entire State of Illinois rather it be Chicago, Central Illinois, or Downstate Illinois. And I think that this is critical legislation that actually takes a... a longterm view at some issues that we have been having and actually puts the onus in a place in which if we have good players at the table, we actually can begin to move the needle in a critical way throughout the entire state to actually provide opportunities for people that, to a previous commenter's statement, we can provide opportunities to those that are prepared and ready and willing to work. But it is by no stretch of the imagination that oftentimes certain communities are locked out of having access to many of these

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

opportunities. And this critical legislation that is strongly marrying the target market program, which is a very successful program, I think is one that is important to all communities urban and rural. And again, I want to thank the Representative for bringing this critical legislation forward and I ask for an 'aye' vote."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Wehrli: "Representative, can you show me in your Bill or point out where in your legislation, proposed legislation, that this requires the areas of poverty be... to be in Illinois? Or is this Bill applicable to anyone in an area of poverty outside the State of Illinois?"

Conyears-Ervin: "The intent of this is for work within Illinois and CMS does provide this data. The data will not include poverty-stricken areas outside of Illinois."

Wehrli: "So, it's for work in Illinois, but your Bill does not exclude people in areas of poverty outside of Illinois. So, someone could be in Iowa, Indiana, Wisconsin..."

Conyears-Ervin: "Did you just hear my answer?"

Wehrli: "...in an area of poverty. How..."

Conyears-Ervin: "I... I just answered that. The answer was CMS will only provide poverty-stricken..."

Wehrli: "It does... your Bill does not specify that language. This only... this applies to anyone in an area of poverty. They could be in poverty in New York and come to Illinois and work. So, I applaud the efforts of this Bill, but I strongly urge a 'no' vote."

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

Speaker Lang: "Representative Conyears-Ervin to close."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, with this Convears-Ervin: legislation, we want to be able to put Illinoisans to work with no additional cost to us. Poverty cuts across color and geographical areas and many of our districts are affected by poverty. This legislation is supported by AFL-CIO, AFSCME, and Local 150. The government has an opportunity and we should not turn a blind eye to those in need. And I will like to close just with data that supports how poverty affects all of us across the state. Currently, in Chicago in 2015 there was 20.9 percent poverty rate; suburban Cook County, 11 percent poverty rate; Cook County, 16 percent poverty rate; DuPage County, 7 percent poverty rate; Kane County, 11 percent poverty rate; Lake County, 8.9 percent poverty rate; McHenry County, 9.2 percent poverty rate; Will County, 7.9 percent poverty rate. We've heard a lot of things this afternoon as reasons why we should not support this legislation. Most of the reasons that we heard were unfathomable. We have due diligence to bring poverty to an end. And this is the obligation of both sides of the aisle. If you can sleep at night knowing that you voted 'no' to this legislation, to put those in your district to work, that's between you and your conscience. But I ask on this afternoon that we work together, that we move forward, and that we vote 'yes' on this important piece of legislation."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Burke, Turner, Walsh. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

question, there are 63 voting 'yes', 53 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1253, Representative Tabares. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1253, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Tabares."

Tabares: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill equalizes bargaining rights between Chicago and other school... other Illinois school districts. The measure seeks to restore bargaining rights that were prohibited in 1995 as part of the Chicago School Reform Act. Specifically, this Bill deletes Section 4.5 of the Illinois Labor Relations Act. This Section lists subjects of bargaining are permissive in Chicago but mandatory and the rest of the state including third-party contracting, class size, and staffing decisions. This is an initiative of the Chicago Teachers Union. I'm happy to answer any questions. And I'd like to ask for your support on this Bill."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Andersson: "Thank you. So, Representative, so what we're doing is we're taking a whole class of... categories of bargaining issues that are currently permissive and we're making them mandatory. Is that correct?"

Tabares: "These are discussions... Yes. These are going to be required as part of the discussions for teachers to talk about..."

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

Andersson: "Right."

Tabares: "...about what goes on in their classrooms."

Andersson: "Right. So, now, the following items: third-party contracting has to be negotiated, layoffs have to be negotiated, reductions in force have to be negotiated, class size, class staffing, assignment, class schedules, length of work school day and year, assessment policies, and even the use of experimental or pilot projects. All those things now have to be mandatorily bargained for. Is that right?"

Tabares: "Correct."

Andersson: "To the Bill. These things are typically what you would call management rights issues. These are not things that are typically put into the mandatory portion of bargaining. This is appropriate if the parties agree that that's something that they want to work on together. They can do that today. To make this mandatory will make it very difficult to ever get a collective bargaining agreement put together. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives for two minutes."

Ives: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I think everybody should be aware of some of the testimony on this Bill that happened in committee. And the testimony from the side... the CPS side was basically, look, we... we still do talk about these issues. We still work with them. Look, the teachers, the CTU, they got nearly everything they wanted in the contract when they struck four... five years ago now. They've got the upper hand already, nobody is doubting that. To make this more of a mandatory subject of bargaining literally would create an environment where you could... the teachers would essentially

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

own the taxpayer and every single negotiation over every single item. You could have strike after strike in Chicago over every... even just one of these items could cause a strike to occur. Now, again, the testimony in the committee was that you have seen actually a very pliant CPS work together with the Teachers Unions to... to get something done. This Bill is nothing more than an affront to really taxpayers and to management. You're going to create more chaos in a situation where there's already too much. You're going to create more strife, more cost and you're going to have longer delays when it comes to getting the teachers' contract. In fact, the people that are at risk if this Bill passes really are the students. The students will be minimized in every discussion here to the detriment of both themselves, their education, and their parents. I urge a 'no' vote. They already talk about a lot of these issues in collective bargaining. Making it mandatory is the wrong direction."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Willis for two minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Willis: "My question is, do we have these rights in most suburban school districts?"

Tabares: "We have these mandatory rights in every school district in Illinois except Chicago."

Willis: "So, what is the average class size for a school... school classrooms in the City of Chicago? Do you know that?"

Tabares: "Well, it could range from maybe 28 to 36, but the class size in Chicago has been increasing. And teachers should have

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

the right... the voice to voice out their concerns and have a discussion about this."

Willis: "Also, is it true that oftentimes teachers that work for the City of Chicago schools will be transferred to another school in the city without their knowledge or permission to do that sometimes?"

Tabares: "Yes, yes."

Willis: "Okay. And that is not something... and obviously, being transferred throughout the City of Chicago's a lot different than being transferred in a smaller suburban district like in Addison."

Tabares: "Correct."

Willis: "It could be a matter of 20, 30 miles difference in that."

Tabares: "Yes."

Willis: "I think this... To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I think this Bill is something that is well due to our teachers. The... nobody goes into the profession of teaching to get rich. They go in it because they have a passion for the job. This is just putting in the protections to them that they duly deserve. I think this is a wonderful Bill. I think it's time that we treat the City of Chicago with equity that we treat our suburban and our downstate Teachers Unions. And I urge an 'aye' vote on this. Thank you very much."

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

Harris, D.: "Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. A question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Harris, D.: "Representative, if I may. Did... did we amend... the General Assembly... did we amend the Illinois Education Labor

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

Relations Act to allow these items to be permissively part of the bargaining package when we did the educational reform of Senate Bill 7, a number of years ago?"

Tabares: "Well, Chicago Teachers have tried for 20 years to get CPS..."

Harris, D.: "Okay. I only have two minutes. Did we amend the Illinois Education Labor Relations Act two years... when we did it a couple years ago and it will allow these to be permissive?"

Tabares: "This Bill does not shorten or lengthen the school day." Harris, D.: "Okay. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, when we passed 7... Senate Bill 7 a number of years ago, a very significant change to the Education Labor Relations Act, we allowed these items to be permissively bargained. teachers agreed to that back then. Apparently, now they don't like that deal, so they want to change the deal back. We made a significant commitment with Senate Bill 7 and this reverses what we're doing with Senate Bill 7. I asked you to look at this very carefully. There are items which have to be mandatorily bargained and there are items which have... which are permissive to be bargained in a contract. This is not just teachers being able to talk about an issue. This is, as you know, something... or provisions which would have to be mandatorily bargained during a contract, slowing down the entire process. We gave the Chicago Public School system flexibility... 'we' meaning the General Assembly... gave the Chicago Public School system flexibility in Senate Bill 7. We're now taking that away. I think this is the wrong

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

direction in which to move. And I would recommend a 'no' vote."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Halpin: "I come from a downstate district. I just want to reiterate, the teachers in my district already have the right to bargain over these subjects, correct?"

Tabares: "Correct."

Halpin: "And they've had that right for how many years, if you know?"

Tabares: "Oh, it's... a number of years. It's been... been there.

Those are part of the negotiating items."

Halpin: "And including... that would include class sizes and
 everything that's also... that's listed in this Bill, correct?"
Tabares: "Yes, yes."

Halpin: "And so, I would say, to the Bill. I've been in my district for over 15 years. The teachers have had the rights to bargain over these subjects for more than that time. And I'm not aware of any ongoing chaos or any ongoing... we have very few strikes. But what this does is it prevents the school district from being able to dictate on a large variety of items, what the teachers can and cannot talk about. It's one thing to say that it's permissive and if the school district is willing to let the teachers talk about something, that doesn't necessarily mean that they have to. And at any time the school district can say we're not going to talk about that. All the power is in the school district. So, considering that the rest of the State of Illinois has had these rights for... for

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

decades, it only makes sense to put Chicago teachers on an equal footing to those... the rest of us in the state. And I'd urge an 'aye' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Flowers for two minutes."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, to the Flowers: Bill. This Bill is correcting a mistake that was made back in 1995. We began the correction with Senate Bill 7 a few years back. Every school district in the State of Illinois has the right to bargain, the right to advocate on behalf of its children, except for the City of Chicago. When you factor in that this Bill would give the Chicago Teachers Union the right to strike over issues that is pertaining the best interest of the children. Currently, the only thing they're striking about now is money because they're restricted from doing so. But if the building is cold, if the building is unclean, if the food is not right, if the teacher's not right, that teacher that's the principal has no control over these issues. Oversized classrooms, it is a problem and Chicago deserves the right just like every other school district to bargain in the best interest of its parents and of its students. Chicago Teachers Union are the ones that's inside the classroom. CPS is inside the buildings downtown dictating to the teachers who's on the front line. They know what they need. Please vote 'aye' on House Bill 1253. Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Wheeler, K.: "Representative, back in... when we saw this Bill in committee, we brought some ideas of... statistics, I guess,

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

about the frequency of strikes. Can you tell me how many strikes we had prior to the current legislation that's in effect now?"

Tabares: "So, there were a number of strikes in the 1970s and 1980s."

Wheeler, K.: "And since this legislation was put in place, how many strikes had there been?"

Tabares: "The fact of the matter is, this legislation allows teachers in Chicago to negotiate items about class size."

Wheeler, K.: "I'm sorry, Representative, but this is..."

Tabares: "Teachers in North Aurora..."

Wheeler, K.: "I only have two minutes."

Tabares: "...teachers in Geneva, teachers in Wheaton, teachers in Arlington Heights can bargain over these. They can have a discussion about this..."

Wheeler, K.: "To the Bill."

Tabares: "...but not Chicago."

Wheeler, K.: "To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, we look at how education runs in our school districts. The focus should be on the school children and their education. The strikes in the City of Chicago in those prior years were not good for those students, not good for those parents, not good for the city. Changing this back in the name of equality isn't the answer for these school children. I urge a 'no' vote. And with that, I request a verification should this get the requisite number of votes."

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

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

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Guzzardi: "Representative Tabares, would you say that... would you say that the right to collectively organize is one that should be dependent on where you live?"

Tabares: "One..."

Guzzardi: "Should you have more rights to collectively bargain if you live in one part of the state than another?"

Tabares: "No, it should be all equalized. It should be all even.

Every... every teacher in Illinois should have the right."

Guzzardi: "Can you think of a reason why teachers in downstate communities should have greater collective bargaining rights than teachers in the City of Chicago?"

Tabares: "No, no."

Guzzardi: "So, I understand that there's some concern about this legislation that, you know, this is a deal that we agreed to once upon a time and why are we changing it? It strikes me... I'll go to the Bill. It strikes me that if we were to operate that way, we'd never pass any Bills at all in this chamber. Every law that exists on the books is a law that we passed once upon a time in the Legislature. So, to make an argument that the Legislature decided it should be this way once and therefore, we ought not be able to change it, strikes me as asking for legislative paralysis, right. Sometimes this chamber makes excellent decisions and sometimes this chamber makes decisions that we want to revisit in the future. In this case, some of the decisions to constrain a collective bargaining right of the teachers in the City of Chicago, are worth revisiting. And I think that this Bill is a noble and

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

worthwhile attempt to revisit some of those flawed changes. And I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

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

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Ladies and Martwick: Gentlemen of the House, when you think about this Bill, the argument that the other side is making that somehow or another that teachers having collective bargaining rights that the state has will somehow harm the education system or not focus on the children is completely and totally false. In 1994, before the School Reform Act was put into place, the School Reform Act, which I love that ... the sound of that ... the Chicago Public Schools was... had a... Chicago Teachers' Pension Fund was almost fully funded. In fact, I think there was a period early, very early on there, where it was more than 100 percent funded. It is now somewhere in the 40s, because as part of the reform we stripped away the rights to collectively bargain over many subjects and we took that out of the hands of the teachers. Collective bargaining strikes a balance between management and labor, and do not presume that just because you don't like unions that somehow giving an equal right to the labor side of the equation is going to harm the schools. In fact, what... what the statistics would show us that given the performance of the Chicago Public Schools since 1995 we've very well might have been better off if the Teachers Union had the same collective bargaining rights that they do in every other district in the state. To somehow think that to deny them is going to make our school system better is the biggest bunch of baloney I've ever heard on the floor or this chamber. If we give them the rights to collectively bargain

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

as they have everywhere else, they will collectively bargain over the things that will make our school district better. That is the input from the educational professionals that know what's best for the teachers. This is the right... I mean, right for the students. This is the best thing to do. This is the right thing to do. Vote 'yes'."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Welch: "Representative, I just have a couple of questions. So, the School Reform Law that was passed in 1995 took away these bargaining rights that you seek to reinstate. Is that correct?"

Tabares: "Yes, that's correct."

Welch: "And in 1995, was it the belief that by taking these rights away from the district that they would get their financial house in order?"

Tabares: "Yes."

Welch: "How are they doing?"

Tabares: "Not... not well."

Welch: "And so, your purpose for bringing this back and trying to reinstate these bargaining rights is what? Can you clearly state that for us here today?"

Tabares: "It's for fairness for all teachers in Illinois."

Welch: "Fairness for all."

Tabares: "Fairness for all teachers."

Welch: "And who are... who are your proponents of this Bill? Are there several proponents other than the Chicago Teachers Union?"

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

Tabares: "We have several proponents. We have the we have the Illinois Federation of Teachers, IFT. We have the Illinois Education Association, IEA, AFSCME, Chicago Federation of Labor, AFL-CIO, Parents for Teachers, University Professionals of Illinois, Local 4100, Illinois Federation of Public Employees Local 4408, SEIU Local 73, SEIU Healthcare Illinois, Unite Here 1, National Nurses United. There are all our proponents on this Bill."

Welch: "So, clearly, all of these organizations believe this is a Bill that will help working families in the city that you represent."

Tabares: "Yes, are hard working men and women."

Welch: "Thank you. To the Bill. I ask Members to support this Bill and stand with working men and women and help us advance Illinois forward. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Stratton for two minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Stratton: "Thank you. Representative Tabares, I wanted to kind of shift the direction a little bit and ask about how students of color might be positively impacted by this Bill."

Tabares: "So, what's... what's very interesting is that there was a study that was published in April this year by John Hopkin's University found that black students with just one black teacher result in those students being more likely to graduate high school and consider attending college. So, allowing teachers to bargain over layoffs and recalls like every other school district in the state could provide greater diversity in Chicago's teaching force, which was over 40 percent

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

minority in 2000 and is now closer to 20 percent. The current situation hurts our students."

Stratton: "Thank you. And just to clarify, the majority of the students are students of color?"

Tabares: "Yes. In Chica..."

Stratton: "In CPS?"

Tabares: "I'm sorry, go ahead. No, CPS has nearly 90 percent of its students who are minority."

Stratton: "Thank you. To the Bill. I think this is a really important point to point out that with 90 percent-plus students being students of color in Chicago Public Schools and the ability for the teachers to collectively bargain layoffs, this study that the issue of Representative spoke about, the Sponsor to the Bill, shows that young people are more likely to ... students of color are more likely to consider college and potentially do better in school by just having one teacher that looks like them. So, the ability to negotiate about this issue, about layoffs, is something that could really help increase the diversity. And I would certainly suggest that this is something that is, in fact, beneficial to the students. I support this Bill and ... and urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Ladies and Gentlemen, we're fortunate enough to be joined by a former Member, Dennis Reboletti, right up here in front. That'll be all, Representative, move on. Mr. Andrade for two minutes."

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

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

Andrade: "Representative, sorry, I was in the... the washroom, so I didn't quite hear all the debate. Could you please reiterate for me again what the bargaining items?"

Tabares: "Sure. So, the bargaining items are third-party contracting, class size, and staffing decisions. These items are being negotiated in every other school district in Illinois except Chicago. So, this Bill simply... simply allows educators in Chicago to bargain for the same items they bargain in every other district in Illinois. Whatever educators can negotiate in your school district, they'll be able to negotiate in Chicago."

Andrade: "Okay. Have other unions... can they negotiate other terms?"

Tabares: "Well, other... other school districts outside of Chicago can. They can. So, teachers in Geneva, teachers in Wheaton, teachers in Arlington Heights, they can negotiate these items. They can talk about these items."

Andrade: "Have... have school sizes increased since they have not been able to negotiate these terms?"

Tabares: "Can you repeat the question, Representative?"

Andrade: "In the City of Chicago have school sizes increased over these last years that now that they cannot negotiate this part in their contract?"

Tabares: "Correct, correct."

Andrade: "Oh, they have. They have. And..."

Tabares: "Oh, no. Well, class sizes in Chicago have increased.

They've... ballooned. They have ballooned."

Andrade: "Okay."

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

Tabares: "So, CPS refuses to talk about these items because they have to be in... both parties have to be in agreement to talk about these items in order to do this."

Andrade: "Interesting. Interesting."

Tabares: "Yes, it is."

Andrade: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Have you concluded your remarks, Sir?"

Andrade: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen, we're joined by another former Member of the House, Franco Coladipietro, right over here. Representative Williams for two minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Williams: "You know, I'm just kind of reviewing one of the items that we're talking about that would be subject to collective bargaining. And isn't it true that the items that are listed pertain to more than just the interest of the employees, the teachers, these are really about quality of education and the efficacy of the ability of the teachers to provide the best education to students. Isn't that true?"

Tabares: "That's true. Yes, that's correct, Representative."

Williams: "Yeah. And so, when you look at the items whether it's staffing, assignment, length of school year, those directly relate to the success of each and every student. Is that not the case?"

Tabares: "Yes."

Williams: "Thank you."

Tabares: "That's correct. Yeah,"

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

Williams: "Thank you. So, to the Bill. If... if, you know, the... the issue that we're talking about, I've heard some of my colleagues reference, the teachers as employees. Obviously, they're the subject of the collective bargaining agreement, but the topics we're talking about go far beyond benefits for teachers. Things like contracting with third parties, decisions to change the number of employees, those items directly impact students. Class sizes, class staffing and assignments, schedules, the academic calendar, these items directly impact students on a daily basis, their parents and the overall health of a school district. Hours, places of instruction, pupil assessment, I can't think of a more comprehensive list of items that will impact the quality of education. This Bill is about much more than collective bargaining. This Bill is about the health of our neighborhood schools. Chicago Public Schools should not be treated differently. We already know how differently we are treated in terms of funding. Unlike the rest of the state, Chicago teachers' pensions are funded by Chicago taxpayers. Obviously, we all know this ... "

Speaker Lang: "Representative, please conclude your remarks."

Williams: "Well, thank you. Just wanted to emphasize again that the items in this Bill go well beyond the issue of collective bargaining and directly impact the quality of education. I urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Stuart for two minutes."

Stuart: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

"Thank you. To the Bill. I don't think that you can Stuart: underemphasize the importance of class size when it comes to teaching children. And to suggest that a teachers' union being able to bargain in terms of class sizes would be detrimental to students is absurd. I... I have taught in public schools in Illinois since 1994. I've taught in two districts that are outside of Chicago. In both of those districts, my union on my behalf and on behalf of my fellow teachers always had class sizes included in the bargaining that we did. We fought to not have class sizes of 30 and 32 and 34 in our high schools. We fought to not have classes that size in our Kindergartens, because we know that the detriment that there is to students. I don't think that Chicago teachers deserve any less than we did as teachers in Highland and teachers in Edwardsville. And I really don't think that the students in Chicago deserve less than the students in Highland and Edwardsville and every other public school district across this state. I think that it's just vitally important that we make sure that we are protecting those rights of those students and working for the best learning outcomes that we can have. And class size has time and time again been proven to be one of the most significant impacts on student learning. I think it's important. And I encourage an 'aye' vote to protect our students and to make sure that the students of Chicago can achieve like the students across the state. Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

Thapedi: "Representative Tabares, just want to get a little clarification from you, please, on the… on CPS's opposition. I'm not really sure that I quite understand and I do know from personal experience recently in working with CPS that sometimes they're not the… the best negotiators as far as good faith negotiations. So, I'm just curious as to what truly is their objection, because if I'm reading the analysis correctly, they're basically saying that they made some concessions many, many years ago and now it's a rollback. I'm not really quite sure that I understand what the objection is."

Tabares: "So, CPS is opposed because they oppose the length... the school day language. The part of the length of the school language in the Bill. But this Bill does not shorten or lengthen the school day, does not. If this Bill passes, school days will not be lengthened or shortened."

Thapedi: "So, basically, the CPS's objection is not applicable to what you're actually doing right now. Is that accurate?"

Tabares: "Correct. Yes."

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

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Davis: "As I was reading the analysis, Representative, it appears that one of the things that you're trying to correct has a lot to do with class size. Is that correct?"

Tabares: "That's correct, class size."

Davis: "So, with regard to class size, and a lot of that... a lot of... there's a lot of mention about class size, currently, in

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

the school funding reform or the school funding reform debate that takes place, you know, what do... what do we anticipate would happen when we're able to possibly negotiate for a smaller class size? What do we expect to happen there?"

Tabares: "We expect more individual-like attention to our students. And this will help teachers 'cause they understand what goes on in their classrooms. They're there up to eight hours a day. They... understand what our children... our students need. So, this will give more individualized attention and safety too, protect our students in safety of the classroom."

Davis: "And I guess, presumably, what we do is we trust that teachers who are there every day with our young people in the classroom are probably the best judges as it relates to, you know, what happens when you are able to lower class... or what are the results of higher class sizes could be. So, I guess what we expect out of this is that they would like to bargain for lower class sizes so that they feel comfortable and they have the opportunity to better educate our young people. Would that be a correct statement?"

Tabares: "That is a correct statement because teachers understand what goes on in the classroom. They know what's best for the students."

Davis: "Well, I know that. And let me just..."

Tabares: "Yes."

Davis: "...speak briefly to the Bill. So, even in the current debate that we're having on school funding reform, one of the things that we have to be mindful of is class size. Data has shown us that smaller class sizes yield better results as it relates to outcomes with our young people. And while some of you may

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

disagree with the idea that unions being able to negotiate class size, let's not forget that data shows us that lower class sizes do... are indeed helpful for our younger people. So, if we look at that, this has the opportunity to help adjust that to give those opportunities..."

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

Davis: "Vote 'yes'. Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ford: "Thank you. Representative Tabares, I don't know if you read the back of the Calendar. Did you read the back of the Calendar today?"

Tabares: "No, I did not."

Ford: "Oh. There's some historic facts. I don't know who's the genius that came up with giving us this historic facts on a daily basis, but I like it. And it says on April 20, 1982, the Illinois House passed 106-64 a labor Bill that would give public school teachers the legal right to strike. So, to the Bill. I wanted to... I want to stay with the Sponsor, but I want to talk about the Bill. What brought this Bill on? Why did you sponsor the Bill?"

Tabares: "I chose to sponsor this Bill because I represent educators, families, students in my district who attend CPS schools. It's a very important Bill to our district."

Ford: "So, who would this Bill benefit if it should pass?"

Tabares: "This Bill will benefit the students, Representative."

Ford: "Okay."

Tabares: "The students."

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

Ford: "The students. And it would benefit the students because you believe that it will help with class sizes, you say?"

Tabares: "Because teachers will have a voice to have a discussion about these items and that will improve the quality of education."

Ford: "You remember Representative Monique Davis? What would she think of this Bill?"

Tabares: "I believe she would be for this Bill. She was strong."

Ford: "Now, would you mind holding on while I call her and ask her."

Tabares: "Sure."

Ford: "No. I urge an 'aye' vote for House Bill 1253."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Scherer for two minutes."

Scherer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I don't... I don't want to be remiss, so as a teacher myself, I feel like I... I have to stand in support of this Bill for all the teachers in the State of Illinois, all the people who are married to teachers: wives, husbands, grandmas, et cetera. We all know there's no question that class size is the number one determining factor of how successful a child can be in a classroom. We don't have problems having them take tests. We throw out the PARCC test, the ISAT, the IGAP and everything else you can think of and we'll throw money at tests, but we won't throw money at people. And I just don't get it. Number one thing that we can do to help our students learn is to reduce class size. So, I think it's time that we put our money where our mouth is, quit criticizing that are tests results aren't high enough, and give the students an opportunity to learn and the teachers an opportunity to teach by lowering

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

their class size. A friend of mine did her master's thesis on this just not that many years ago and there was overwhelming evidence that class size is the number one determining factor. I don't see how anybody has any option other than to vote 'yes' on this Bill. Thank you."

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

Harris, G.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. And just a couple questions of the Sponsor if she would yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Harris, G.: "So, Representative Tabares, I was just downstairs with a group of Chicago High School students. You know, there's hundreds of them gathered in the rotunda for School Health Center Day and we were talking about what makes a successful school and what doesn't. So, would your Bill allow more ability for their teachers to actively negotiate through the collective bargaining process on matters concerning keeping their class sizes small?"

Tabares: "Yes, that's correct. Yes."

Harris, G.: "So, that is in your Bill an opportunity for teachers to negotiate for a size of class where instruction will happen where they can really make a difference to these young men and women?"

Tabares: "Exactly. To make a difference, yes, yes."

Harris, G.: "So, are there elements in the Bill that talk about how the school day is structured or how curriculum is chosen and taught?"

Tabares: "Well, teachers will have the opportunity to discuss and negotiate those items, yes."

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

Harris, G.: "So, this just goes back to local control where it would become a matter of collectively bargaining where Chicago Public School teachers could work with CPS and come to the best... best agreement on how to educate and how to schedule themselves to be most available to their students."

Tabares: "Yes, that is correct."

Harris, G.: "Okay. So, are there other elements to the Bill regarding, you know, school choice and you know, how that's determined so that these young men and women, you know, will know that somebody is representing... their interests in negotiations about how schools are chosen with the school board?"

Tabares: "Right, yeah. So, teachers with this Bill... this Bill is... it's just about parity."

Harris, G.: "Parity."

Tabares: "Parity for Chicago educators."

Harris, G.: "So, other educators in all the other hundreds of school districts in Illinois have these rights?"

Tabares: "Right. Suburban and downstate districts, correct."

Harris, G.: "So, if it's something that our young people feel is..."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris, please bring your remarks to a close."

Harris, G.: "Then I would say we should vote 'yes'. Is that fast enough, Lou?"

Speaker Lang: "I wasn't saying fast. I was just..."

Harris, G.: "Okay."

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

Harris, G.: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you. Mr. Arroyo for two minutes."

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Arroyo: "Representative, what is the logistics of this Bill? What are you really trying to do with this Bill?"

Tabares: "So, as it currently stands, bargaining over class size, the school calendar and other issues can only take place if both Chicago Public Schools and the Teachers Union are in agreement to discuss them. So, this Bill removes that requirement, placing those subjects as required issues to talk about during collective bargaining regardless of whether both parties are in agreement to discuss them."

Arroyo: "And who is opposing this Bill? I think this is a great idea. You got all these Sponsors for this Bill and there's... are two people that are opposed to this Bill. Who is the..."

Tabares: "So, we have..."

Arroyo: "...the public schools, the School Alliance, Advance Illinois. Who is that?"

Tabares: "So, there is Stand for Children, Chicago Public Schools, and Advance Illinois are the only three opponents to the Bill."

Arroyo: "Okay. I also... Representative, I also know you have six initiatives here. Could we go through those initiatives, one... one through six? The decision to contract with the third party, could you explain that to me? What happens now? What is happening now?"

Tabares: "So, currently, with third-party contracting, outsourcing and CPS was sold as a business-style management tool that would lead to greater financial stability, flexibility, efficiency in cost savings. It was billed as a

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

solution to challenges CPS faced, so in practice outsourcing has led to diminished services for our young people. And lack..."

Arroyo: "Representative..."

Tabares: "...a lack..."

Arroyo: "...Representative, I think that all these initiatives are good for my district. I have 14 schools in my district and I think that these all initiatives are good. I think this is a wonderful Bill. I'm glad that somebody brought this..."

Speaker Lang: "Please complete your remarks, Sir."

Arroyo: "...so we could reduce the class sizes. Because in my neighborhood, it's always a lot of overcrowding. I stand in support of your Bill. Congratulations on your Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Hernandez for two minutes."

Hernandez: "Thank you, Speaker. May the ... may the Representative yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Hernandez: "Representative, I just wanted to ask within your district, have your experienced schools that are overcrowded, classroom overcrowding?"

Tabares: "Yes, I have. I've actually seen schools where the child...

the students are eating in the hallways for lunch."

Hernandez: "Would you say your district has a very large... a large LL... English Language Learner population?"

Tabares: "Yes, yes, there is."

Hernandez: "Would you say that teachers in that capacity are overwhelmed with the type of instruction that is required and sometimes wouldn't you say their recommendation... their say...

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

having a say when it means scheduling, instruction and so forth, counts in... when it comes to... at some point collective bargaining?"

Tabares: "Yes, that's correct, Representative. I agree with you."

Hernandez: "To the Bill. I just want to add my experience with...

I do... do represent a suburban district that at one point experienced the overcrowding due to the influx of families coming into the district. And the teachers were extremely overwhelmed, overworked and for... to have a strong union and to be able to have a... a say in when it comes to collective bargaining. When it's class size, when it has to do with scheduling, by the surmounted responsibilities that are come their way, there is no other way than to try to bring some quality education to our students through the..."

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

Hernandez: "I just want to say thank you, Representative. This is a good Bill. And I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Tabares to close."

Tabares: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to thank all of my colleagues who spoke in support of this Bill. Thank you for your support and for your encouragement of urging an 'aye' vote. I want to repeat that this Bill is about parity. I repeat, parity for Chicago educators with educators in the school districts you represent in suburban and downstate districts. This Bill allows Chicago school dis... school employees to better advocate for their students and their families. It's about fairness for teachers. This legislation would ensure teachers in Chicago to focus on what's important by educating and preparing our students. Students in Chicago

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

deserve better. Teachers in Chicago should have the rights that every other teacher in the state has. Because currently, as it stands, bargaining over class size, the school calendar, and other issues can only take place if both Chicago Public Schools and the Chicago Teachers Union are in agreement to discuss them. The Bill will remove... this Bill will remove that requirement placing those subjects as required issues to talk about during collective bargaining regardless of whether both parties are in agreement to discuss them. So, I just really... this simply... just simply... this Bill is about allowing educators in Chicago to bargain over the same items they bargain in every other district in Illinois. Whatever educators can negotiate in your school districts, they'll be able to negotiate in Chicago. So, I just want to ask for your 'aye' vote. 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. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 63 voting 'yes', 54 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is here... I apologize. Mr. Wheeler had asked for a verification. Mr. Wheeler, do you persist in your request? He does. Mr. Clerk, would you read the affirmative. Members, please be in your chairs."

Clerk Hollman: "A poll of those voting in the affirmative:

Representative Ammons; Representative Andrade;

Representative Arroyo; Representative Beiser; Representative

Burke, D.; Representative Burke, K.; Representative Cassidy;

Representative Chapa LaVia; Representative Conroy;

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

Representative Conyears-Ervin; Representative Costello; Representative Currie; Representative D'Amico; Representative Davis; Representative DeLuca; Representative Drury; Representative Evans; Representative Feigenholtz; Representative Fine; Representative Flowers; Representative Ford; Representative Gabel; Representative Gordon-Booth; Representative Greenwood; Representative Guzzardi; Representative Halpin; Representative Harper; Representative Greg Harris..."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, the Gentleman withdraws his request. 63 voting 'yes', 54 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Rules Report."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on April 26, 2017: recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is House... is Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 3908. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on April 26, 2017: recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 188, Floor Amendment #5 to House Bill 189."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Cassidy, for what reason do you rise?"

Cassidy: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Cassidy: "Hopefully, they're still up there during that lengthy debate. But I wanted to welcome some of the students from Senn High School in my district. They're here today advocating

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

for School Days Health Centers and they're doing a great job. Got up really early this morning to join us in Springfield and I'd like to welcome them."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome. Thanks for joining us today. Mr. Andersson is recognized. For what reason do you rise, Sir?"

Andersson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A parliamentary inquiry."

Speaker Lang: "State your inquiry, Sir."

Andersson: "Thank you. Yesterday on House Bill 302 one Member of my caucus made a Motion to put the previous question. At that time, the Motion was ignored. It was not ruled on either favorably or negatively. My question for the parliamentarian is upon what basis was... was that done? House Rule 59 provides specifically that once the previous question has been stated, until the question is decided all Amendments and debate are precluded. I'd like to know how it was that the Motion was completely ignored."

Speaker Lang: "I don't believe I was in the Chair at the time."

Andersson: "You were not, Sir."

Speaker Lang: "So, I wasn't listening to that particular part of debate. So, let me just ask you a question. Was... was the request simply... no comment was made about the request?"

Andersson: "The... there was very little comment that I could even hear from the Member in the Chair. When I came up afterwards, it was explained to me that their interpretation of this Rule was that an individ... that the... at the discretion of the Chair could allow it to continue that those people whose buttons had already lit up. I don't find that interpretation in the Rule. What I find is a requirement that debate is suspended until the decision on the matter is made."

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

Speaker Lang: "Let me ask one additional question..."

Andersson: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Lang: "...and then the parliamentarian will check on this for you. Did the person that make... made the request also debate on the Bill?"

Andersson: "No."

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

Andersson: "Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Lang: "House Bill 3649, Mr. Crespo. Mr. Crespo. Out of the record. House Bill 2624, Representative Fine. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2624, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Fine."

Fine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill focuses on health insurance rate review. It's designed to improve insurers' accountability and transparency. And it ensures also that after experts evaluate whether a proposed rate increase is based on reasonable cost and consumption that consumers are treated fairly."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Andersson: "So, give me a little bit more on this. What are... what ill are we trying to correct here?"

Fine: "When the Affordable Care Act was passed, part of the Affordable Care Act said that every state also has to initiate rate review. So, every time an insurance company brings out their new premium for the upcoming year, they have to get

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

that premium to the Department of Insurance. And the department goes through it in an actuarial way to make sure that the increase in the rate is sufficient, that it is not too high. And if it is more than 10 percent, they're going to decide whether or not they need to lower that rate for consumers."

- Andersson: "So, I believe under existing law that's already the case. A rate increase of 10 percent or more, applicable to a 12-month period, has to be calculated. I..."
- Fine: "Correct, except there's no final step. So, the Department of Insurance can say, well, you gave us these rates. You know, you told us you want a 20 percent increase. We find a 15 percent increase adequate. There's no other step that they can do to ensure that there's only a 15 percent increase for consumers."
- Andersson: "So, at this point, the real change is you're... you're creat... you're making the... the review process mandatory on the part of the Department of Insurance. Is that correct?"
- Fine: "So, right now, like I said, it is mandatory under the Affordable Care Act. We don't know if that's going to change, if the Federal Government changes the Affordable Care Act, but this is something that/s very good to have in place for the consumer. We have found that in states that have this final step in place, where they can actually decide if the rate has gone too high, in the last study that I found they save consumers over a billion dollars. And in some states in particular, in Rhode Island for example, the proposal that was given to them, their depart..."

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

Speaker Lang: "Representative, please complete your answer to the question."

Fine: "...their department decreased that rate by 6 percent."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andersson, please bring your remarks to a close."

Andersson: "Thank you. To the Bill. It appears we already have a requirement like this. This idea that now we're going to make it absolutely mandatory and for our government to decide what's reasonable rather than the insurance companies who actually, I think, know their business is once again another opportunity for us to make Illinois business unfriendly. I urge a 'no' vote."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Reis: "Representative, I notice this came out of Consumer Protection. Is that where the Bill first went?"

Fine: "That's where I know it was assigned to."

Reis: "No. It went to Health Insurance: Life & Health. To the Bill. We couldn't get the Bill out of committee because it's an insurance-related matter and the people on the committee didn't want to support the Bill, so we transferred it to Consumer Protection and here it is on the floor. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we're... we're asking the government to approve insurance rate hikes or disapprove. We owe over \$3 billion in state employee health insurance claims. What on earth business does the government have in deciding private insurance rates? Let the competitive market work. We're not doing any good by having companies pull out of coverages and

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

things like that because they can't make a cover the cost of the claims. In the end, the consumer is the one that loses."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives for two minutes."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. To my esteemed colleague who just spoke before me, who's also is a Representative on our side of the aisle, I think you don't understand. I think you don't understand here is the philosophy down here in Springfield is the ... guess what, we know how to run your business better than you know how to run your business. The other part of that philosophy is that nothing is out of our realm to regulate. And finally, you know what, there's nothing that we can't collect data on that we... that you have to give us that we have to approve. That's the philosophy down here. Then this Bill's the perfect example of that working. It works in every single labor and commerce Bill that comes through our committee. It works in every business Bill that comes by. And the whole thing has to change here. We need us to get out of the place of telling business what to do when we have no place doing it. We can't even run our budget, we can't run our government, and we're going to ask these insurance companies, private corporations, we're also this information data and then assess whether or not they're profitable or not. This is the philosophy that is killing Illinois. And it's killing the spirit of Illinoisans across the state at every demographic level. This is a perfect example. We know your business better than you do. There's nothing we can't regulate. And oh, by the way, if you're the employer, you're responsible for every facet of your employee's life. We got to get out of this rut. Vote 'no'."

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

Speaker Lang: "Representative Hammond for two minutes."

Hammond: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. This Bill is simply a duplicative action of what is currently done at the Department of Insurance. They have the authority and they do review rate increases in excess of 10 percent. This is a very troubling time with the insurance fluctuations that are going on in our nation. And I firmly believe that the... the minimum... the minimum loss standards, the ratio standards that are currently in place, they are there to keep our costs down and keep our rates in check. By doing... by taking this type of an action, it will simply result in increases to the consumers. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Flowers for two minutes."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of the Lady's Bill. First of all, insurance is no longer a choice. It's a mandate. And the fact that it is a mandate it should be regulated. If we do not have insurance, the possibility is we're getting... if we become sick, we will be a burden on the taxpayers. And the insurance companies get funding from the Federal Government. They get subsidies from the Federal Government. And they are supposed to be affordable as well as attainable. And what this Bill is merely doing is to have the insurance company to come before this committee to explain the purpose of its rates hikes. A lot of insurance companies have a fiduciary responsibility to its shareholders. Insurance companies really do have a conflict of interest. This Bill is about helping people maintain affordable, quality health insurance that is mandated by law. I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

Speaker Lang: "Representative Fine to close."

Fine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This isn't something new. This is something that's actually already in place. So, the argument saying that we are creating a new law to regulate the insurance industry is wrong. The Department of Insurance already regulates... or not regulates, but already... already reviews what the new rate increase is going to be. Many other states go that final step to protect the consumer. And their actuaries make sure that the rates that they put into place are applicable to the marketplace and protect the consumer. So, all this legislation does is take the final step. If you go on to the Department of Insurance website, there's a great chart that shows you how they do the rate review process. But the problem is once that process comes to an end, if they feel like the rate is too high, it explicitly says on the website that there's really nothing that they can do about it. I urge your 'aye' vote. This is a consumer protection Bill."

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? Costello, Harris. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 65 voting 'yes', 49 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Andersson, in regard to your inquiry. The parliamentarian advises that the past practice in the Illinois House is to allow the Chair the discretion to deal with that particular Motion as the Chair sees fit. You can respond."

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

- Andersson: "Thank you. So... so, the answer is that that's the past practice or that's the current practice?"
- Speaker Lang: "That has been the practice according to the parliamentarian. I'm just repeating to you what I was told, Sir."
- Andersson: "Thank you. I appreciate that. Just a brief comment. Interpretations of Rules sometimes do require practice, past practice, past policy; however, in this case, the Rule is explicit. The Rule is clear. The Motion was made, debate needed to be suspended until the question could be decided. That was completely ignored. And the idea that there's an unwritten Rule, 'cause that's what I'm being told is there's an unwritten Rule that completely contradicts the Rules that you created violates the very basic tenets of what we're supposed to do. But I do thank you for the answer."
- Speaker Lang: "You made your record, Sir. Mr. Davis is recognized."
- Davis: "Can I speak to that, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Lang: "No, it's not necessary, Sir. Thank you. House Bill 3601, Representative Greenwood. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3601, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Greenwood."
- Greenwood: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 3601 provides that East St. Louis School District 189 is encouraged to allow students in grade... grades 11 and 12 to take classes at Southwestern Illinois College for dual credit at no cost to the student. I ask for a 'yes' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andersson for two minutes."

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Andersson: "So, is this only applicable to the East St. Louis School District 189?"

Greenwood: "Yes. And it's a current practice already since 2015 where the district pays for those classes for the students."

Andersson: "Is there a reason why we have to do it by statute if they're already doing it?"

Greenwood: "It's just to ensure that the practice continues."

Andersson: "Okay. And is there... who... who bears the cost? I think you said, but I didn't hear it."

Greenwood: "East St. Louis School District 189 currently bears all the cost."

Andersson: "And I assume they're a proponent of the Bill. They support the Bill?"

Greenwood: "Yes. They support the Bill."

Andersson: "Thank you very much."

Greenwood: "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. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3061, Mr. Guzzardi. Mr. Guzzardi. Out of the record. House Bill 3083, Representative Hernandez. Representative Hernandez. Out of the record. House Bill 137, Mr. Hoffman. Please read the Bill."

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 137, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hoffman."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 137, as... as amended, would... would ensure that we adopt the Federal Buy American Act provisions here in the State of Illinois. This Bill would mandate that we utilize state resources, state tax dollars to buy American goods. The provisions in the Bill very specifically outline how we determine whether a good is made in America, how we determine whether or not a specific product that the state is buying or good has to be... has to be bought from American made goods with specific exemptions. Those exemptions are very specific and are contained in the Buy America Act of 1933 that was passed federally by the United States Congress. This is really simple, I believe. First of all, Illinois wants to ensure that when we use our taxpayers' dollars that we're going to buy, first of all, Illinois made products and secondly, U.S. products. This Bill along with... with House Bill 138 would ensure that that happens. I ask for a favorable vote."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Andersson: "So, Representative, talk to me about component parts in products that we'd be manufacturing? How do we determine whether something is made in the United States or not depending on portions of it?"

Hoffman: "Yes. The... what is... what is adopted and we make reference to the Buy American Act... Federal Buy American Act in 1933 and

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

there are various specific provisions, how you determine whether a component part... when... when a product that is made of component parts is... will be getting made in America. And that means that the cost of the component parts... the cost of at least 15 per... 50 percent of the component parts must have been made in America."

Andersson: "So, 50 percent is the threshold then? If it's 51 percent or more made outside the US, it no longer qualifies it. Am I understanding that correctly?"

Hoffman: "Well, if it's 49 percent."

Andersson: "Okay. I may have..."

Hoffman: "You see what I mean, yeah?"

Andersson: "The other way around."

Hoffman: "So, if... if it was 51 percent, that means more of it was made in America, 49 percent less."

Andersson: "Yeah. I said 51 percent made outside of the United States that... that product would not qualify. Now, does this apply to current contracts or is this prospective only?"

Hoffman: "It is prospective only."

Andersson: "Where does it say that 'cause I'm not seeing it?"

Hoffman: "Well, that... if... if it isn't, that's the intent. But I don't believe that we can go back and undo current contracts."

Andersson: "And who's going to be charged with enforcing this requirement?"

Hoffman: "Each procurement officer would be in charge with making sure they follow this law."

Andersson: "And do we anticipate or has any determination been made with regard to the cost increase that this could... could

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

- result in since we're no longer buying the lowest, most responsive bidder, we're now adding this element?"
- Hoffman: "To my knowledge, CMS did not provide an estimate. I would say to you..."
- Speaker Lang: "Please complete your answer."
- Hoffman: "I would say to you that... that, Representative, if indeed we buy more Illinois and more American products, there's going to be more money coming into the state's coffers. It's very specific that if the cost of a product is more than 12 percent higher to buy American versus the foreign that then you could buy the foreign product."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andersson, please bring your remarks to a close, Sir."
- Andersson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think in this day and age where the state is under such financial burdens adding this additional element does not make sense at this time. I would urge a 'no' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hoffman to close, if you wish."
- Hoffman: "Yes, real briefly. This is all about putting Illinois people to work, American people to work. I could just reference your President's Executive Order regarding buy American. This is saying our taxpayer dollars to put our people to work, and we should use the buying power of our state to create jobs and economic opportunity. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

question, there are 66 voting 'yes', 48 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 138, Mr. Hoffman. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 138, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We just debated House Bill 137 which indicated that state money when it purchased products should be used to buy American. This adds an additional step. It says first you should look at buying an Illinois manufactured good. If there isn't an Illinois manufactured good available that the state would buy, you would then buy an American manufactured good. If there isn't one of those, then you could buy a foreign manufactured good."

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

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

Andersson: "Thank you. So, this is basic... Jay, this is basically the same Bill that we just went over but for Illinois products. Is that correct?"

Hoffman: "This is the same Bill, but it adds another step. First, you would look to Illinois made products. Then you would look to US made products. And then you would look to outside the US."

Andersson: "And does it have the same threshold? We talked about the 12 percent rule, the 50 percent rule. Is that all the same?"

Hoffman: "Everything's identical except the additional step."

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

Andersson: "Okay. So, what I told you last time, ditto."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Hays: "Representative, I want to make sure I understand. And this really maybe goes back to the last Bill as well. So, review with me again what the criteria is for either American or Illinois made? And let me give you a specific example. So, what do I tell two manufacturing companies in Danville, Illinois, one of which makes the... the hood and the trunk for Toyota cars, the other makes the camshaft. So, I have to go back home and tell them that the automobile that is assembled in Ohio, with parts made in Danville, Illinois, is now banned permanently from the list of items that the state can buy. Am I hearing that correctly?"

Hoffman: "It would depend on the product. So ... "

Hays: "It's a Toyota. It's a Toyota automobile..."

Hoffman: "Well, I don't know. So..."

Hoffman: "I am not tell..."

Hays: "...home to Danville and tell those hundreds of workers that Representative Jay Hoffman took the item that you make for one of the highest selling cars in this country assembled in Ohio, and it can't be purchased anymore by the State of Illinois. I want to be crystal clear 'cause that's going to be a hell of a message."

Hoffman: "No, that is not correct. But if that's what you want to say..."

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

Hays: "So, they can buy a Toyota?"

Hoffman: "They could buy a Toyota, if indeed... if I can read to you what is in... what we made reference to and has been the law of the land since under the Buy America Act... Federal Buy America Act since 1933. The cost of the component parts are generally determined based upon certain costs incurred by the contractor and first single manufacturer of the components. For components purchased by the contractor, the cost of components includes the acquisition cost including transportation costs to the place of incorporations into the end product. And for components manufact..."

Speaker Lang: "Please complete your answer."

Hoffman: "The costs of components includes all costs associated with the manufacturing. So, it's laid out... and this has been the law of land since 1933... and if, indeed Representative, if indeed the... one of the criterias is not met, you then can look outside buy Illinois and then you can buy an American made product. I don't know the specifics of ... of the case which you have indicated. I would say to you that some people who were against... I would call it former Representative Smiddy's Bill and there was... and this Bill, I believe, addresses those issues. I believe it addresses those issues because what we have done is said that if 50 percent of the costs of the component parts are in Illinois, right, you would buy Illinois. If that isn't the case, you would then look to buy American, okay? So, under your scenario, I would suggest to you, simply because it was done in Ohio, 50 percent of the component parts... costs would have been done in the United

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

States and you would be able to buy them here in Illinois and you'd save taxpayers' dollars."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andersson, please bring your remarks to a close. It wasn't you?"

Hays: "It's me. Oh..."

Speaker Lang: "Oh, it's Mr. Hays."

Hays: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hays, will please bring your remarks to a close."

Hays: "Thank you. And I appreciate that explanation. I guess my commentary, Representative, is it's... it's, you know, a global economy... it's not that simple. And what you just suggested to me, it's very probable that the hood and the trunk made at Alcoa Danville and the camshaft made at Thyssenkrupp Gerlach in Danville would not equal 50 percent of the total sum cost of the automobile. But I think it's a heck of a message to have to go home and tell hundreds and hundreds of workers in my largest community that, hey, sorry, as it relates to the State of Illinois despite your good work, despite the quality being off the map, you're... you're now off the list of what we can spend your hard earned tax dollars for. I... I just think this sounds good, but I fear that it's not well thought out."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reick for two minutes. Gentleman does not wish to speak. Representative Willis for two minutes. Representative Willis does not wish to speak. Mr. Hoffman to close."

Hoffman: "Thank you. I appreciate the comments of the previous speaker, but I don't believe that the Bill would have the con... would have... would have the effect of what he was

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

concerned about. This is very specific. We're going to use Illinois products and buying power to make sure we create jobs for Illinois workers. If, indeed, the product isn't available or made in Illinois, then we would look to the U.S. products. And if, indeed, it is not available in the U.S., then you would go to the foreign products. This has been done by the United States Government since 1933. We've adopted their Bill. We've adopted their concepts. And we said let's do that in Illinois. Incidentally, there are several other states that have begun to... to look into this matter. These states which already have these statute of laws, Buy American laws, are Hawaii, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Oklahoma, of all places, and Pennsylvania. The following states have proposed some type of buying American goods products: Pennsylvania, I said, New York, Texas, Virginia, and I also indicated New Jersey. So, this isn't something new. All we're saying here is let's use our buying power, let's make sure that we buy Illinois or U.S. goods and let's put our people to work by using our taxpayer's dollars. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 66 voting 'yes', 46 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Ladies and Gentlemen, the House Democrats will caucus immediately in Room 114. Do the Republicans wish to caucus? Mr. Demmer, Mr. Andersson. The Republicans can go do whatever you wish. Democrats will caucus immediately in

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

Room 114. The House will be in recess 'til the call of the Chair. "  $\,$ 

Speaker Turner: "The House will come to order. We'll be moving the Bills on Third Reading. First Bill is House Bill 698, Representative Slaughter. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 698, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Slaughter."

Slaughter: "All right. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In our efforts to continue to improve and enhance the programs and services that we offer our inmates and exoffenders, HB698 creates a five-year pilot project to establish a prerelease entrepreneurship program for the Illinois Department of Corrections. The Bill is giving IDOC a great opportunity to offer a program that is new and different from innovative and the... its traditional educational job training programs as it will provide some of our more outstanding, exceptional inmates with skills to ultimately become employer... employers and business owners themselves. There's no opposition. IDOC is officially neutral, but they support the concept. This Bill generated a lot of positive feedback in committee from both sides of the aisle. Please note that all of the ... the resources and funding are not quite there for this, so we ensured that this Bill is subject to appropriation. I urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Leader Durkin."

Durkin: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

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

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

- Durkin: "Representative, could you just give me an indication of how much the cost would be to the Illinois Department of Corrections to implement this program?"
- Slaughter: "Sure. And this program is... is based off of a model program in Texas that they implemented approximately about five years ago. They started off at about 200 thousand. Since then, it's grown, I think, I believe they're up to about 3 million a year. But it started out at 200 thousand."
- Durkin: "All right, great. Well, thank you. I think you've done fine work this Bill and I think it's a very good program. And I think we should support this, but more importantly, I want people to look at the board. I see three Democrats and two Republican Sponsors on a piece of legislation. We could do more of that. And this is an example where we can work together in a bipartisan manner to get problems solved. Let's use this as a starting point for us to work together in a collaborative manner to solve the big issues of the day. So, Representative Slaughter, thank you. I plan to support your Bill. I'd encourage all Members to support it as well. But remember, we are here to work together to solve the problems in a cooperative manner where we both respect the priorities of both sides. Vote 'aye'."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Andersson is recognized."

Andersson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I'm tempted to say 'ditto' again because Jim just said exactly what I was thinking. But I would note that this is... this is pretty unique. This is an excellent program because what we're doing is we're training in... inmates for business skills, computer skills, budgeting, creating a business plan, public speaking,

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

and goal setting. How can you ask for better than that? We're not asking them to be, you know, go to work for, you know, whatever. We're giving them a chance to shoot for the stars. I think this is an excellent program. And I congratulate you for bringing it. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Long is recognized."

Long: "Thank you, Speaker. I appreciate it. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Long: "I have one question. Do you know how Illinois rates as far as recidivism in the United States? What... are we ranked at the highest?"

Slaughter: "I do believe we do rank in the highest. I know that the recidivism rate here is a ridiculous 48 percent."

Long: "Very good. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I'm not real big on implementing new policies that cost the State of Illinois, but because of the fact that Illinois has an extremely high recidivism rate and part of the problem is education. And I think that if we educate those inmates, I think that they have a golden opportunity to be able to get out here and get a good job and not repeat again. And because of that, I support this Bill heavily. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Slaughter to close."

Slaughter: "Thank you. I urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 698 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 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

'present', House Bill 698, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2963, Representative Nekritz. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2963, a Bill for an Act concerning corporations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Nekritz."

Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2963 establishes the Entity Omnibus Act. This is dealing with corporate organizations and corporations, limited liability companies, limited liability partnerships, and so forth. And this particular legislation deals with how they can convert from one type of an organization to another within the State of Illinois. And then, how someone from another state might convert their... their... that other state's corporation or business organization into an Illinois business organization. It's... right now, our statutes provide different types of conversions and domestications for different types of business organizations. This standardizes it for all the business types of organizations."

Speaker Turner: "For further discussion, we have Representative Andersson."

Andersson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Turner: "Sponsor indicates that she will yield."

Andersson: "Thank you. So, my understanding is we're really bringing all together all the various conversion possibilities into a single schedule, for lack of a better term, making it more efficient. Is that correct?"

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

Nekritz: "Correct and make it easier for our business organizations to manage the type of business that they would like to be."

Andersson: "Correct. Are there any fee changes or implications on that?"

Nekritz: "I... I couldn't hear you, Representative."

Andersson: "I'm sorry. I apologize. Are there any fee changes or are the fees the same as they are now?"

Nekritz: "I believe they are all the same as they are now."

Andersson: "Thank you very much."

Nekritz: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Nekritz to close."

Nekritz: "I urge your support."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2963 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 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 2963, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 607, Representative Yingling. Mr. Clerk, can you please move this Bill back to the Order of Second Reading and read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 607, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. This Bill was read a second time a previous day. Amendment 2 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Yingling, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Yingling."

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

- Yingling: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to adopt House Floor Amendment #3. The Amendment makes some clarifying changes in consolidation of highway commissioners."
- Speaker Turner: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 607. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read House Bill 607."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 6..."

Speaker Turner: "Out of the record. Out of the record. House Bill 682, Representative Olsen. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 682, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Olsen."

Olsen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is a... is a transparency Bill. This Bill creates the Local Initiative Sunshine Act. It creates a database... a searchable database that the Office of Comptroller would maintain that would indicate the name of the initiative, the location, the district in which it represents, the amount, the funding agency, et cetera. Obviously, because we don't have a budget, we don't have a capital Bill, this Bill... nothing would be done... in current. But in the case where we do get a budget and it has... perhaps have a new capital Bill, that's when this Bill would be applicable. The Bill has the support of Better Government Association, the Comptroller's Office. I ask for your support."

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 682 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 111 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 682, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1849, Representative Stewart. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1849, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Stewart."
- Stewart: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 1849 is a clean-up Bill for the Illinois State Police. It eliminates some ranks that are no longer used that are obsolete. I know of no opposition. And I'd ask for your support."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 1849 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 114 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 1849, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3163, Representative Manley. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3163, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Manley."

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

Manley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3163 takes our existing ABLE program and creates a tax deduction up to \$10 thousand per year for contributions to an ABLE account. I'll answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Andersson is recognized."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Andersson: "So, what's an ABLE account?"

Manley: "The ABLE account... I don't know how much history you want... but the ABLE account is... the acronym is Achieving a Better Life Experience. It is an account that is established for a person with a disability. Much like a 529 college savings plan, ABLE account is a 529A plan an it allows people to contribute to an account that can be used by a person with a disability for expenses that are acceptable under that statute."

Andersson: "Okay. It looks like the maximum amount that they can contribute is \$14 thousand per year. Is that correct?"

Manley: "The maximum you can contribute is 14 thousand. The tax...

Illinois deduction is 10 thousand."

Andersson: "What... what... Oh, the max tax... tax deduction even if you..."

Manley: "That you can take is 10 thousand."

Andersson: "Okay. And it looks this is a relatively new program that we... we had established. So, we're... Is that correct? Looks like..."

Manley: "We voted for it in a previous GA."

Andersson: "Right."

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

Manley: "It was borne out of some federal legislation. Currently, in the State of Illinois, there is 113 ABLE accounts that have been opened by Illinois residents. And we are one of 20 states that have ABLE programs. And I just want to point out, Illinois is kind of a leader in this. I know we like to bash our state and talk about how bad it is all the time, but let me tell you where we're good. We're leading the charge at being responsible for getting 14 other states to come together so that the fees from the third-party management company are low and affordable and helps to... to make this program even more attractive."

Andersson: "Last question. So, obviously, it's a deduction. Do we have an implication of what this will cost in tax revenues?"

Manley: "Well, we don't know how many people are going to participate or how many people will participate and actually take the tax deduction."

Andersson: "Right."

Manley: "I mean, it requires the taxpayer to keep track of it.

It's... this is probably more than you want to know. Taxpayers will put it on their Schedule M on Illinois as a subtraction which carries to the front page of the... the IL-1040."

Andersson: "Oh, yeah, that's exactly..."

Manley: "Stop making that face. Stop making that face."

Andersson: "...that's exactly what I was asking about."

Manley: "Yeah, that's what you wanted to know."

Andersson: "I want to know all about Schedule M."

Manley: "So, we really don't know, 10... 5 to 10 million, maybe."

Andersson: "Okay. Thank you very much."

Manley: "Thank you."

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

Speaker Turner: "Representative Pritchard is recognized."

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

Speaker Turner: "She indicates that she will."

Pritchard: "Representative, this is a Bill that we passed last Session and it's one that Illinois was partial leader in helping bring forward and we're glad that the Treasurer has worked with us in implementing it this year. Do you have any idea how many people have taken advantage of this program since January 1?"

Manley: "Well, I have a... I have some information for you. There are now to date 113 ABLE accounts with an estimated value of about 215 thousand in assets. So, I don't know what that is as far as individual contributors, but it's also... the accounts are for somebody with a disability. And the best... one of the best parts of this is you... it kind of incentivizes people to deposit into these accounts instead of giving a birthday gift or giving other things, the bonds and the things we used to do for young people. People are being encouraged to make deposits into these accounts so that the person with the disabilities care and other items necessary for their care can be paid and they can save for those things."

Pritchard: "Well, certainly, as I know I have several parents that are concerned about a handicapped child and what will happen to that child. And that's really the purpose of the ABLE account is to give some assurance. And this money can also be sheltered from the federal limitations, correct?"

Manley: "Well, as far as sheltering, so the money you deposit is after-tax. So, you've paid tax on your contribution."

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

Pritchard: "But I'm... what goes into the account can be sheltered from any federal limitations?"

Manley: "There are no limitations, but you are... when you hit the \$100 thousand mark, you start to affect SSI benefits. So, I don't know if that's what you're referring to, but I want to add this, too, Representative Pritchard. Every... So, you make a deposit into the ABLE account. All the growth, all the interest... all the growth is not taxable."

Pritchard: "Correct."

Manley: "So, it's... it could really... it's almost... it kind of almost mirrors what happens in a Roth IRA."

Pritchard: "Well, a 529 savings account, that's why the analogy.

But this certainly is a help and it's... it's \$10 thousand a

year. Is that correct?"

Manley: "At 10 thousand, your ABLE... the contributor can take a 10 thousand per year deduction."

Pritchard: "The tax... the tax credit is 10 thousand."

Manley: "But you can... you can contribute up to 14 thousand."

Pritchard: "Federal. I thought yours... your Bill limited it to 10 thousand in Illinois?"

Manley: "You can only deduct up to 10 thousand in Illinois."

Pritchard: "Correct. That's what I'm saying. Thank you. It's a good piece of legislation. I encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Bellock is recognized."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to say thank you to Representative Manley for doing this Bill. And last year for Kelly Burke and all the work that she did on the ABLE account Bill. This is a model piece of legislation that as Representative Manley said, the State of Illinois was

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

one of the first to do it, although the Federal Government allowed us to do it. And this is especially helpful to parents with children with Autism. And I think it's really nice that we're being able to do it during this month which is Autism month in Illinois. So, thank you very much, Representative Manley."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Manley to close."

Manley: "I appreciate your support on this. Members, this is a good Bill. It's something we can be proud of here in Illinois.

Please vote 'aye'."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3163 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 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 3163, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2462, Representative Moeller. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2462, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Moeller."

Moeller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. On this historic day after women from all over Illinois gathered here in our State Capitol, I am pleased to present House Bill 2462, a Bill to address the pervasive wage gap that affects women across our state. For over 50 years, it has been illegal to pay men and women a different wage for equal work in Illinois. And yet, women are still paid less for equal work and a

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

significant wage gap persists. According to the National Women's Law Center, Illinois ranks 32nd in pay equity. And over their lifetime, women lose roughly \$433 thousand in earnings due to the wage gap. Earning less than their male peers means that women have fewer choices. They have fewer options in the neighborhoods in which they live, the educational opportunities for their children and the food they put on their table. The pay gap can have especially dire consequences for single mothers since they are the only breadwinners for their families. In the long run, the pay gap contributes to elderly women living in higher poverty... rates of poverty with elderly women at a rate living at 11 percent in poverty compared to 6 percent of elderly men. Overall, the poverty gap... the pay gap makes achieving economic security more difficult for women and their families."

Speaker Turner: "Excuse me, Representative. Excuse me. Members, can we please bring the noise level down in the chamber. There's an important debate going on. Thank you very much."

Moeller: "Thank you, Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Representative."

Moeller: "Thank you. House Bill 2462 would help close the wage gap by strengthening our current Equal Pay Act in the following ways. First, it would strengthen the requirement for an employer to defend if they are paying their male employees more than their female employees and to justify why there is a pay disparity in their organization. It would also require them to justify the entire pay differential based on legitimate business reasons such as merit, experience, and education. Second, it would make it unlawful for an employer

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

to prohibit an employee from sharing his or her wage information. Third, it would prohibit an employer from requiring a job applicant to disclose his or her wage history when applying for a job and prohibit an employer from screening job applicants based on prior wages and benefits. And fourth, it would increase the penalties for employers who act in malice or reckless indifference in violating the Equal Pay Act by providing compensatory damages, punitive damages, and injunctive relief. The novel provision in this Bill is the provision that would prohibit employers from asking for prior wage information from job applicants. According to a study conducted by the AUW in 2013, women on average get paid 6.6 percent less than men in their first job and after that... and that's after controlling for personal demographics, occupation, college major, hours worked, and location. Women are less likely to negotiate their salaries and when they do, they ask for less and are perceived more negatively. When a young woman begins her career, already... already making less than her male counterparts, even prior pay to determine future pay continues and extends the pay inequity over her entire career. We can put an end to that cycle of inequity by passing this legislation. And while this Bill will help close the gender wage gap, the prohibition on using past salary to determine future wage offers also stands to benefit male and female older workers or workers reentering the workforce after a layoff or to care for their families."

Speaker Turner: "Excuse, Representative. Excuse me. Members, we have people complaining that they can't hear the debate. Can you please take all conversations to the rear of the chamber?

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

Thank you very much for your consideration. Representative Moeller."

Moeller: "Thank you, Speaker. In closing, as a state we have a compelling interest to ensure that all of our citizens are protected against discrimination and afforded equal pay for equal work. The very fact that we still have today, in 2017, white women making 80 cents, African-American women making 63 cents, and Hispanic women 54 cents on the dollar to white men illustrates the dire need to end this unfair disparity. House Bill 2462 is a step in that direction. I ask for an 'aye' vote and look forward to addressing any questions. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Durkin is recognized."

Durkin: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Durkin: "Representative, I'm looking at this legislation and you're amending the Equal Pay Act of 2003. What needs to be changed and where is the problem, since we already have an Equal Pay Act on the books?"

Moeller: "Today, in 2017, there is still a wage gap in Illinois based on gender, not accounting for any other factor. And therefore, further changes, further developments, further progress needs to be made in closing that gap. The changes that I outlined in my opening remarks would help to make those changes."

Durkin: "Did you write this... this legislation?"

Moeller: "I did."

Durkin: "Oh, good for you."

Moeller: "With the help of advocates and..."

Durkin: "Well, like who?."

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

Moeller: "Pardon?"

Durkin: "Who?"

Moeller: "By women employed on the Shriver Poverty Center were very instrumental in helping to draft this legislation."

Durkin: "Anybody else?"

Moeller: "The National Women's Law Center was also involved."

Durkin: "Anybody else?"

Moeller: "Tho... those were the groups."

Durkin: "All right. Let's look at this. Now, it says no employer may discriminate at all. So, does this apply to all employee... employers no matter how many employees that they have? If they have one or two employees, does this apply to them?"

Moeller: "The applicability remains the same under the current Act... as the current Act."

Durkin: "I'm not saying that it's... You didn't answer my question.

Does this apply to all employers no matter how many employees that they have?"

Moeller: "Whatever the existing Act applies to, this Bill applies to as well."

Durkin: "Why don't you educate me and the Members of my side of the aisle of what that is?"

Moeller: "It is my... it's my under... this does not change any of the applicability standards..."

Durkin: "You haven't answered my question."

Moeller: "...in the... in the current Act."

Durkin: "Does it apply to... My question is, does it apply to all employers no matter how many employees they have?"

Moeller: "It has... it has the same applicability as the current Act."

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

Durkin: "All right. Here's the hypothetical question. If I have one employee, am I subject to this Act? If I'm the employer and I have one employee, am I subject to this Act?"

Moeller: "We are checking to ascertain that specific detail."

Durkin: "Okay. While you're checking that, let me ask you a few other questions."

Moeller: "Sure."

Durkin: "Does this... does this apply to public employers?"

Moeller: "Yes."

Durkin: "Such as the State of Illinois?"

Moeller: "Yes."

Durkin: "The City of Chicago?"

Moeller: "Yes."

Durkin: "All park districts? All schools? Okay. Let me ask you this. You do have a legal right of action in here which you can ensue somebody and also get injunctive relief, get attorneys' fees against employers who are in violation of it. Now, in Illinois, under our Constitution we have something called the sovereign immunity for the State of Illinois, which states that... which is 745 ILCS 5... that the State of Illinois should not be a defendant or party in any court. How does your action, if the State of Illinois is alleged to be an employer in violation of it, how do you get past sovereign immunity that is within our current statutes? 'Cause you have not amended that Section of the Civil Code."

Moeller: "Could you re... restate that... your question?"

Durkin: "Sure. If you want to have your staff look up or your able counsel over here, Heather."

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

Moeller: "The Attorney General would interpret the answer to that question."

Durkin: "Who?"

Moeller: "The Attorney General."

Durkin: "Oh, you want to bring her in here. I can wait. Why don't you call the AG over, bring her over and I'll ask her that question. I'm serious."

Moeller: "Why don't we continue the discussion of this Bill."

Durkin: "All right. Then why don't you answer one of my questions.

Again, how do you sue the State of Illinois if they are alleged to be an employer in violation of this Act when they are currently immune under the Sovereign Immunity Section under the State Lawsuit Immunity Act?"

Moeller: "Again, that would be a question for the Attorney General's Office."

Durkin: "No, it isn't. It's a question from me to you. You want to get my support, answer my questions."

Moeller: "That is a question for the Attorney General's Office."

Durkin: "All right. Now, that... All right, let's go to the City of Chicago and local governments. Similar... similar type of provisions we have, we have under the local government and Governmental Employee Tort Immunity Act. It says the purpose of this Act is to protect the local public entities and public employees from liability arising from the operation of government. And it states in here an injury, under that Section, includes any injury alleged in a civil action, which is what this would be. How would you also sue... how would that employee sue the City of Chicago or the Elgin Park District or any other public employee whether it's the library or not

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

when they have protections currently under the local Tort Immunity Act?"

Moeller: "Again, that would be a question for the attorneys representing those... those local governments."

Durkin: "Do you want to take this out of the record and get those questions..."

Moeller: "No. I do not."

Durkin: "...asked 'cause our Members want to hear..."

Moeller: "I do not."

Durkin: "...your response not the Attorney General's response."

Moeller: "I have a... I have a... the answer to your previous question regarding the applicability in terms of number of employees."

Durkin: "I'm all ears."

Moeller: "It applies to organizations that have four or more employees."

Durkin: "Could you point that out? Is that... was that part of an Amendment or is that... I'm looking at the legislation right now. I'm going to have someone look that up 'cause I'm looking at something differently, so. All right, so we're going to punt and let everything go back on the Attorney General. So, let's go to another question. Okay. You have in this Section as I'm looking at... you've amended Section 10 and you've created a Section (C), where it says something of the effect that such defense shall not apply if the employee demonstrates that an alternative employment practice exists that would serve the same business purpose without producing such differential and that the employee... employer has refused to adopt such alternative practice. I have no idea what the heck that means. You wrote it. Explain it to me and give me an

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

example of what this is and I want... like to know in great detail of what exactly you're trying to accomplish with that."

- Moeller: "This simply... this simply specifies that if an employer is paying its male employees a different... more than its female employees it needs to explain and defend why they're paying their male employees or a male employee more than equivalent female employees. And it has to... the entire differential has to include the legitimate business person... purpose for that disparity in pay meaning merit, years of experience, education."
- Durkin: "Thank you. That's the type of answers that I've been looking for. Thank you. All right, let's go to a couple other Sections here. Now, this is the violation, fines, and penalties Section. You state that there is that injunctive relief may be appropriate. Explain to me, and you can ask Representative Nekritz, she's a fine lawyer, of what exactly what type of injunctive relief you're refer... referencing to. What are you referring to? What type of injunctive relief would apply in this situation?"
- Moeller: "It would depend on the... the facts of the... of the circumstance of the situation. And it would give the employee who is claiming a violation under this Act the opportunity to petition a court for... for that relief. But it would depend on the facts of the case."
- Durkin: "Are you saying a temporary restraining order, a permanent injunction... a temporary injunction? I... I'm just looking for some... some guidance, Representative, since you wrote the Bill."

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

Moeller: "Yeah. It would depend on whatever the... the plaintiff is asking for from the court in terms of its... its complaint."

Durkin: "That's seems like it's very wide open and I think you can be construed..."

Moeller: "It would be."

Durkin: "...and I think..."

Moeller: "It is wide open. It would be."

Durkin: "...it does not... we're not giving anybody..."

Moeller: "...it certainly... it would depend on the circumstances of the case."

Durkin: "Well, that's not good enough. Someone's going to look... someone's going to have to defend this... some court's going to have to look at this. If this does become law, if they're going to figure out what the heck you're talking about and what exactly was the intent and I'm not getting anywhere with it. So, all right, let's also talk... you talk about getting compensatory damages and you stated that punitive damages as may be appropriate. Now, under what circumstances, would punitive damages be appropriate and don't... I don't want to hear it depends on the circumstances of the case. When would punitive damages be appropriate?"

Moeller: "This is how... it would depend on the situation of the case, Representative... Leader."

Durkin: "Is that the best..."

Moeller: "This is how..."

Durkin: "...is the best we can do?"

Moeller: "...this is how... that's why we have a court system. That's why we have a judicial system. That's why we have attorneys."

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

Durkin: "I'm familiar with that. Yeah. I'm just trying to get some guidance from you since you wrote the legislation with some other advocates. I'd like to get some guidance from you what the intent is. And I'd like to know what would be the appropriate situation where punitive damages would be available. And what under the... the current law right now... under the current... what... what circumstances would warrant the award of punitive damages?"

Moeller: "If a... if an employer is knowingly with malice or reckless indifference paying their male employees more than their female employees for equivalent work."

Durkin: "Now, I want to get back to the issue of whether or not how many employees this applies to in a business situation.

And last year, the definition of employer under the Equal Pay Act eliminated four or more to include all employees."

Moeller: "Yes. That..."

Durkin: "So, it is not four..."

Moeller: "You are correct."

Durkin: "...employees or more."

Moeller: "You are correct."

Durkin: "So, it's all employees. So if I have one employee, I'm going to be subject to this Act, correct?"

Moeller: "Yes."

Durkin: "Okay. Thank you."

Moeller: "Yes."

Durkin: "Wow."

Moeller: "I apologize for it."

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

Durkin: "You don't have to apologize. That's all right. Let's get into a few other things. What's the statute of limitation for taking this in... for one of these actions in a court?"

Moeller: "It's five years and that's the current..."

Durkin: "Can it be applied ret... can it be applied retroactively?"

Moeller: "It's five years, the statute, so, any... a violation that's occurred within the last five years."

Durkin: "So, are you saying with... is this a retroactive application of this..."

Moeller: "That's the current... this doesn't change the statute of limitations. That's the current statute of limitations in the Act."

Durkin: "If there's a five year, but... are we saying that this new Section that you are amending that you can apply this new Section to... to whatever..."

Moeller: "No. The... the..."

Durkin: "...alleg... allegations and this has to be prospective, correct?"

Moeller: "It's all prospective. The new... Yes. This additional... these additional provisions in the Act are all prospective."

Durkin: "Okay. You also have a provision which allows for the award of reasonable attorney fees, correct?"

Moeller: "I'm sorry. Can you repeat that?"

Durkin: "You also have a Section in here which will allow for the award of reasonable attorneys' fees. Correct?"

Moeller: "Correct."

Durkin: "As it states here, to make the employee whole. Correct?"

Moeller: "Yes."

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

Durkin: "And again, consistent with the questions I've already gave you. Give me a situation where that would warrant... where a court would award attorneys' fees. Under what circumstances would attorney fees..."

Moeller: "That would be up to the judge..."

Durkin: "Oh."

Moeller: "...and the... and the circumstances of the case."

Durkin: "You're not answering my question very well. Give me an example of what would be the type of action... what would the... what would... what would warrant the award of attorneys' fees to make the employee whole?"

Moeller: "If the judge found egregious violations of the Equal Pay Act, they may award attorneys' fees to the plaintiff."

Durkin: "Okay. Now, I presume you also have in your legislation a clause that'll allow for an employer to have their attorneys' fees reimbursed when an employee has filed a bad faith claim or a frivolous action. Correct? Is that in your legislation?"

Moeller: "No, it is not."

Durkin: "Really? Really? Don't you think that that would be fair in a world where we have a litigious society where we are just going to say it's going to be... the employer's the one who bears the responsibility for attorneys' fees if their acts are egregious, but if the employee files a frivolous lawsuit or one which is absolutely no good faith, but they don't have a chance to recover their fees. What makes that right?"

Moeller: "Usually, it's... it's reasonable to conclude that typically it's a... the process of filing a complaint under the

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

Equal Pay Act is an onerous process for most employees. And the... the resources are going to be available to the employer and typically not to the employee."

Durkin: "Well, that's a great response, but how about answering my question whether or not the employer is going to be able to have their fees reimbursed when an employee files or former employee files a frivolous lawsuit against him and they're forced to run up a significant amount of fees from a bad faith claim by an employee, yes or no?"

Moeller: "You could make that argument for the entire Act. Do you think that we should not have an Equal Pay Act..."

Durkin: "No."

Moeller: "...in Illinois?"

Durkin: "I'm asking whether or not since you're allowing for the award of rea... of attorneys' fees against employers..."

Moeller: "They don't ... we don't current..."

Durkin: "...when their acts are egregious, but if the employee..."

Moeller: "We don't currently..."

Durkin: "...is egregious of their acts we're not allowing the employer to recover their fees."

Moeller: "We don't currently include fees for employers in the current Act."

Durkin: "I know because they're so bad in the State of Illinois. They're horrible people. They're horrible individuals. And we need to keep beating them up. You make a great point. One last question. We sponsored a Bill which we have which is House Bill 2094, which I introduced, which is a model from the Massachusetts Pay Equity Act which has the support of the

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

business community. Have you taken a look at that, at the Massachusetts Act?"

Moeller: "We have been in discussions with the business community regarding this Bill, yes."

Durkin: "And..."

Moeller: "And we made... we amended the Bill to accommodate some of their concerns."

Durkin: "So, are they supportive of your legislation, the members of the business community?"

Moeller: "I... I don't believe so."

Durkin: "Okay. I will just say that there's a better approach. And it's in House Bill 2094 which comes from the State of Massachusetts, the very progressive State of Massachusetts, that I know that if we pass out of this chamber, would be... would meet the signature requirements of the Governor. I think that's a better way of going about this. I walked into this with an open mind. I wanted to ask reasonable questions because I think it's important for our employers to know what exactly their obligations and what are the liabilities that they could potentially be found... they could be... they could stumble upon them. You have not satisfied my concerns. And for that, I'll be voting 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "Members, this Bill is on the Order of Short Debate on the Calendar and there are many, many people seeking recognition on this Bill. And considering the amount of work we have to do for the rest of the day, we'll be moving to a two-minute timer going forward. Representative Andersson is recognized for two minutes."

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

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Andersson: "Representative, my Leader just discussed IRMA's approach to you with regard to their requested changes. I understood that while there are several things they had a problem with, there were four fundamental exceptions that they sought to have you include. One was with regard to public employees whose records are available? Did you make that change?"

Moeller: "Yes, we did."

Andersson: "The second was with regard to the same company or group of corporations if they have that information that would be allowed to be used, correct?"

Moeller: "That is correct."

Andersson: "The one that you did not include was a require... that the employee may voluntarily release the information, correct?"

Moeller: "That's correct."

Andersson: "Why did you not include that one?"

Moeller: "We felt that that would be subject to abuse. That in a job interview situation there is a power differential and that the applicant may feel coerced or induced to provide their pay history."

Andersson: "So... so, it would essentially it's an exception that would eat the rule. Is that a fair statement?"

Moeller: "That's... yes, I would say."

Andersson: "Thank you. To the Bill, Ladies and Gentlemen, I only have a minute. IRMA came to me. IRMA's first statement to me was we agree with this concept at the 30 thousand foot level. We agree that this is an appropriate thing to do. They

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

disagreed with all of the approach that Illinois... or this Bill has taken, but they agree with the concept. And so do I, Ladies and Gentlemen, because this may not be perfect, but remember the phrase we all use, perfect is the enemy of the good and this Bill is good. What do we have to accept? We have to accept the reality that women are being paid less than men, even though we've had years and years and years of pay equity Bills on the books. They're not working. Seventynine cents for every dollar for most women in Illinois and less for people of color. Number 2, I generally don't favor restrictions on bus..."

Speaker Turner: "Representative, please bring your remarks to a close."

Andersson: "Actually, I think I was going to get two minutes..."

Speaker Turner: "Your minutes just ran."

Andersson: "Fine. I'll conclude as quickly as I can. Number 2, when that regulation or that lack of self-regulation fails, we need to step in. And most importantly, this information isn't relevant. I have worked for 25 years hiring and firing people. You know what's relevant? Recommendations, your work experience, where you came from, your education, those sorts of things. You know what's not relevant? What you got paid at your last job because maybe you were out of work for a while so it didn't catch up, maybe you're applying in Kane County, but instead, you came from Chicago. It's no longer relevant. This information isn't helpful. The only time it's helpful is in a bad faith exercise, when you are trying to get something for less."

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

Speaker Turner: "Representative, I can have someone yield their time to you, but we have a procedure for doing that. I don't want you... you keep talking then the next person, when the timer runs out, will want to keep talking as well."

Andersson: "I respect that."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you very much."

Andersson: "I will conclude my thoughts with a request for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Batinick is recognized for two minutes."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Batinick: "Quick technical question. How does this Bill deal with commissioned-based jobs? If I'm going to... I come from the world of real estate where it's awesome. It doesn't matter what nationality you are, what your gender is. You produce more, you make more. If... if I own a car dealership and I'm going to ask... and I'm going to interview somebody that's going to potentially work for me selling cars, I would think the most relevant question to that job would be how much money did you make selling cars? It's a commission-based position. So, how does this Bill deal with commission-based jobs?"

Moeller: "It doesn't change that at all. If you look at the current Act, already you are allowed to pay a different salary to employees based on a seniority system, a merit system..."

Batinick: "I have a minute 18..."

Moeller: "...a system..."

Batinick: "...so I'm going to cut you off. I'm not saying what you can pay them."

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

- Moeller: "A system that measures earnings by quantity or quality of production."
- Batinick: "I'm asking you about wage history if I'm going to hire somebody. If I'm going to hire somebody during the interview process, to me it would be important to ask for a commission-based job, what they ma... I know I can pay them in the future, but why is it not relevant or why is it unfair for me to ask that person that I'm interviewing what they made at their last commission-based job?"
- Moeller: "Because it's not relevant. It's... it's not relevant to their... to..."
- Batinick: "I'm going to go to the Bill 'cause I have 43 questions...
  or 43 seconds. To say that it's not relevant, when I'm hiring
  somebody that works on commission, it's not relevant how much
  they made at their last job when that is a direct correlation
  to how well they did their last job, I think is an absurdity.
  I agree at the 30 thousand foot level on this concept;
  however, this Bill does not allow for that exclusion.
  Therefore, I urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Parkhurst is recognized for two minutes."
- Parkhurst: "To the Bill. I am proud to cosponsor this Bill and also HB2... 2094. I would lend my support in leveling the playing field for women in the workforce. And I'd like to yield the rest of my time to Representative Andersson so he can finish his remarks. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Andersson."
- Andersson: "Thank... thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, just to conclude, a couple of people were confused about what I was trying to

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

say. My point here is that merit is what matters. Merit matters and pay history isn't reflective of it. In my time being an employer, what I have found is everything that you can do to research a person's qualifications, all the recommendations, those things matter, but what doesn't matter is what they made in their last job. What matters is what the job is worth in the area that you're working in. So, we do surveys. We figure out what our compatriots are paying and that's how we set how much we're willing to pay. Finding out that I can, you know, get an extra \$10 thousand off of somebody's salary because they had... they hadn't been working for a while for whatever reason doesn't change the fact that they're... if they meet the qualifications, they ought to be paid the rate for the area in question. Is this Bill perfect? No, it's not, but what we really know is what we have right now isn't working. This is a step in the right direction. I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Wallace is recognized for two minutes."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Wallace: "I just want to say I don't know how you find the grace to stand here and present this Bill as you have done. So, Representative, include... especially in light of the pretty uncivil, sarcastic, demeaning, condescending... I don't know how many other adjectives I can name... manner in which our pre... our Leader on the other side of the aisle spoke with you. I just want to say thank you for bringing this Bill. This particular Bill is so important because we continue to

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

have so many disparities related to wage and income. It is why I started the Economic Justice & Equity Committee here for the House because we still know that women, our women, make about 79 cents per dollar that a man makes. But when you do compound it as was mentioned before with race and gender, African-American women make just over 60 cents for every dollar a white man makes and Latinas make about 54 cents for every dollar that a white man makes. This is unacceptable especially in light of the conversation we had yesterday about women living in poverty and what kind of access to health care they might have. We cannot continue to accept policies that hurt the citizens of Illinois. And we certainly can't continue to support businesses who will make such bad decisions and put us on the hook as Legislators, policymakers, bureaucrats to, again, as I said earlier today, figure out how to pick up where they left off. This is a commonsense Bill. It is 2017. There is no reason anyone in the State of Illinois should not be paid equally for equal work and it is just absolutely unacceptable that anyone could fix their mouth to argue against Representative Moeller's Bill. For that, I encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Ives is recognized for two minutes."

Ives: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. So, I'd like everybody to pay attention to this Bill and contrast it with another Bill that is actually being looked at too and that'd be HB3539 because what you're going to see here is a bit of hypocrisy... from the other side. First of all, Representative Moeller is basically saying employers who own their business, who run

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

their business, who know their business, who sign the front of the check, not necessarily the back of the check, who are the ones making the decisions on pay and who to hire, they are prohibited, prohibited from asking wage or salary history including prior wages, benefits, compensation, everything, cannot ask any of that. It's unlawful under her Bill for an employer to seek wage or salary history. However, in a competing Bill 3539, which really isn't a competing... I guess it's a complement Bill, we're going to require those same employers if they want to bid on contracts at the state level, they have to actually submit all of that history and all that employer information on the number of females, the number of males, their rate of pay, how often do they work and everything else in order for them to get a pay equity certificate in order to actually do business with the State of Illinois. So, on one side you're telling this employer, no, you can't ask any of this information, but guess what, we're going to require you to give us all that information in order to do business with us. That is hypocrisy. That is ridiculous. And by the way, we don't own those businesses, we don't run those businesses, we don't make business decisions. And if they decide that they want to hire somebody based on history for \$10 thousand less, well, guess what, the applicant doesn't have to accept the job. Salary history, whether it's relevant or not, is not our decision. It is the decision of the employer who owns and operates..."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Ives, would you like me to find...
Okay."

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

Ives: "Hi. I'd like to close. Thank you. I'd just like to close
 with..."

Speaker Turner: "Your final sentence, Representative."

Ives: "What's that?"

Speaker Turner: "This is your final remark. Just make the final sentence."

Ives: "Yeah, this is my final remark. My final remark is eventually this isn't going to matter in Illinois because the last March... in just last month we lost 89 hundred jobs. We're down a fewer jobs than the year 2000. And since the year 2000, according to Illinois Manufacturing Association, we have only added 100 jobs. That's one job for every two months. So, you go ahead and you put all the regulation you want on employers because they're going to leave the State of Illinois. The more you do this the less you get in employment."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Nekritz is recognized for two minutes."

Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I have to join some of my colleagues in being offended by the tenor of the debate and that somehow equal pay is a bad thing and is something that we... that we should not be fighting for. So, I urge you, if you're voting 'no' on this Bill, to go home and ask your wife, if you have one, whether... whether they think that restitution is the reason that we should not vote for this Bill or whether injunctive relief is the reason that we should not vote for this Bill or whether the Tort Immunity Act is a reason we should vote against this Bill. You should ask your sister or your daughter or the woman in your life whether restitution, attorney's fees, injunctive relief,

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

frivolous lawsuits, and Tort immunity are the reasons that you're voting 'no' on this Bill. I think that's offensive. This is the right Act... action to take. The... as the Sponsor indicated, we have not made enough progress achieving equal pay for women in this state. This is a good step forward. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Breen is recognized for two minutes."

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

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

Breen: "Representative, I'm looking at your Bill, page 2, sub (C)4... it's sub (4) of C and then below that it mentions an alternative employment practice. What is an alternative employment practice?"

Moeller: "Let me find the citation. That Section, as I explained in a previous question, essentially states that if an employer is paying its male employees more than its female employees..."

Breen: "No, no, no, no, no, no, no. No, no, not generally. What is an alternative employment practice? Don't tell me... I mean, and with all due respect, you're not reading your Section correctly here. What is an alternative employment practice?"

Moeller: "Is it related..."

Breen: "Because that's the only defense."

Moeller: "...because it says that if you are paying your... your employees a different wage and... you need to be able to justify why you're paying your employees a different wage. And there are legitimate reasons for doing that."

Breen: "Okay. To the Bill. To the Bill because the Representative is delaying this. We're on a short clock. Look, if you're

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

paying Bob 15 bucks an hour and you're paying Sam 16 bucks an hour, this Bill will now force you to justify the difference in payment. Doesn't matter that, you know, Bob's been there for six months longer. Bob could be your brother. I don't know, whatever. In the current law, as long as you're not paying them differently because of sex or a protected class under the Human Rights Act, you're okay. Under this Bill, you're going to create a trial lawyer paradise. Look, the Governors of our surrounding states are doing a little happy dance right now when they see how poor we are making our business climate. This Bill has nothing to do with family. All it's doing is putting additional restrictions on people who want to create jobs in this state. That's the reason every single business group in this state is opposed. Please, this is the stupidest Bill we've considered at least this week. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Members. Representative McDermed is recognized for two minutes."

McDermed: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You're going to hear something today that you may not hear again for a while. But notwithstanding my association with this side of the aisle, I do rise in support of this Bill. I may be one of the... I may be one of the few people in this Assembly that spent 30 years working for a large corporation, in fact, one of the largest corporations in the world. And this was my life. And have to vote for this Bill. It's not a perfect Bill. And I would have preferred some of... to see some Amendments. Notwithstanding that, I gave my support from the very first day I was asked for it. I re... I considered it thoughtfully when not all the

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

Amendments that I liked came through, yet, nevertheless, because of the life I lived and you know, I retired early because I could afford to retire early, so I'm not asking for a tag day over here. But think about... I think about with very great regret how much more I would have retired with if we'd had some of the protections that our Representative is fighting for here today. I do stand in favor of this Bill. Thank you, sister."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Moeller to close."

"Thank you, Speaker. I don't know if I can put it any Moeller: better than the last speaker did. This is... it's unfortunate that this Bill has been characterized so negatively by some of my colleagues. As has been mentioned, if... this is... this is strengthening the current Equal Pay Act that we have in this state. The fact that women in 2017 continue to be paid less than their male counterparts for equal work, the business community admitted as much during our hearing and the equal opportunity committee that there is a pay gap. That cannot be justified or explained based on legitimate reasons. The very fact that women continue to make less demonstrates that we must do better in this state. Illinois can be a leader in ensuring that women are paid for their work and that we are supporting our families and supporting our communities and ending discrimination in our state. I thank you for your consideration. I thank you for the debate. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2462 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 91 voting 'yes', 24 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 2462, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2989, Representative Slaughter. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2989, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Slaughter."

Slaughter: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all, HB2989 is not exclusively about video visitation for IDOC. LRB, whatever reason, could not change the title of Bills once they go there. So, with that said, House Amendment #3 is what we should all be looking at here... House Amendment #3 in your analysis. HB2989 is an effort to make IDOC policies in rules for visitation more transparent, visible and accessible for both... for inmates, IDOC employees and most importantly, the public. The Bill will ensure that IDOC post its visitation policy in their facilities as well as on their website. It's important to know that there's a provision in this Bill that is ensuring that IDOC posts on their website any restrictions that would... that would not make visitation available for particular facility for that day in the succeeding five-day calendar. There's another provision... there is one provision about video visitation that encourages IDOC to continue to value in-person visits by not restricting or limiting inperson visits simply because video visitation is available. I... IDOC is neutral. They do understand the value and importance of visitations. They're okay with this. There's s

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

fiscal note filed on this. There's no fiscal impact. I urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Andersson is recognized for two minutes."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Andersson: "Sir, just to be clear, what we are saying is the fundamental part of the Bill is the ability to give family members of DOC inmates notice if there's going to be an interpretation of their ability to... to go to the confinement center, right?"

Slaughter: "Representative Andersson... Representative Andersson, that's exactly right. In a big state like Illinois with our Department of Corrections department having over 25 facilities, many of our families have to travel 2, 3, 4, sometimes up to 5 hours to go visit some of our inmates. And oftentimes, they... well, sometimes they're turned down. And so, this is the objective of the Bill."

Andersson: "So, this gives... this gives them a chance..."

Slaughter: "Notice... Exactly."

Andersson: "...to find out, guess what, I can't go this week. I'll have to go next week."

Slaughter: "That's exactly right."

Andersson: "And the other aspect is it doesn't allow DOC to eliminate in-person visitation just because they have video, right? They have a right..."

Slaughter: "That's exactly right."

Andersson: "...they have a right to the physical or as close to physical contact as they can get."

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

Slaughter: "That's right, Representative."

Andersson: "Seems like a very reasonable Bill. It seems like with your Amendment, DOC, you said, is neutral. Looks like the Governor's Office is not opposed as well."

Slaughter: "That... that's correct. One of the concerns that DOC had was the effective date. They are modifying their IT system right now, and so they asked to move the effective date back.

And so, that's what we did with the Amendment."

Andersson: "Thank you very much."

Slaughter: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Bryant is recognized for two minutes."

Bryant: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Bryant: "Thank you. Representative Slaughter, I want to applaud you for the work that you've done on this Bill. I know when you first talked to me about it I had some questions. I will say that in the years that I spent working in the Department of Corrections that one of the most important things to an offender is a visit from home. It isn't just about whether it keeps, you know, keeps the family happy or keeps them happy, it's also a good tool for management within the facility. This isn't a cost to the department, per se. It's good for the families; it's good for the offender. It's good for the staff. It's a good Bill. And I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you for bringing this."

Slaughter: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Slaughter to close."

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

- Slaughter: "Thank you. I urge an 'aye' vote... 'yes' vote, sorry."

  Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2989 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 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 2989, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Leader Lang in the Chair."
- Speaker Lang: "I appreciate the greeting. Mr. Demmer is recognized."
- Demmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please excuse Representative Batinick for the remainder of the day."
- Speaker Lang: "We can do that, Sir. House Bill 3244, Representative Winger. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3244, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Winger."
- Winger: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3244 is a Bill which would allow a premium finance company to create an agreement with clients for electronic filing of notices including cancellation notices. The 99th General Assembly adopted legislation which allows insurers to create such an agreement. This legislation simply extends that to premium finance companies and giving them the same ability. This is an agreed upon Bill. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Pritchard. Please take the record.

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

There are 112 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3904, Representative Stratton. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3904, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Stratton."

Stratton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3904 creates a women's division in the Illinois Department of Corrections under the direct supervision of the director. The division will have statewide authority and operational oversight for all the departments... women's correction centers and women's adult transition centers. It unanimously passed out of committee and has strong bipartisan support. I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Burke, Lilly, Turner. Please take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Chair recognizes Representative Scherer."

Scherer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today... real quick, if I could do a point of personal privilege?"

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Scherer: "Today, I know I'm kind of late in getting this in, but we have Elliott Staley. He's a freshman at Rochester High School. And he's doing an awesome job as our Page for the

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

day. And he even wore purple without knowing he was supposed to for Alzheimer's. So, thank you, Elliott. Big welcome."

Speaker Lang: "House Bill 3903, Representative Stratton. Please...
Out of the record. House Bill 169, Mr. Turner. Please read
the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 169, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Turner."

Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If I could just have a moment to pull up my analysis. Thank you very much. House Bill 169 expands the list of exempted positions to... to provide that county board members may also serve as public administrators or public guardians during their term. Currently, in order to limit conflicts of interest, the Public Office... Officer Prohibited Activities Act provides that members of a county board are prohibited from holding certain county and local offices during their terms on the county board. The Act exempts from this prohibition a county board member's appointment or selection to serve as a member of the county extension board emergency telephone systems board, property tax board of review. This Bill would allow public ... would allow those county officials to serve as public quardians as well. Be happy to answer any questions and ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

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

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

declared passed. House Bill 2977, Mr. Welch. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2977, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Welch."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill we talked about before break and I asked my colleagues to take a long, hard look at it. I've had several conversations with many of them regarding the importance of cursive writing. I think the one thing to really stress and talk about why this is so important to bring back to our schools and that is the cognitive learning abilities of our students. It has been proven over and over and over, several educators have said that this is the one thing that helps a child development with their cognition. And we also know that when they can write it they can read it. They can read the notes from their mother and grandmother. They can read our historical documents like the Declaration of Independence and the U.S. Constitution. They can sign legal documents like checks and mortgages and many other important documents. And if they go on to become a state Legislator who important cards from receives thank you notes and constituents every day and all of those notes are written in cursive, they'll be able to read the notes from their constituents and respond to them. You can feel free to come and read any of these notes if you know how to write in cursive after you vote 'yes' on this Bill. I would ask that we, in a bipartisan fashion here today, agree that cursive writing is important. It helps our children learn. And we

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

should return it to our schools and vote 'aye' on House Bill 2977."

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

Andersson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. We debated this a bit two weeks ago and as I understand it, it does three things or it's encouraging three things: the ability to sign checks, the ability to read ancient documents or current documents, and to stimulate childhood brain activity. Interestingly enough after the... the debate, I took some time to do a little research on the question of stimulating childhood brain activity. How do we make that better. 'Cause certainly that's a good thing, we all want to encourage it. Do you know that when I did that the top 5 things that stimulate brain activity, cursive wasn't one of them. When I did the top 10, cursive wasn't one of them. I had to look for it specifically and when I found it, it certainly said that, yes, indeed, it does. But you know what else does? Printing, drawing, being outside in the environment, going for a walk, physical education. All of these things have these sorts of benefits. So, I think that if a local school district wants to go ahead and... and make cursive their determination that that's the best way to stimulate those activities, good, that's great. They should... they should do that if they want to. But should we as a state decide which one's best? Absolutely not. What we should be doing is allowing our local districts to make that determination allowing local control. With regard to reading, yes, I get it, it would be nice if they could read some of those things. Honestly, I took cursive; I can't read it that well. And I also don't read a

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

lot of foreign languages and yet, I can still get that information. And finally, with regard to the signing of checks, your signature is your mark. If you're illiterate, you can still sign a check with a mark and I would challenge anyone to look at my signature and claim that it's cursive 'cause it's not. It's curve linear, nobody can reproduce it, I guarantee you that, but it's not cursive. Ladies and Gentlemen..."

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

Andersson: "This is a local control issue. If our schools want to do it, they should do it, but we shouldn't mandate it. Thank you."

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

Fortner: "Thank you, Speaker. To the Bill. I appreciate the comments and I will not duplicate the comments about cognitive learning of the previous speaker. I do want to address the talk about reading the writing of one's mother or grandmother that the Sponsor mentioned. Because when we talk about cursive we have in our minds a particular graphic form of writing that happened to be the kind that was commonly taught in much of the 20th century. But if you look at the history of cursive writing what you actually find is that that particular form of cursive writing was not what someone 150 years ago would have considered cursive writing. There were different styles of connecting characters in doing script style writing. That doesn't mean they still have ... (Inaudible) are quite elegant. Art classes will teach calligraphic... calligraphic text forms, which include what they would have called a cursive script, something where the letters have... more curve or often slanted

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

in what's called an italic form. IN fact if you look at our founding documents, something like the Declaration of Independence, you'll see those kinds of written script styles. It certainly doesn't look like the cursive script I learned when I was in grade school. And the point is that our writing styles change, what is called cursive changes. It would make no sense to lock the schools into a particular style of writing, particularly as technology may well dictate certain types of handwritten notation that simply adapts better to our modern society. For that region... reason, I strongly urge a 'no' vote."

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

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question of the Sponsor?" Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Harris, D.: "Representative, how does an individual that doesn't know cursive, how do they sign their name today?"

Welch: "You know, I'd only be speculating, General, and I would have to imagine they probably scribble something or print their name. But I just think the... the level of identity theft possibility increases because they don't know how to write in cursive. And I just believe it's so important that our schools start teaching this again because letter and word recognition, comprehension, abstract thought, neural development..."

Harris, D.: "Right. And I've only got two..."

Welch: "...everything... everything improves."

Harris, D.: "...I've only got two minutes, Representative. I've only got two minutes. And what you're saying is there should

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

be a unit of instruction that is taught. It doesn't have to be all year long, but a unit of instruction, correct?"

Welch: "It's completely up to the school districts..."

Harris, D.: "Right."

Welch: "...on how they want to do it."

Harris, D.: "Right. And so, Ladies and Gentlemen, if I may, to the Bill. Yes, it is an issue of local control. But if you look at the School Code outside of the course studies, we have mandated a course of instruction on bird and Arbor Day, on just say no day, on Irish famine study. Really? Irish famine study? I think cursive could be just as important as Irish famine study. This is something which is a reasonable Bill. And I strongly encourage a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Scherer for two minutes."

Scherer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I really can't believe there's even opposition to this Bill. I wasn't going to speak because I thought that it would just pass unanimously because to me anybody with any common sense whatsoever understands that writing and reading cursive handwriting is a necessary skill to be successful in life. I'm surprised that a business owner would want to hire someone that could neither read nor write cursive. You know, what if somebody came into their shop and said I'd like to give you \$10 thousand and you can't read the cursive then I guess you don't get it. I... I just can't hardly even believe we're having this discussion. So, I just happened to look at my seatmate and look what I found. Here's her notes and voila, guess what? They're all in cursive. How's she going to hand me a note in cursive and then what am I going to say? Oh, no, I'm an

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

uneducated person; I can't read cursive and just give it back to her. That... it's just the silliest, most ridiculous thing I've ever heard in my whole life. I... I encourage every one of you to look around your desk and show me a desk where there isn't at least something on your desk written in cursive. I bet you you'll find things... How are you going to read it if you don't teach it? What's the big deal? It takes... I taught third grade. I taught cursive writing. I wrote on the board. I had kids say, Ms. Scherer, I can't read it. I don't know what you're writing. And I said that's part of learning it. When you... when you learn to read it, then you can learn to write it, but first you learn to read it. It takes like five minutes a day for a couple months, at most, to teach cursive writing. I just don't understand what the big deal is. I urge an 'aye'..."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Breen: "Representative, I'm reading your language here and I hear all this hubbub about unfunded mandate and terrible... and this that and the other. And I see it says every public elementary school and high school shall include a unit of practicing writing in cursive. So, the one concern I had was high school folks. If the kids already know how to write in cursive and they're doing it well, I mean, this unit doesn't have to be a terribly lengthy unit, right?"

Welch: "That's correct."

Breen: "Okay. So, it's really more just to make sure they can write in cursive?"

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

Welch: "Correct."

Breen: "Okay. And... and as best... I think you had alluded to this in an early debate. This business about eliminating cursive in our grade schools is... sounds like it was something out of the Common Core mandate coming out of Washington, DC. Wasn't it?"

Welch: "Well, it was because Common Core didn't mandate it or include it in Common Core. Many schools started eliminating it."

Breen: "So, folks started thinking that cursive was somehow unimportant?"

Welch: "Correct."

"Okay. To the Bill. Look, folks, I mean, that brain Breen: development and the rest, you've seen the latest studies, using your hands, not taking notes on a computer, actually writing in cursive helps the development of our children. It certainly has benefits for reading historical documents, for writing in a more formal manner. We all know that when you're writing a note to someone when you read that note in blocked script, you think less of the person. You want to see a cursive note. So, it's a skill that, frankly, would leave our children less competitive than children in other places where they're still teaching cursive. And so, for that reason, I don't see this as a great mandate at all. It's really more of a commonsense measure. And it's certainly not a very difficult thing on our school districts. So, I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Brady for two minutes. Mr. Mr. Brady does not wish to speak. Mr. Davis for two minutes."

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. It's interesting that we're having a debate about making sure that a child can write in cursive and I guess otherwise it wouldn't be a problem, but unfortunately, as an adult when I see certain documents that says 'print name, sign name'. So, unless we're going to change all of that and allow just for printing names, then, yes, young people need to know how to sign their names. Now, we have a lot of lawyers in the room and I can only imagine if someone as a lawyer said that a document was invalid because only printed their name and even if it said sign it, they didn't sign it or if they used the same print name in both places and then it was deemed inapplicable or they couldn't use it or anything like that. So, I mean, just looking at it from that perspective, why would we not want to encourage children to be able to write their names in cursive. If it wasn't for Sister Beverly Johnson, who was my fourthgrade teacher, who insisted that we learn how to write in cursive. We worked on it every day. Now, she could figure out how to make it a part of her curriculum in addition to teaching spelling and language arts and other things, certainly don't see why it's such a problem for teachers today to be able to do it as people have indicated. It just adds something else that they have to do. Well, some things that they have to do are worth doing. And cursive writing is something that is worth doing. Now, as adults, trust me, I've seen some of your signatures. Not sure if you learned it or not, they look terrible, but hey, mine isn't all that great either admittedly. But nevertheless, I do remember how to put the loop on my 'w' and write my name. I... I got ... I got that,

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

but nevertheless, there's no reason why we shouldn't be encouraging our young people to write in cursive. It should just be something inherent and what we are teaching our children..."

Speaker Lang: "Please complete your comments, Sir."

Davis: "I just said that my five-year-old daughter as she is learning how to write certainly will learn how to write her name in cursive. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sauer: "Thank you. Representative, thank you for offering this Bill. We had a chance to speak about this the other day. When I was on the school board, I was the youngest member of our school board at the time and there was a vote to get rid of cursive and I was the only vote 'no' on that ... on that measure. I really firmly believe that, you know, this Body is an extension... or school districts, pardon me, is an extension of the Legislature, do set some fundamentals that we should learn. And Representative Harris said, there are some things that I believe we've mandated that may not be necessary, but this Bill is necessary. I think cursive is necessary. It teaches you patience and discipline. I'm learning so does serving in the Illinois House of Representatives. However, I think that if one generation does not know how to write this, the next generation will not know how to read this and our founding documents, as has been said before, are written in cursive. So, thanks for offering this. And I encourage an 'aye' vote."

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

Speaker Lang: "Representative Williams for two minutes."

Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. When I first heard about this Bill, I think I saw it on Facebook, and then I saw the Representative that's sponsoring the Bill on Chicago Tonight. And honestly, I thought, oh, that's nice and nostalgic. It's kind of feel good, kind of old school, but really isn't a big deal. It's just kind of a feel good thing. I talked to the Representative about it and he shared some information with me about some educational experts and their thoughts on teaching cursive. And I was fascinated to read what I did about how relevant learning to write in cursive is to the learning, thinking, and analyzing process. It's really fascinating and I'd encourage any of you to take a look if you're thinking this is just something kind of light and fun that we're talking about it. If anyone has seen my writing, I do have a very, very, very neat handwriting. But I do... I was thinking back after we had the conversation about my law school finals. And you know, anyone that's been to law school knows you got to do those long outlines and prepare those and when I was in law school, we didn't do much with computers. But I remember writing out my outlines by hand and then I would rewrite them and then I would write them again. That's how I learned. I didn't realize until we discussed this Bill that that was an integral process of me memorizing and learning the concepts that were later to be touched on in the finals. So, this is much more than a feel good proposal. This is much more than something nostalgic, not wanting to let go of the past. This is about teaching our kids the very core principles of learning to write and read in a way that's going

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

to make them most equipped for the future. So, I encourage everyone to vote 'yes'."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ford: "Chris... Representative Welch, I... when we think about testing, I don't think we only have to worry about lawyers taking tests. And in the State of Illinois, we mandate testing for elementary and high school students and entrance exams for other schools, right?"

Welch: "Yes."

Ford: "And if for no other reason each test is timed, and one of the main reasons that we learn cursive in school is to speed up our writing skills and to finish the work faster. Is that..."

Welch: "That is... that is one of the positive side effects of cursive writing."

Ford: "Yeah. And to the Bill. For no other reason if nothing else, as a Body we put time limits on students when they take tests and cursive writing was, sort of, originated so that people could speed up writing when they take tests or whatever. But the most important thing is, is it increased the speed of a person's writing. So, I urge everyone to vote 'aye'."

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

Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll be brief. Will the Sponsor
yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Zalewski: "Representative, isn't it true that most senior executives and senior officials in an organi... business

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

organization do still use cursive as a means of communication?"

Welch: "They do and they do it on a daily basis."

Zalewski: "And isn't it true that the younger workforce is starting to enter into these... into these business organizations where senior level officials use cursive?"

Welch: "Yes."

Zalewski: "So, isn't there a dynamic that exists where senior officials are using cursive to communicate to younger millennial workers?"

Welch: "Yes."

Zalewski: "But doesn't it behoove the General Assembly to continue to ensure that millennials and our children can read cursive so that we can have an efficient economy when it comes to being able to have senior executives communicate with younger millennial workers?"

Welch: "Absolutely."

Zalewski: "And Mr. Speaker, this is a probusiness Bill. I urge an
 'aye' vote."

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

Andrade: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I have a nephew and a niece that... you know, they did very well in school and one of the things that I see... or I'm a true believer in tradition, and my nephew and niece we're literally sitting next to each other and were texting each other and... instead of having a conversation. And I feel that the youth today are actually forgetting how to talk to each other. They can't even talk to each other and I'm afraid that you would think that we would not have to do a Bill like this, but it is

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

necessary. I actually am going to school, right now, myself and in order for me to study, it helped me to retain the information for my final exams. Also, when I was growing up, I had to go through some physical therapy for hand-eye coordination. And one of those rehabilitation practices physical therapy was actually handwriting, handwriting to improve my coordination. So, I stand in support of this Bill. And I hope that the future generation will still be able to have a handwriting/cursive writing 'cause it's not... it's not a luxury. I believe it is actually a necessity and it should be a part of their education to be able to read and write by hand. When I'm in school right now, kids don't even have notepads. It's literally everything on their iPad and on their computer. They're not even looking at the professor. Everything is taking notes in there and I think it's truly being lost in our generation day by day. So, I stand in support of this Bill and request a... I highly ask that we support our colleague with a 'yes' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Welch to close."

Welch: "Mr. Speaker, it's been eloquently stated by folk on both sides of the aisle. So, I'm just going to ask that we right this wrong and we bring cursive back to our schools by voting 'yes' to House Bill 2977."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 67 voting 'yes', 48 voting 'no'. And this

39th Legislative Day

- Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Chair recognizes Mr. Brady."
- Brady: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as the hour grows late, I, too, would be remiss if I did not introduce my Page for the day who's been here all day long serving diligently, Mr. Parker Meyer. Parker is an eighth grader from Evans Junior High School in my district in Bloomington. He's here with his mother, Laura Parker, if you'd stand up. Thank you very much for being here and serving us here in Springfield."
- Speaker Lang: "Thank you for joining us today. Representative Hernandez is recognized."
- Hernandez: "Yes, Speaker. I just want to change my vote. I inadvertently pressed 'no' for House Bill 2977."
- Speaker Lang: "The record will reflect your intention. Thank you.

  Representative Bellock."
- Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. And I would just like to say thank you. It's been a long day to my Page, Max, who's still down there and his grandfather is still up in the balcony. So, can we all give him a little bit of applause for a long day."
- Speaker Lang: "Thank you very, very much. House Bill 3503, Representative Mah. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3503, a Bill for an Act concerning telecommunications. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Mah."
- Mah: "Thank you, Speaker. This is a Bill that is designed to save consumers money. It's a consumer-friendly Bill that prevents cable and telecom companies from continuing to charge rental

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

fees once the wholesale price plus a reasonable mark-up has been paid off. Many of my constituents have shared with me their experience of being charged rental fees for an inexpensive piece of equipment where the fees continue in perpetuity. The purpose of this Bill is to save consumers money and to prevent cable and telecom companies from overcharging their customers and to call for transparency in their pricing."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Andersson: "So, is it correct to say that at present consumers have a choice and the choice is they can rent a modem or they can purchase it outright, finance it their own way, whatever they wish, right?"

Mah: "With some companies, they do have that option. With some companies, they do not."

Andersson: "Actually, I believe Federal Law requires that... that no person be required to affirmatively agree to that. In other words, I think Federal Law says they absolutely have that choice."

Mah: "So, from what I understand, there are some companies that do not provide the option."

Andersson: "Well, if they don't, then they should be dealt with according to the existing law. To the Bill, Ladies and Gentlemen. It's just another example where we're trying to interfere in the private business. Honestly, if you don't want to pay the rental charges, if you don't want to agree to it, don't agree to it. Buy the modem, if you can't buy the

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

modem, afford to finance it a different way, but for us to say that there has to be an absolute cutoff is inappropriate in this situation. I'd urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Hammond for two minutes."

Hammond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. As the... previous speaker just brought up, there are options that we have currently in the State of Illinois and certainly, some of those are covered under Federal Law. But in addition, I think that the same could be said that if I am going to rent an apartment and I'm going to do that for an extended length of time that once I have satisfied the market value of that apartment, I should no longer be required to pay rent on that apartment if the same rules would follow as presented in this Bill. In the same respect, if I'm going to rent a car and I'm going to rent that car for an extended period of time and I have satisfied the market value of that automobile then if I am to continue to drive that automobile, I should not be responsible for paying any lease agreements on it. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd urge a 'no' vote."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Frese: "So, if I rent this piece of equipment... Representative Mah, if I rent this piece of equipment and something goes wrong with it, say six months into the rental, what happens?"

Mah: "Six months into the rental, if the wholesale price has not been reached then I believe the company can replace the piece of equipment."

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

Frese: "Okay. They're going to replace the piece of equipment. Do

I pay for the shipping back and forth or is that on the

company?"

Mah: "It... it depends on the company. We can't speak to what each company does."

Frese: "Okay. Let's say, six months in I've paid and haven't paid the full amount, but... do I start over then when they send me the new one? Or are you going to say... going to tell them, no, you've already paid for, say, half of it, now you only have to pay for the new half?"

Mah: "Well, if there's a new modem that's provided then the rental charges would simply continue for that new piece of equipment."

Frese: "Okay. And for all this, your Bill says they get to make a five percent profit mark-up on that?"

Mah: "Yes."

Frese: "Is that what your Bill reads?"

Mah: "So, the purpose of the Bill is to ensure that customers do not pay more than the wholesale price..."

Frese: "Okay. But..."

Mah: "...and the five percent mark-up."

Frese: "Okay, a five percent. So, where did the five percent come from? How was that figured out?"

Mah: "It was simply a percent that... percentage that we felt reasonable."

Frese: "Okay. You felt reasonable. And not necessarily what the business might consider reasonable? Okay. To the Bill. I would just say I think this is a... this is a bad Bill. We should not support it. They're doing everything they can to provide you

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

a good piece of equipment. You can purchase it. There's always that option. I'd... I'd oppose it."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wheeler for two minutes. There are seven people who wish to speak on this Bill. Mr. Wheeler for two minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Wheeler, K.: "Thank you, Sir. Representative, I'm looking at this and I understand frustration. I pay some of those fees, but I choose to pay those fees because I want the maintenance that comes along with that rental option because they're required then to maintain that equipment for me while I'm leasing it from them. Is that correct how the system works right now?"

Mah: "So, this Bill... so... just a minute. So, many of my constituents have told me that they are locked into rental options where they end up paying for the price of the piece of equipment multiple times over because the rental costs continue. Now, if the company would like to offer maintenance as a separate item on the bill, there's nothing in my Bill that prevents them from doing that. And in fact, that would provide more transparency so that..."

Wheeler, K.: "Okay. I..."

Mah: "...customers know what they're paying for. If there's, you know, cost that's associated with maintenance for the item..."

Wheeler, K.: "Okay."

Mah: "...after the bill... after the wholesale cost..."

Wheeler, K.: "Let me go to the Bill here because I'm running out of time..."

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

Mah: "...has been paid off..."

Wheeler, K.: "...on the clock. Thank you, Representative."

Mah: "...then that's fine."

Wheeler, K.: "The ultimate result of what's going to happen the way this Bill is written is going to be that companies are going to say, okay, fine, we're not going to offer the rental option because if we can't obviously even pay for the maintenance part with a five percent margin. So, that's going to eliminate that option from the list, which means the people you're actually trying to help probably in line to having to purchase some outright equipment and then having to maintain it themselves which also is unaffordable. So, what... you're taking a system that, yeah, it may be annoying in some respects as it seems expensive, it actually covers everything. Vote 'no'. Thank..."

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

Davidsmeyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the Bill, you talk about the wholesale cost, five percent of the wholesale cost after it's paid off, correct?"

Mah: "Yes."

Davidsmeyer: "So, is that five percent of the current wholesale cost or five percent of the original wholesale cost? So, will you be dealing with, you know, as tech... technology gets older, will you be dealing with different wholesale costs on different pieces of equipment? Will this be incredibly difficult and onerous for a company to watch?"

Mah: "It... so, it's the wholesale cost of the piece of equipment as it's installed on your unit."

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. So, as the price of these things go down, you'll have some people paying five percent of a hundred dollars and you'll have people... some people later on, a year later, maybe paying five percent of \$75. I'd just like to go into this really quick. To the Bill. If I own a video rental place and I pay off the value of that DVD, we don't tell them they can only charge five percent of the \$20 that they paid for the original DVD. If I own an equipment rental place or an equipment sales place and we decide to rent equipment, we don't say after you pay it off you can only charge people five percent. We don't do this in any other field. This is a place where you have the option to either purchase the equipment or you can rent it from them and they will replace it... replace it if it goes bad or if it's out of date. So, you're actually using their equipment. You can go out and buy your own. We don't do this to any other field, so there's no reason to do it in this. I urge a 'no' vote."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Demmer: "Representative, I... under the terms of your Bill, you're looking really at the retail cost of the piece of equipment, but it's been brought up many times in debate here that not only is the fee that you're paying on your monthly bill to cover the cost of the unit, but also maintenance on that piece of equipment, replacement of that piece of equipment and service or upgrades or new software or the changes that might add features or add benefits to you. So, why do you ignore

39th Legislative Day

- all those other added services and focus only on the actual cost of the unit itself?"
- Mah: "Because for the most part the equipment that we're talking about is equipment that's generally under a hundred dollars.

  And you know, they're, for the most part, durable."
- Demmer: "The equipment's under a hundred dollars, but you're...
  you're ignoring all those other things that come in place:
  free replacement, free upgrades, free service, maintenance.
  You can call the support line and they can help you diagnose what's wrong, send you a new unit if that... if it needs to be replaced. You're... you're segmenting all those costs on a separate issue and saying, well, it's only the box. And so, the box will... it has a certain cost and you only charge based on that cost."
- Mah: "So, when you're paying for the rental of the equipment, then it's the responsibility of the company to maintain it and replace it if it's broken, but..."
- Demmer: "And that's a value to you. That's a value to you as a consumer, but you're ignoring that. You're ignoring that value."
- Mah: "...and the consumer is paying the rental price. The consumer is paying the rental price."
- Demmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I have 20 seconds left. To the Bill. Let's understand that we're not just talking about a piece of equipment. People have a choice today if they'd like to purchase their own piece of equipment. What we're talking about is a company that's going to offer the service, offer maintenance, offer replacement, offer upgrades. This is a much bigger piece of... a service that's

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

being offered than just simply the box that sits on your... on your..."

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

Demmer: "Thank you. It's a much more of a service than just a piece of equipment. If people want just a piece of equipment, they don't want the other things that come along with it, they can purchase their own in the market today. I encourage you to vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davis for two minutes. Gentleman does not wish to speak. Representative Mah to close."

Mah: "So, this is a piece of legislation that is a consumerfriendly piece of legislation. It aims to save consumers money. It is... it has been very popularly received by many of my constituents many of whom are seniors and immigrants and even if they have the option to go out and purchase their own electronic equipment, they're not likely to do so. And I, myself, have been too busy at a certain point to take the option of purchasing my own equipment. I've had to accept the option of rental and I see on my bill every month a charge that will never end and I will end up paying in perpetuity for this piece of equipment that is... that is not, you know, worth paying three or four times the cost of. The bottom line is this Bill does not prevent providers from doing anything but charging their consumers over and over again after the customer has paid the fair market value of the piece of equipment. There's nothing in the Bill that says that the rental prices... the rental cost can't continue. Simply, there is an option for the consumer to decline to pay more after the wholesale price has been paid off. This is, as I said, a

39th Legislative Day

- consumer-friendly piece of legislation. It saves customers money. And it prevents companies from charging in perpetuity for an inexpensive piece of equipment. I urge a 'yes' vote."

  Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please
  - opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 39 voting 'yes', 64 voting 'no', 4 voting 'present'. And the Bill fails. House... On the Order of Second Reading, House Bill 1252, Representative Lilly. Representative Lilly. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1252, a Bill for an Act concerning education. This Bill was read a second time previously. Committee Amend... Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Lilly and has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Lilly."
- Lilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Amendment will require at least one semester of civics in either sixth, seventh, or eighth grade."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 140, Representative Williams. Please read the Bill. This Bill's on the Order of Third Reading. Take it out of the record, Mr. Clerk. House Bill 418, Mr. Wehrli. Please read the Bill."

39th Legislative Day

- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 418, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. 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 Wehrli."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wehrli on Amendment 1."
- Wehrli: "Amendment 1 passed out of Personnel & Pensions. Amendment 2 is a Floor Amendment that I need adopted. It removes duplicative language in Floor... in Floor Amendment 1."
- Speaker Lang: "Is Amend... Amendment 1, apparently, has not been adopted yet, Sir. But..."
- Wehrli: "Oh. Can we..."
- Speaker Lang: "So, those in favor of Amendment 1 say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted.

  Tell us briefly what's in Amendment 2."
- Wehrli: "Thank you. Amendment 2 just removes duplicative language in Amendment 1. It's more of..."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment will say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. On the Order of Postponed Consideration, House Bill 768, Mr. Welch. Please proceed, Sir."
- Welch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 768 is a Bill that we discussed at length yesterday. This is a Bill that would allow local control when it comes to making the decision for charter schools. I have had an opportunity to talk with several Members who were off the floor and wanted an opportunity to

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

cast their vote on this important initiative. So, I'm bringing it back today and asking my colleagues to join me in supporting this pro local-control Bill that is not anticharter. And I ask for a 'yes' vote."

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

Demmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to request a verification should this Bill receive the requisite number of votes."

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

Andersson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I won't ask questions because we really did just debate this yesterday. But let's remember what we're talking about. We're talking about denying due process to individuals and groups who want to create a charter school. It was said yesterday during debate that that's not uncommon to deny local governments... not require appeal rights. Nothing could be further than ... from the truth. When you're in a munic... when you have a municipality and you have a zoning question and the zoning board denies you, what do you get? You get an appeal right. You get judicial access. This denies that judicial access. This is... this totally violates the concept of due process. All it does is give all the power without any real significant review of any sort to the local school district. That's not what we talk about when we talk about local control. When we talk about local control, yes, we want to give them the initial decision, but there always has to be right to review. This denies it. It's wrong. It's bad law. It should be denied. I urge a 'no' vote."

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Guzzardi: "Representative Welch, can we talk through some of the experiences of the City of Chicago. I know it's, you know, particular to Tar City, but I think that maybe enlightening us on how the commission has behaved so far."

Welch: "Well, I think the City of Chicago, you know, should be used as the poster child for why this Bill is needed, but... well, I'll get back to that 'but' later. They've had five instances where CPS has rejected a charter proposal. And five different times, the charter commission has overruled that local board. Most recently last year, they overruled the local board in their attempt to close what CPS deemed three poorly performing schools. And CPS was very upset about that decision, and I just think that this is a perfect example where local control would come into play."

Guzzardi: "Here's a question for you, Representative. When local school boards decide that they want to open a charter school, is there an appeal process to the charter commission in that case? If the local district approves the charter, could the community appeal to the charter commission to get that charter canceled or revoked?"

Welch: "I am not aware of a process for that."

Guzzardi: "Right. So, but it seems to me here is that this isn't really a genuine appeals process at all. The way this process works is simply to allow the possibility of green lighting additional schools the districts didn't want, right? It's not as though both sides get a fair shake at the appeals process."

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

Welch: "That is absolutely a correct statement."

Guzzardi: "Right. So, I think it's important to know that when we talk about, you know, appealing these local decisions this is completely one-sided. To the Bill. This... whoa, I don't have a lot of time... To the Bill. I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Willis for two minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Willis: "So, currently, what we have here is... I find it interesting. So, we're asking really for more local control, correct?"

Welch: "We are asking for more local control."

Willis: "And one of the things that we're seeing is currently what happens is if the school board says no, the people actually have much more of a vested interest. The charter school commission who, of course, are going to support charter schools is the appeal process under current law?"

Welch: "That's correct."

Willis: "And historically, have these charter commissions ever denied charter schools?"

Welch: "I can't hear you. It's so loud in the chamber."

Willis: "My question was, historically, to your knowledge, has the charter school commission ever denied a charter school?"

Welch: "I am not aware of specific denials."

Willis: "No, I am not either. And in the big picture, when we're talking about school finance when we open up a charter school, and I'm not going to debate the credibility of charter schools, but we are taking money away from the public school

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

districts in that area to help fund some of these charter schools in that same area. Is that not correct?"

Welch: "That's correct."

Willis: "So, wouldn't it be in their best interest to actually have the say over funding for education in their district?"

Welch: "Again, I couldn't hear the question."

Willis: "I said, wouldn't it be best to have the local school districts to have control over funding in their districts?"

Welch: "Absolutely. These boards are elected to do just that and they should be able to... to control where their money goes."

Willis: "And I would also go and counter, as one of our previous speakers said, if the decision is not what the local community wants, well, that's why we have elected school boards and they do get elected out of office if they don't..."

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

Willis: "Thank you. Just to the Bill. I would urge an 'aye' vote.

I think this is something that we have constantly... I'm hearing
from the other side of the aisle... we want local control. This
is local control. I vote... I urge an 'aye'. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "We still have five speakers on this Bill.

Representative Flowers for two minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Flowers: "I'm sorry, Representative Welch, it was rather noisy in this room. Can you please explain, once again, what is the purpose of this Bill?"

Welch: "This pur... the purpose of this Bill, Representative, is to empower the local school board. In most places outside of the city these school boards are elected. These communities are

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

very engaged in these school board elections. The community has a... very much has a say in what goes on in these districts through their school boards. And they should be able to vote... know that their school boards are making decisions in their best interest and those decisions should be honored by... on the local level."

Flowers: "Does the charter schools contribute anything to the local school boards?"

Welch: "Not that I'm aware of. They just take money away once they grant these charters."

Flowers: "So, the charter schools take money away from the local schools?"

Welch: "The local schools."

Flowers: "And so, this Bill is giving more accountability to the people that's elected, that was elected by the people not appointed?"

Welch: "That is correct."

Flowers: "And one more question. Does the commission have a conflict of interest in regards to the charter school?"

Welch: "Well, I would say they do because they are... it's an appointed commission, appointed by a procharter Governor, typically appointing people that probably think like him. And I would say that if we truly care about the community and the community's input, this is the Bill that should be the law. Because it also not only relies on the local school board, but there's a mechanism for a referendum for the people to decide if they want a charter school if they so choose."

Flowers: "I want to commend you, Representative, for bringing this Bill forward because House Bill 768 still provides that

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

the final decision of the local school board and the commission are subject to judicial review. So, and it... there's still the possibility that there is an administrative review even after the school board has spoken. Am I correct about that?"

Welch: "This is correct. And I specifically encourage..."

Flowers: "Thank you very much. And I urge an 'aye' vote."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Davis: "Representative, when a local... when a... an application is appealed to the charter school commission... being first rejected by the local district and is appealed to the commission. If the commission approves that, do they offer any additional funding to that district?"

Welch: "They do not. And that's one of my bones of contention. Is that the charter commission can overrule the local school board and grant a charter and the money that's going to pay for this charter is going to come out of the local school district's funds."

Davis: "Currently, it comes out of that local school district's GSA?"

Welch: "That's correct."

Davis: "To the tune of about 80 percent."

Welch: "I don't know the exact percentage."

Davis: "It's..."

Welch: "It's a significant number."

Davis: "It's about 80 percent. So, for those of you who think that this is taking something away and that this charter

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

school commission should be allowed to operate, then let them reverse one of your school districts and your school districts have to give that new charter 80 percent of their general state aid money and see how you and your district like it. This charter school commission is outdated. It's not necessary. We do not need it. Absolutely do not need this charter school commission. There are other ways that we could figure out how to work for those districts that are looking to or where charters want to come into a district. There are better ways to do this. To allow this charter school it is against local control. 'Cause the moment we talk about mandating something, putting it on a school district then everybody yells, what about local control? So, how does a commission get to over roll... overrule a local school district and it not be considered going against that school district local control? Now, if you don't like your school board, then actively work to reelect different people. But to the extent in which they have the ability to make that decision, we need to allow them to make that decision. If they say no to that charter school then no should be it. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Chair recognizes Barbara Wheeler."

Wheeler, B.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to move the previous question."

Speaker Lang: "Lady moves to put the previous question. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the previous question is put. Mr. Welch to close."

Welch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We've debated this Bill extensively. I believe everyone knows how they're going to vote. I just ask that they vote their district, vote their

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

conscience, and vote in favor of local control. Mr. Speaker, I also ask that they take into consideration that if they vote to leave the charter commission in the current form that they're in, they're voting on the most ultimate unfunded mandate. The state charter commission can overturn a local school board's decision and take money, desperately needed money, away from these local school boards. And I say we need to respect local control and local school board decisions and vote 'yes' on House Bill 768."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman has moved passage of the Bill. Let me remind the chamber that Mr. Demmer has asked for a verification. So, Members will be in their chairs and vote their own switches. Those in favor of the Gentleman's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves, Members. Have all voted who wish? Arroyo, Burke, Harper. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 61 voting 'yes', 46 voting 'no'. And Mr. Demmer, do you persist? Mr. Demmer persists. Mr. Clerk, please call the affirmative."

Clerk Hollman: "A poll of those voting in the affirmative: Representative Ammons; Representative Andrade; Representative Arroyo; Representative Beiser; Representative Burke, K.; Representative Cassidy; Representative Chapa LaVia; Representative Conroy; Representative Conyears-Ervin; Representative Costello; Representative Crespo; Representative Currie; Representative D'Amico; Representative Davidsmeyer; Representative Representative DeLuca; Representative Evans; Representative

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

Feigenholtz; Representative Fine; Representative Flowers; Representative Ford; Representative Gabel; Representative Gordon-Booth; Representative Greenwood; Representative Guzzardi; Representative Halpin; Representative Hammond; Representative Harper; Representative Harris, G.; Representative Hays; Representative Hoffman; Rep..."

- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, would you suspend. Mr. Demmer withdraws his verification request. There are 61 voting 'yes', 46 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Ladies and Gentlemen, we have a series of Bills on Second Reading. Please be in your seats. We'll run through these if you cooperate with the Chair as quickly as possible and we can move on to committees. House Bill 2622, Representative Fine. Out of the record. House Bill 243, Representative Flowers. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 243, a Bill for an Act concerning education. This Bill was read a second time a previous day.

  Amendments 2 and 3 were adopted in committee. No... no Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 2572, Mr. Butler. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2572, a Bill for an Act concerning land. 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 2474, Mr. Demmer. Please read the Bill."

39th Legislative Day

- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2474, 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 456, Representative Greenwood. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 456, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Greenwood, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Greenwood on the Amendment."
- Greenwood: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. This
  Amendment removes the... the opposition that was on the Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Please tell us in one sentence what the Bill... what the Amendment does, please?"
- Greenwood: "It amends the Higher Education Student Assistance Act requiring ISAC to award grants to students in financial need who household income is less than the poverty guidelines updated periodically in the Federal Register by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 3539, Mr. Halpin. Out of the record. House Bill 2878, Mr. Hoffman. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2878, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. Sec... This Bill was read a second time on a previous

39th Legislative Day

- day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Hoffman, has been approved for consideration."

  Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hoffman."
- Hoffman: "Yes. This Amendment is an initiative of the Liquor Control Commission. And it actually extends the statute of limitations for enforcement these violations."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 2630, Representative Mah. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2630, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. 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 1125, Representative Manley. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1125, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. This Bill was read a second time a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Manley, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Manley on the Amendment."
- Manley: "Thank you, Speaker. The Amendment is a gut and replace.

  It changes the sunset date to May 31 from April 30."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."

39th Legislative Day

- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 737, Mr. Meier. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 737, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. This Bill was read a second time a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 was offered... was adopted previously. No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 2771, Mr. Mitchell.

  Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2771, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. 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 2388, Representative Moeller. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2388, a Bill for an Act to provide information on individuals with respect to whom an indicated report of child abuse or any other violation has been made and who are licensed providers through the Department of Children and Family Services. 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 Moeller."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Moeller on Amendment 2."
- Moeller: "Thank you, Speaker. Amendment 2 replaces the Bill and it specifies that the Department of Child... Children and Family Services will keep a database of licensed group home child care providers and whether or not their licenses have been

39th Legislative Day

- suspended, revoked, or surrendered under investigation of child abuse and neglect."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #3 is offered by Representative Moeller."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Moeller."
- Moeller: "This is a technical change that would gut and replace the language."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 3369, Mr. Sims. Mr. Sims. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3369, a Bill for an Act concerning education. 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 2987, Mr. Slaughter.

  Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2987, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Second Reading of this House Bill.

  Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments have been approved for consideration. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 2810, Mr. Spain. Please read the Bill."

39th Legislative Day

- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2810, a Bill for an Act concerning animals. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Spain, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Spain."
- Spain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a Bill concerning animal abuse. The Amendment is related to horses and moves the Farm Bureau to neutral."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 3095, Mr. Stewart. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3095, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Second Reading of this House Bill.

  Amendment 2 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 189, Mr. Thapedi. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 189, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Floor Amendment #3 was adopted previously. Floor Amendment #5, offered by Representative Thapedi, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Thapedi."
- Thapedi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the Omnibus Condominium Property Act Bill that I spoke about a little earlier. House Amendment... strike that... Floor Amendment #5, in which I move

39th Legislative Day

- for its adoption, actually relates to owner petition rights and increases the number of days from 30 to 21 under Sections 18(a) and 18.4."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 188, Mr. Thapedi. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 188, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. This Bill was read a second time a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 2 and 3 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Thapedi."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Thapedi."
- Thapedi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a Bill that we've been working on very diligently with all the trial lawyers and the Illinois State Bar Association. Amendment #2 is actually the first attempt that curing the difficulties that we were having in Floor Amendment #3 which will come after that is the final and best version."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #3 is offered by Representative Thapedi."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Thapedi."
- Thapedi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move for the adoption of Floor Amendment #3. Floor Amendment #3 actually takes care of the

39th Legislative Day

- issue with respect to waiver of objections to personal jurisdiction. The waiver will actually be prospective rather than both prospective and retrospective. I move for its adoption."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 3462, Mr. Zalewski.

  Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3462, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment 2 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendments 3 and 4 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #3 is offered by Representative Zalewski."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski."
- Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If we could adopt Floor Amendment #3, it changes the reporting requirements to be more compliant with what is accomplishable."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #4 is offered by Representative Zalewski and has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski."
- Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Wish to... wish to adopt Floor Amendment #4. It gives the department more time to promulgate a rule if the task force comes up with a recommendation."

39th Legislative Day

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 1776, Mr. Martwick.

  Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1776, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 2959, Representative Fine. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2959, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk Hollman: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 335, offered by Representative Ford. House Resolution 336, offered by Representative Keith Wheeler. House Resolution 337, offered by Representative Sims. House Resolution 338, offered by Representative Welter. House Resolution 339, offered by Representative Currie. House Resolution 340, offered by Representative Mah. House Resolution 341, offered by Representative Brady. And House Resolution 342, offered by Representative Brady."
- Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Mr. Clerk, committee announcements."

39th Legislative Day

- Clerk Hollman: "The following committees will be meeting immediately after Session: Museums, Arts, & Cultural Enhancement will be in C-1; Labor & Commerce will be in Room 114; Appropriations-Public Safety will be in D-1; Cybersecurity, Data Analytics & IT will be in 122; Restorative Justice will be in Room 115; Health Care Licenses in 413; the Executive Committee in 118. A note that the Cities & Villages Committee for tomorrow morning has been canceled. Cities & Villages for tomorrow morning has been canceled."
- Speaker Lang: "And now, leaving perfunctory time for the Clerk, Leader Currie moves that the House stand adjourned 'til Thursday, April 27 at the hour of 10:30 am. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the House stands adjourned 'til Thursday, April 27 at the hour of 10:30 am."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Second Reading of House Bills. House Bill 1128, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 1129, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 1130, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 1131, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 1132, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 1133, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 1134, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 1135, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 1136, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 1137, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 1138, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 1139, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 1140, a Bill for an Act

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

concerning revenue. House Bill 1141, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 1142, a Bill for Act concerning revenue. House Bill 1143, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 1144, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 1145, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 1146, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 1147, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 1148, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 1149, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 1150, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 1151, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 1152, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 1153, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 1154, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 1155, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 1156, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 1157, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 1158, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 1159, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 1160, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 1161, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 1162, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 1163, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 1164, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 1165, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 1166, a Bill for an Act concerning public

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

employee benefits. House Bill 1167, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1168, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1169, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1170, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1171, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1172, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1173, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1174, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1175, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1176, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1177, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1178, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1179, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1180, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1181, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1182, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1183, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1184, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1185, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1186, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1187, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1188, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1189, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1190, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1191, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1192, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

1193, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1194, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1195, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1196, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1197, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1198, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1199, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1200, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1201, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1202, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1203, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1204, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1205, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1206, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1207, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1208, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1209, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1210, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1211, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1212, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1213, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1214, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1215, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1216, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1217, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1218, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1219, a Bill for

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1220, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1221, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1222, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1223, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1224, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1225, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1226, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1227, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1228, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1229, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1230, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1231, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1232, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1233, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1234, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1235, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1236, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1237, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1238, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1239, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1240, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1241, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1242, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1243, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1244, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1245, a Bill for an Act concerning local

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

government. House Bill 1246, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1247, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1248, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1249, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1250, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1251, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1255, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 1258, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 1259, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 1260, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 1261, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 1262, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 1263, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 1264, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 1265, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 1266, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 1267, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 1268, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 1269, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 1270, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 1271, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 1275, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1276, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1277, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1278, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1279, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1280, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1281, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1282, a Bill for an Act

39th Legislative Day

concerning	regulation.	House	Bill	1283,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	regulation.	House	Bill	1284,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	regulation.	House	Bill	1285,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	regulation.	House	Bill	1286,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	regulation.	House	Bill	1287,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	regulation.	House	Bill	1288,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	regulation.	House	Bill	1289,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	regulation.	House	Bill	1290,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	regulation.	House	Bill	1291,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	regulation.	House	Bill	1292,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	education.	House	Bill	1293,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	education.	House	Bill	1294,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	education.	House	Bill	1295,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	education.	House	Bill	1296,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	education.	House	Bill	1297,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	education.	House	Bill	1298,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	education.	House	Bill	1299,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	education.	House	Bill	1300,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	education.	House	Bill	1301,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	education.	House	Bill	1302,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	education.	House	Bill	1303,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	education.	House	Bill	1304,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	education.	House	Bill	1305,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	education.	House	Bill	1306,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	education.	House	Bill	1307,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	education.	House	Bill	1308,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	education.	House	Bill	1309,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	education.	House	Bill	1310,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	education.	House	Bill	1311,	а	Bill	for	an	Act

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

concerning education. House Bill 1312, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 1313, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 1314, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 1315, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 1316, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 1316, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1317, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1318, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1319, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1320, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1321, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1321, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1322, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1323, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1324, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1325, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1326, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1327, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1328, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1329, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1330, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1331, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1336, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1337, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1338, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1339, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1340, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1341, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1342, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1343, a Bill for an Act concerning

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

regulation. House Bill 1344, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1345, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1346, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1347, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1348, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1349, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1350, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1351, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1352, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1353, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1354, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1355, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1356, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1357, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1358, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1359, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1360, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1361, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1362, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1363, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1364, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1365, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1366, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1367, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. House Bill 1368, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. House Bill 1369, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. House Bill 1370, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. House Bill 1371, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. House Bill 1372, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. House Bill 1373, a Bill

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

for an Act concerning gaming. House Bill 1374, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. House Bill 1375, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. House Bill 1376, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. House Bill 1377, a Bill for an concerning regulation. House Bill 1378, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1379, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1380, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1381, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1382, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1383, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1384, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1385, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1386, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1387, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1388, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1389, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1390, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1391, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1392, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1393, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1394, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1395, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1396, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1397, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1398, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1399, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1400, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1401, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1402, a Bill for an Act

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

concerning liquor. House Bill 1403, Bill for а an Act for concerning liquor. House Bill 1404, a Bill Act an a Bill concerning liquor. House Bill 1405, for an Act concerning liquor. House Bill 1406, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. House Bill 1407, a Bill for an Act 1408, concerning liquor. House Bill Bill for Act a an concerning liquor. House Bill 1409, Bill for Act а an concerning liquor. House Bill 1410, Bill for an Act a concerning liquor. House Bill 1411, Bill for а an Act concerning liquor. House Bill 1412, Bill for Act a an concerning liquor. House Bill for 1413, a Bill an Act concerning liquor. House Bill 1414, a Bill for Act an a Bill concerning liquor. House Bill 1415, for Act an a Bill concerning liquor. House Bill 1416, for an Act concerning liquor. House Bill 1417, a Bill for an Act 1418, a Bill concerning liquor. House Bill for an Act concerning liquor. House Bill 1419, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. House Bill 1420, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. House Bill 1421, a Bill for an Act concerning warehouses. House Bill 1422, a Bill for an Act concerning warehouses. House Bill 1424, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 1425, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 1426, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 1427, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 1428, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid."

Clerk Hollman: "Introduction and First Reading of Senate Bills.

Senate Bill 196, offered by Representative Reis, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 298, offered

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

by Representative Cassidy, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Senate Bill 863, offered by Representative Scherer, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 865, offered by Representative Mitchell, Christian, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 866, offered by Representative Kifowit, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 868, offered by Representative Conroy, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Senate Bill 872, offered by Representative Welter, a Bill for an Act Senate Bill 883, offered concerning revenue. Representative Burke, Kelly, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Senate Bill 886, offered by Representative Moylan, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 892, offered by Representative Demmer, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 898, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 899, offered by Representative Rita, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 901, offered by Representative Jimenez, a Bill for an Act 904, offered concerning regulation. Senate Bill Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 930, offered by Representative Phillips, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 932, offered by Representative Wehrli, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 973, offered by Representative Feigenholtz, a Bill for an Act concerning children. Senate Bill 1249, offered by Representative Breen, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 1254, offered Representative Bellock, a Bill for an Act concerning

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

regulation. Senate Bill 1258, offered by Representative Wheeler, Barbara, a Bill for an Act concerning property. Senate Bill 1274, offered by Representative Costello, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Senate Bill 1297, offered by Representative Nekritz, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 1298, offered by Representative Rita, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Senate Bill 1311, offered by Representative Crespo, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 1325, offered by Representative Costello, a Bill for an Act concerning wildlife. Senate Bill 1329, offered by Representative Demmer, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 1342, offered Representative Fine, a Bill for an Act concerning wildlife. Senate Bill 1348, offered by Representative Soto, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 1364, offered by Representative Reis, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 1370, offered by Representative Andersson, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 1385, offered by Representative Spain, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 1399, offered by Representative Sims, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. Senate Bill 1422, offered by Representative Breen, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 1437, offered by Representative Moylan, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 1446, offered by Representative Riley, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 1449, offered by Representative Turner, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Senate Bill 1456, offered by Representative Fortner, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Senate Bill 1462, offered by

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

Representative Kifowit, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 1465, offered by Representative Willis, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Senate Bill 1489, offered by Representative Welch, a Bill for an Act safety. Senate Bill 1516, offered concerning Representative Bourne, a Bill for an Act concerning human rights. Senate Bill 1519, offered by Representative Bellock, a Bill for an Act concerning the Department of Juvenile Justice. Senate Bill 1544, offered by Representative Beiser, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Senate Bill 1556, offered by Representative Evans, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Senate Bill 1567, offered by Representative Davis, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. First Reading of these Senate Bills. Second Reading of House Bills. House Bill 68, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 241, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 263, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 268, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 281, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 286, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. House Bill 312, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 313, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 398, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 426, a Bill for an Act concerning immigration. House Bill 458, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 477, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 482, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 484, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 498, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 499, a Bill for an

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 502, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 512, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. House Bill 536, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 537, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 539, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. House Bill 566, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 647, a Bill for an Act concerning human rights. House Bill 661, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 662, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 678, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. House Bill 688, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 689, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 690, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. House Bill 723, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 734, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 777, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 795, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 1256, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 1257, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 1272, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1274, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1276, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1332, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1333, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1334, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1335, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1454, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 1560, a Bill for an Act concerning business. House Bill 1618, a Bill for an Act

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

concerning transportation. House Bill 1819, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 1820, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 1848, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1853, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1857, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1878, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 1894, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1910, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1953, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1954, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1955, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1963, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1969, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 2031, a Bill for an Act concerning conservation. House Bill 2085, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 2094, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. House Bill 2286, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 2292, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 2319, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 2340, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 2342, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 2351, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. House Bill 2381, a Bill for an Act concerning certain racial terms. House Bill 2393, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 2394, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 2402, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 2409, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 2410, a Bill for an Act concerning wildlife. House Bill 2424, a Bill for an Act

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

concerning finance. House Bill 2428, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 2436, a Bill for an Act concerning health. House Bill 2439, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 2457, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 2459, a Bill for an Act concerning business. House Bill 2465, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 2469, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. House Bill 2493, a Bill for an Act concerning State employment. House Bill 2494, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 2495, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. House Bill 2510, a Bill for an Act concerning health. House Bill 2515, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 2525, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. House Bill 2536, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 2545, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 2577, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 2591, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 2626, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 2652, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 2653, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 2654, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 2702, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 2703, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 2716, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 2731, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 2747, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 2756, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 2762, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 2764, a Bill for an Act

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

concerning State government. House Bill 2774, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 2777, a Bill for an Act concerning violence research. House Bill 2798, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 2806, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. House Bill 2808, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 2856, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 2857, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 2859, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 2860, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 2861, a Bill for an Act concerning public health. House Bill 2863, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 2899, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 2907, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 2912, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 2933, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 2937, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 2949, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 2958, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 2964, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 2968, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 2988, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 2992, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. House Bill 3006, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 3021, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3042, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3044, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. House Bill 3052, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3057, a Bill for an Act concerning

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

revenue. House Bill 3071, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 3072, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 3085, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 3086, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 3123, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. House Bill 3185, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3187, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 3220, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 3223, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 3242, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 3251, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 3254, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 3261, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 3264, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. House Bill 3286, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 3287, a Bill for an Act concerning health. House Bill 3293, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 3320, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 3326, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 3337, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 3338, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 3339, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 3340, a Bill for an Act concerning racial and ethnic bias training. House Bill 3341, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 3352, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 3355, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 3374, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 3375, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

3376, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 3377, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 3392, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 3393, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 3395, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 3418, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 3436, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3437, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3447, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3449, a Bill for an Act concerning business. House Bill 3459, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 3464, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 3488, a Bill for an Act concerning health. House Bill 3514, a Bill for an Act concerning business. House Bill 3515, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 3528, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 3540, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 3555, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 3567, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3611, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 3626, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 3629, a Bill for an Act concerning human trafficking. House Bill 3645, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. House Bill 3648, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 3662, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. House Bill 3699, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 3700, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 3709, a Bill for an Act concerning health. House Bill 3710, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 3712, a Bill for an Act

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

concerning criminal law. House Bill 3717, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 3720, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 3751, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 3769, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3773, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 3792, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3793, a Bill for an Act concerning health. House Bill 3815, a Bill for an Act concerning data. House Bill 3822, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 3830, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 3839, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 3852, a Bill for an Act concerning health. House Bill 3853, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. House Bill 3872, a Bill for an Act concerning business. House Bill 3876, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Second Reading of House Bills. House Bill 1821, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 1822, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 1823, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 1824, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 1825, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 1826, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 1827, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 1828, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 1829, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 1830, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 1831, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 1832, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 1833, a Bill for an Act concerning government.

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

House Bill 1834, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. House Bill 1835, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. House Bill 1836, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1837, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1838, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1839, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1840, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1841, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1842, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1843, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1844, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1845, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1846, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1847, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1850, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1851, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1852, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1854, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1855, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1856, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1858, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1859, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 1860, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 1861, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 1862, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 1863, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 1864, a Bill for concerning finance. House Bill 1865, a Bill for an Act

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

concerning	finance.	House	Bill	1866,	а	Bill	for	an	Act		
concerning	finance.	House	Bill	1867,	а	Bill	for	an	Act		
concerning	finance.	House	Bill	1868,	а	Bill	for	an	Act		
concerning	finance.	House	Bill	1869,	а	Bill	for	an	Act		
concerning	finance.	House	Bill	1870,	а	Bill	for	an	Act		
concerning	finance.	House	Bill	1871,	a	Bill	for	an	Act		
concerning	finance.	House	Bill	1872,	а	Bill	for	an	Act		
concerning	finance.	House	Bill	1873,	а	Bill	for	an	Act		
concerning	revenue.	House	Bill	1874,	а	Bill	for	an	Act		
concerning	revenue.	House	Bill	1875,	a	Bill	for	an	Act		
concerning	revenue.	House	Bill	1876,	а	Bill	for	an	Act		
concerning	revenue.	House	Bill	1877,	а	Bill	for	an	Act		
concerning	revenue.	House	Bill	1879,	a	Bill	for	an	Act		
concerning	revenue.	House	Bill	1880,	a	Bill	for	an	Act		
concerning	revenue.	House	Bill	1881,	a	Bill	for	an	Act		
concerning	revenue.	House	Bill	1882,	а	Bill	for	an	Act		
concerning	revenue.	House	Bill	1883,	а	Bill	for	an	Act		
concerning	revenue.	House	Bill	1884,	a	Bill	for	an	Act		
concerning	revenue.	House	Bill	1885,	a	Bill	for	an	Act		
concerning	revenue.	House	Bill	1886,	a	Bill	for	an	Act		
concerning	revenue.	House	Bill	1887,	a	Bill	for	an	Act		
concerning	public emp	oloyee	benefi	ts. Ho	use	Bill	1888,	a	Bill		
for an Act	concernin	g publ	ic emp	oloyee	ben	efits	. Hou	se	Bill		
1889, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits.											
House Bill 1890, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee											
benefits. House Bill 1891, a Bill for an Act concerning public											
employee b	enefits.	House	Bill	1892,	a	Bill	for	an	Act		
concerning State government. House Bill 1893, a Bill for an											
Act concern	ing local	govern	ment.	House :	Bil	1 1897	7, a E	Bill	for		

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1898, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1899, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1900, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1901, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1902, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1903, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1904, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1905, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1906, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1907, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1908, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1909, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1911, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1912, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1913, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1915, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1916, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1917, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 1918, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 1919, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 1920, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 1921, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 1922, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 1923, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 1924, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 1925, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 1926, a Bill for an Act

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

concerning	education.	House	Bill	1927,	а	Bill	for	an	Act	
concerning	education.	House	Bill	1928,	а	Bill	for	an	Act	
concerning	education.	House	Bill	1929,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	
concerning	education.	House	Bill	1930,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	
concerning	education.	House	Bill	1931,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	
concerning	education.	House	Bill	1932,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	
concerning	education.	House	Bill	1933,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	
concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 1934, a Bill										
for an Act	concerning (	educati	on. H	ouse Bi	111	1935,	, а В	ill	for	
an Act cond	cerning educ	ation.	House	Bill	193	36, a	Bill	for	r an	
Act concerr	ning education	on. Hou	se Bi	11 1937	7,	a Bill	L for	an	Act	
concerning	education.	House	Bill	1938,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	
concerning	education.	House	Bill	1939,	а	Bill	for	an	Act	
concerning	education.	House	Bill	1940,	а	Bill	for	an	Act	
concerning	education.	House	Bill	1941,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	
concerning	education.	House	Bill	1942,	а	Bill	for	an	Act	
concerning	education.	House	Bill	1943,	а	Bill	for	an	Act	
concerning	education.	House	Bill	1944,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	
concerning	education.	House	Bill	1945,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	
concerning	education.	House	Bill	1946,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	
concerning	education.	House	Bill	1947,	а	Bill	for	an	Act	
concerning	education.	House	Bill	1948,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	
concerning	regulation.	House	Bill	1949,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	
concerning	regulation.	House	Bill	1950,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	
concerning	regulation.	House	Bill	1951,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	
concerning	regulation.	House	Bill	1956,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	
concerning	regulation.	House	Bill	1957,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	
concerning	regulation.	House	Bill	1958,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	
concerning	regulation.	House	Bill	1959,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

concerning	regulation	n. Hou	ıse	Bil	Ll	1960	,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	regulation	n. Hou	ıse	Bil	Ll	1961	,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	regulation	n. Hou	ıse	Bil	Ll	1962	,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	regulation	n. Hou	ıse	Bil	Ll	1965	,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	regulation	n. Hou	ıse	Bil	Ll	1966	,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	regulation	n. Hou	ıse	Bil	Ll	1967	,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	regulation	n. Hou	ıse	Bil	Ll	1968	,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	regulation	n. Hou	ıse	Bil	Ll	1971	,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	regulation	n. Hou	ıse	Bil	Ll	1972	,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	regulation	n. Hou	ıse	Bil	Ll	1973	,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	regulation	n. Hou	ıse	Bil	Ll	1974	,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	regulation	n. Hou	ıse	Bil	Ll	1975	,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	regulation	n. Hou	ıse	Bil	Ll	1976	,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	regulation	n. Hou	ıse	Bil	Ll	1977	,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	regulation	n. Hou	ıse	Bil	Ll	1978	,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	regulation	n. Hou	ıse	Bil	Ll	1979	,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	regulation	n. Hou	ıse	Bil	Ll	1980	,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	regulation	n. Hou	ıse	Bil	Ll	1981	,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	gaming.	House	Bi	11	19	82,	a	Ε	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	gaming.	House	Bi	11	19	83,	a	Ε	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	gaming.	House	Bi	11	19	84,	а	Е	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	gaming.	House	Bi	11	19	85,	a	Е	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	gaming.	House	Bi	11	19	86,	a	Ε	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	gaming.	House	Bi	11	19	87,	а	Е	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	liquor.	House	Bi	11	19	88,	a	Ε	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	warehouses	s. Hou	ıse	Bil	Ll	1989	,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	public ai	d. Ho	ıse	Bil	11	1990	,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	public ai	d. Hou	ıse	Bil	11	1991	,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	public ai	d. Hou	ıse	Bil	11	1992	,	а	Bill	for	an	Act

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

concerning public aid. House Bill 1993, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 1994, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 1995, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 1996, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 1997, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 1998, a Bill for an Act concerning housing. House Bill 1999, a Bill for an Act concerning urban problems. House Bill 2000, a Bill for an Act concerning aging. House Bill 2001, a Bill for concerning aging. House Bill 2002, a Bill for Act an concerning aging. House Bill 2003, a Bill for concerning children. House Bill 2004, a Bill for an Act concerning military service. House Bill 2005, a Bill for an Act concerning military service. House Bill 2006, a Bill for an Act concerning health. House Bill 2007, a Bill for an Act concerning health. House Bill 2008, a Bill for Act concerning health. House Bill 2009, a Bill for an Act concerning health. House Bill 2010, a Bill for Act concerning health. House Bill 2011, a Bill for an Act concerning health. House Bill 2012, a Bill for an Act concerning health. House Bill 2013, a Bill for an Act concerning health. House Bill 2014, a Bill for Act an concerning safety. House Bill 2015, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 2016, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 2017, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 2018, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 2019**,** a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 2020, a Bill for Act concerning safety. House Bill 2021, a Bill for an Act

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

concerning safety. House Bill 2022, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 2023, a Bill for Act concerning safety. House Bill 2024, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 2025, a Bill for concerning agriculture. House Bill 2026, a Bill for an Act concerning animals. House Bill 2027, a Bill for an Act concerning fish. House Bill 2029, a Bill for an Act concerning wildlife. House Bill 2032, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 2033, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 2034, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 2035, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 2036, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 2037, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 2038, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 2039, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 2040, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 2041, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 2042, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 2043, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 2044, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 2045, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 2046, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 2047, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 2048, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 2049, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 2050, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. House Bill 2051, a Bill for an Act concerning alternative dispute resolution. House Bill 2052, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 2053, a Bill for

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 2054, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 2055, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 2056, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 2057, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 2058, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 2059, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 2060, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 2061, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 2062, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 2063, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 2064, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 2065, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 2066, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 2067, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 2068, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 2069, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 2070, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 2071, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 2072, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 2073, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 2074, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 2075, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 2076, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 2077, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 2078, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 2079, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 2080, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 2081, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 2082, a Bill for an Act

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

concerning civil law. House Bill 2083, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 2084, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 2086, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 2087, a Bill for an Act concerning human rights. House Bill 2088, a Bill for an Act concerning business. House Bill 2089, a Bill for an Act concerning business. House Bill 2090, a Bill for an Act concerning business. House Bill 2091, a Bill for an Act concerning business. House Bill 2092, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. House Bill 2093, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. House Bill 2094, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. House Bill 2095, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 2096, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 2097, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 2098, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 2099, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 2100, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2101, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2102, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2103, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2104, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2105, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2106, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2107, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2108, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2109, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2110, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2111, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2112, a Bill for an Act

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

making appropriations.	House	Bill	2113,	а	Bill	for	an	Act	
making appropriations.	House	Bill	2114,	а	Bill	for	an	Act	
making appropriations.	House	Bill	2115,	а	Bill	for	an	Act	
making appropriations.	House	Bill	2116,	а	Bill	for	an	Act	
making appropriations.	House	Bill	2117,	а	Bill	for	an	Act	
making appropriations.	House	Bill	2118,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	
making appropriations.	House	Bill	2119,	а	Bill	for	an	Act	
making appropriations.	House	Bill	2120,	а	Bill	for	an	Act	
making appropriations.	House	Bill	2121,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	
making appropriations.	House	Bill	2122,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	
making appropriations.	House	Bill	2123,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	
making appropriations.	House	Bill	2124,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	
making appropriations.	House	Bill	2125,	а	Bill	for	an	Act	
making appropriations.	House	Bill	2126,	а	Bill	for	an	Act	
making appropriations.	House	Bill	2127,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	
making appropriations.	House	Bill	2128,	а	Bill	for	an	Act	
making appropriations.	House	Bill	2129,	а	Bill	for	an	Act	
making appropriations.	House	Bill	2130,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	
making appropriations.	House	Bill	2131,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	
making appropriations.	House	Bill	2132,	а	Bill	for	an	Act	
making appropriations.	House H	Bill 2	2133, a	В	ill fo	r an	Ac	t in	
relation to budget imp	olementa	ition.	House	В	ill 2	134,	a :	Bill	
for an Act in relation to budget implementation. House Bill									
2135, a Bill for an A	Act mak	ing ar	ppropri	at	ions.	Hous	se :	Bill	
2136, a Bill for an A	Act maki	ing ar	ppropri	at	ions.	Hous	se :	Bill	
2137, a Bill for an $R$	Act maki	ing ar	ppropri	at	ions.	Hous	se :	Bill	
2138, a Bill for an A	Act maki	ing ar	ppropri	at	ions.	Hous	se :	Bill	
2139, a Bill for an A	Act maki	ing ar	ppropri	at	ions.	Hous	se :	Bill	
2140, a Bill for an A	Act mak	ing ar	ppropri	at	ions.	Hous	se :	Bill	

39th Legislative Day

4/26/2017

2930, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 2030, a Bill for an Act concerning wildlife. (sic-House Bills 2930 and 2030 were read in error-not meant to be read into the record). There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."