40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 353, offered by Speaker Madigan is referred to the Rules Committee. Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on April 27, 2017: recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 259, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 3072, Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 3293, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 3735; recommends be adopted, referred to the Order of Resolutions is House Resolution 353."

Speaker Lang: "The House will be in order. Members will be in their chairs. We shall be led in prayer today by Dr. Zachery Lee who's the Reverend at the Mount Paran Missionary Baptist Church in East St. Louis. Dr. Lee is the guest of Representative Greenwood. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off cell phones and rise for the invocation and Pledge of Allegiance. Dr. Lee."

Dr. Lee: "Thank you, Speaker. All heads bowed, all eyes closed. All wise, almighty, everlasting, eternal One, thou who rules and super rules our world. Thou who made the ethane, ethereal, ethos. Thou who rolled this terrestrial ball into space and baptized with... with a liquid mist. You who ordered a variety of blooming flowers, transfigured them into a marvelous attraction. In these days of which we live when civilization has been torn by degradation and flirts with doom and disaster. In these days when high mindedness runs our streets like a mad dog beating in uncertain path. Selfishness has evaporated the milk of human kindness while pain and panic

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

chase each other like June bugs in the summer sun. We internationally, nationally, statewide in each of counties, cities, villages and hamlets need thee more now than ever before, Illinois, most especial, this great Land of Lincoln. Oh God, we pray and beseech thee for guidance, that our deliberations, our talking with each other; our reaching the aisles, despite Party, let us have bipartisan efforts. Guide us, Oh God, to make decisions that are proper and pertinent for the aggrandizement of the people of Illinois for whom we represent and are praying on their behalf. We pray that chaos of these times will become cosmos and we will study war no more. It is in thee, Oh God, that we pray for the coming together of blacks and whites, Jews and gentiles, Protestants and Catholics, Christians and Muslims, Democrats and Republicans, atheists and agnostics, LGBTQ and straight, oriental and occidental, dove and hawk, lion and lamb. Please bring us all together. In Your name we pray, Amen."

- Speaker Lang: "We shall be led in the Pledge by Representative Winger."
- Winger 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. Andersson. Mr. Demmer. Who would like to give... Mr. Andersson."
- Andersson: "All Republicans are present and ready to do business." Speaker Lang: "Thank you. Leader Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record show that there are no excused absences among House Democrats today."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

- Speaker Lang: "In other words, we have a full House. Mr. Clerk, take the record. Ladies and Gentlemen, we have 118 Members answering the roll this morning. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk Hollman: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 343, offered by Representative Walsh. House Resolution 344, offered by Representative Walsh. House Resolution 346, offered by Representative Manley. House Resolution 347, offered by Representative Turner. House Resolution 348, offered by Representative Batinick. House Resolution 349, offered by Representative Turner. House Resolution 352, offered by Representative Phelps."
- 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. Committee Reports."
- Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Hoffman, Chairperson from the Committee on Labor & Commerce reports the following committee action taken on April 26, 2017: do pass as amended Short Debate is House Bill 2376; recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 690, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 2622, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 2703, Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 2764, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 3044, House Resolution 272. Representative Andrade, Chairperson from the Committee on Cybersecurity, Data Analytics, & IT reports the following committee action taken on April 26, 2017: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #5 to House Bill 2774, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 3251, Floor Amendment #2 to House

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

3449. Representative Ford, Chairperson from the Committee on Restorative Justice reports the following committee action taken on April 26, 2017: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 183, Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 2515. Representative Daniel Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on Executive reports the following committee action taken on April 26, recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 3164. Representative Rita, Chairperson from the Committee on Business & Occupational Licenses reports the following committee action taken on April 27, 2017: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 2856, Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 3486, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 3897. Representative Wallace, Chairperson from the Committee on Economic Justice & Equity reports the following committee action taken on April 27, 2017: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 3157. Representative Zalewski, Chairperson from the Committee on Revenue & Finance reports the following committee action taken on April 27, 2017: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 159. Representative Martwick, Chairperson from the Committee on Personnel & Pensions reports the following committee action taken on April 27, 2017: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House 165, Floor Amendment #2 to House Representative Riley, Chairperson from the Committee on State Government Administration reports the following committee action taken on April 27, 2017: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 3419, Floor Amendment #1 to House

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Bill 3514. Representative Gabel, Chairperson from the Committee on Human Services reports the following committee action taken on April 27, 2017: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 173, Floor Amendment #2 House Bill 3488. Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 345, offered by Representative Andrade. House Resolution 350, offered by Representative Mussman. House Resolution 351, offered by Representative Flowers. House Joint Resolution 49, offered by Representative Keith Wheeler. House Joint Resolution 50, offered by Representative Keith Wheeler. House Joint Resolution 51, offered by Representative Keith Wheeler. House Joint Resolution 52, offered by Representative Lilly. House Joint Resolution 53, offered by Representative Bellock. These are referred to the Rules Committee."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Brady is recognized."

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

Brady: "Thank you very much. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if I could have your attention for a minute. I'd like to introduce my Page for the day, from my district back in Bloomington, Mr. Colton Buckley. He's 13 years old, a seventh grader... Colton, please stand up... from Metcalf Grade School, who is accompanied by his father Tyler, who's up in the gallery. Please give them a nice Springfield welcome."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome to the Capitol. Thanks for being with us today. Ladies and Gentlemen, continuing Bills that are on the priority list. House Bill 7... on Second Reading, House Bill 795, Mr. Halpin. Please read the Bill."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 795, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. This Bill was read a second time a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 2525, Mr. Hoffman. Mr. Hoffman. Out of the record. House Bill 2622, Representative Fine. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2622, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Fine."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Fine on the Amendment."
- Fine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Amendment takes away some of the concerns of the opposition. It says that... it's with the state-based workers' comp fund. Independent insurance agencies can also sell those policies."
- 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. Mr. Clerk, please read House Bill 2622 on Third Reading."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2622, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Fine."
- Fine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Over the past several years in this House we've been talking about different ways that we can prove workers' comp in the State of Illinois. We've talked about in the different ways what we've done with the Bill in

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

2011. And then, a group of us decided let's see what other states are doing. And what we've found successful in 27 other states is a state-based workers' comp fund. So, what this legislation would do would be creating a not-for-profit workers' comp fund that could sell only workers' comp insurance in the State of Illinois."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andersson."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Andersson: "So, what we're doing is we're setting up a... I think you said it was not-for-profit, but this is being established by the State of Illinois. Is that correct?"

Fine: "What it would do is it would start out with a loan from the state of \$10 million to be repaid within five years. And the state would currently only be responsible for putting together a board and eventually, everything would be moved over to the board and that loan would be repaid within five years."

Andersson: "All right. And my understanding is the loan that we have to make is \$10 million. Is that correct?"

Fine: "That is correct."

Andersson: "Where is that money coming from?"

Fine: "The \$10 million loan would come from the Workers' Compen...

Workers' Compensation Commission Operations Fund. Currently,
that fund has about \$28 million in it. And soon, in the next
four months, it will be receiving 28 million more."

Andersson: "So, is that GRF or non-GRF?"

Fine: "That's non-GRF."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Andersson: "Okay. My understanding is that the... that there's actually a prohibition in the Bill on who can be a member of the board. Can you explain what that is?"

Fine: "I'm sorry. Can you ask the question again?"

Andersson: "Absolutely. My understanding is that there's an actually prohibition on who can be on this governing board, who can... who can run this entity. Can you explain that?"

Fine: "Well, it's not really a prohibition. It's just making sure that the members of the board don't have financial interest."

Andersson: "Let's see..."

Fine: "Or any conflicts of interest."

Andersson: "My understanding is that people who actually are familiar with the workers' comp industry are, you know, prohibited from being on this board."

Fine: "No. Anybody can have a history of working on workers' comp, but you just can't currently have a conflict of interest or any financial interest in what the company would do."

Andersson: "So, they can't be workers' comp insurers in another place. They..."

Fine: "Correct. At the current time, correct."

Andersson: "All right. Thank you. I appreciate the answers to the questions."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ives: "So, my understanding right now that the Illinois Workers' Compensation Operations Fund was created in 2003 to pay for the administration cost of agencies. Would your in... this

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

nonprofit insurance company also can enter into that fund as well?"

Fine: "Yes, it would."

Ives: "Okay. Why are you setting this up? What's your reasoning
behind it?"

Fine: "Well, in 2011 we know that we passed workers' compensation insurance that was supposed to save our companies purchasing workers' comp up to 18 percent. And our businesses had said that they had not realized those savings. So, by establishing this fund and the success we've seen with other funds in other states, we'd be able to sell this insurance with little to no profit. And so, the savings would really be passed on to the businesses in the State of Illinois."

Ives: "Okay. So, does... currently, does the State of Illinois sell other types of insurance? Do we sell health insurance? Do we sell life insurance? Does the State of Illinois sell car insurance? What other insurance would you like the State of Illinois to sell?"

Fine: "So, this would not be owned by the state. This would be a startup and it would be a not-for-profit."

Ives: "Essentially, it's owned by the state. The state is setting it up and completely controlling who can be the members on the board. It's using start-up funds that is taxpayer money. So, essen... are you setting the same thing up for a not-for-profit for car insurance, health insurance, home insurance, life insurance and any other insurance that's sold competitively on the open market? Are you now... Could I have some quiet in here? I can't even hear myself talk. Thank you,

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

- Sir. I appreciate that. So, are we now going to get completely involved in the insurance business at every other level?"
- Fine: "Absolutely not. The loan would be made out of \$10 million and would be paid back with interest. And the company would actually be owned by those who seek insurance from this workers based fund. It's based on what we saw in the Missouri model that has been extremely successful."
- Ives: "But there's no... there's no... been really no testimony that the Missouri model's been successful. Do you know how many insurance companies already operate in the State of Illinois that provide workers' comp insurance? How many companies?"
- Fine: "There are about 300 that are licensed to sell, but most don't. And this would just give our employers another option."
- Ives: "So, we have 300 companies that are licensed to sell workers' compensation insurance in the State of Illinois and yet, now, you want the state to intercede into that marketplace and come up with their own competing not profit... not-for-profit insurance company using taxpayer funds to start it up when we already have a competitive marketplace. Are you then going to also tell these people what they can and cannot charge? Because when you have 300 companies operating in this space, you already have a very open and competitive market."
- Fine: "But the top 25 workers' comp providers in Illinois sell to about 40 percent of the market. And this is something that would help the businesses in the State of Illinois. My businesses in my district have told me they are tired of paying these inflated prices for those workers' comp

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

insurance. So, this would just merely give them another option where they can purchase those plans."

Ives: "Okay. I absolutely... That is actually right. You're right. Every business is complaining that workers' comp insurance is too high in the State of Illinois, but it's not because the state hasn't come in and come up with their own insurance carrier. It's because the clause surrounding the in... workers' comp insurance are onerous in the State of Illinois. After 2011, when we put in some reforms, we dropped from the fourth highest in the nation only down to number seven. And it's not because we don't have a competitive market. It's because when you look across the history of worker comp claims in this state we still have... we're still very, very costly. In fact, workers' comp insurance needs big reform. We have a Bill on the Republican side to... that business is in favor of that business would like to do. So, if you're telling me your businesses don't like paying high costs, how come is it that the opponents to your Bill are all pretty much business organizations. The Illinois Chamber's opposed, Department of Insurance, the IMA, the Illinois Insurance Association, Associated Builders and Contractors, and technology manufacturers. All these business groups stand opposed to your Bill, so it must not be benefiting business."

Fine: "Those businesses all represent insurers. And if I could just do a little history of what we were supposed to see in 2011 when the legislation passed. Our medical fee payments were cut 30 percent; our... we expanded the use of the American Medical Association guidelines for assessing permanent and partial disability benefits; we restricted the PPD wage

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

differential benefits to the latter age of 67 or five years after the injury. And we cut PPD for most carpal tunnel cases for 20 percent and reduced the basis upon which benefits are calculated by 7.5 percent. Ironically, when we presented this Bill in committee, the man who was representing the opponents of the legislation pretty much freely said that what's so wrong about the insurance industry making a profit? And what we're saying is they can continue to make that profit, but let's give our business owners another opportunity. Let's look at the success we've seen in other states and mirror that success here in Illinois."

"Well, you know, that's about the best statement that you have said to ... so far in this debate that you're okay with insurance companies making a profit. That's wonderful. So, why do we need a not-for-profit to set up and compete with them? The truth is, is that we have a competitive market and the rates haven't gone down 'cause the ... because first of all, we allow workers' compensation insurance to go beyond which is typical in other states when it's been a temporary disability. We... we actually have a causation standard that is way out of the norm where even if one percent of the reason that you got injured was job-related, you're going to get a hundred percent of that compensation from your employer. We... we also have still problems with prescriptions and we need to do something on that end as well. We've had a number of individual Bills to handle this. We've had a comprehensive Bill to handle it. None of those get a fair hearing or a vote on the House Floor. We need real compensation reform. We don't need a competing insurance agency. In this

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Representative Fine, quite frankly, you're basically saying that they colluded among each other. These insurance companies should actually be charged with racketeering and a monopoly because they haven't brought down prices. They... You're assuming that they colluded with each other on price fixing and that is absolutely not the case."

Fine: "So, what we have seen our national insurance providers have said that based on the laws that were changed in Illinois, our businesses should be seeing a... at least an 18 percent decrease in the price they're paying for workers' comp insurance. The Illinois's average medical cost for workers' comp claims are absolutely plummeting including a drop of 15.3 percent in one year alone. So, even though those fees are going down, our employers are still seeing no relief. This would give them one more option to find that relief."

"Well, in the Republican plan on workers' compensation reform, we do not decrease any single benefit. There's no benefit decrease in this... in our plan. What we do, do is we talk about things that are reasonable to most bystanders even. Reasonable that if you got injured on the job, really if that injury should have been 50 percent of the cause of the job and not some outside activity that you did. Time and time again, we have case after case where people have been scamming the system. This needs to stop. So, you know, I don't like the fact that steel companies moved out of Illinois based on workers' compensation costs. I don't like the fact that manufacturers have fled Illinois based on workers' compensation costs. I don't like the fact that in my own district when Office Depot and Office Max decided to come

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

together, the part... one of the reasons they de... the combined company decided to locate in Florida was because they were going to save almost \$2 million a year on workers' comp costs alone. That one line item is going to save that combined company a lot of money and they chose to move to Florida. So, we know workers' comp costs are high, but it's not because of the insurance companies. It's because of the underlying reason that we need to fix in our system. So, that's why we need to work together on this issue. We do not need a competing not-for-profit set up by taxpayer money. This is absolutely the wrong way to go. Business is opposed to it. We cannot continue down this path of giving them one more reason to leave. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wheeler."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Wheeler, K.: "Good morning, Representative."

Fine: "Good morning."

Wheeler, K.: "We talked about this in committee and I want to just briefly reiterate for the record what the purpose of this Bill is. Why we're creating one more company is going to make a difference from your perspective."

Fine: "By creating a not-for-profit company, this is a business-friendly piece of legislation. As the previous speaker just mentioned, we had a company merge and leave the state and go to Florida because of their workers' comp rate. Had this already been in place that may not have happened because they would have been able to save money on their workers' comp insurance."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

- Wheeler, K.: "Representative, you tell us that there's a \$10 million loan that's going to start this company up. What other investment will take place to grow this company?"
- Fine: "From the state, the \$10 million loan will be repaid within five years plus interest and that's what we've seen in the other states that have started this. And that is the only investment that will be paid back."
- Wheeler, K.: "Thank you. But my question has to do with how much other money's going to be invested in this not-for-profit company that will allow it to actually insure these companies?"
- Fine: "All... all the money that will come into the company after the 10 million will be coming from selling premiums. And the way it's currently setup is \$1 in reserve equals \$3 available in premium sales. So, if the company has \$7 million in reserve left after they set up the company, it can sell up to \$21 million in premiums."
- Wheeler, K.: "Okay. But \$21 million in premium in the State of Illinois in this environment the exposure that we place on companies with our current workers' compensation laws means that you're not going to be able to cover very many companies for a very long time. And that's the reason I want to talk about... when we talked about this Bill in committee, taking us from 332 companies that offer workers' compensation insurance to 333 companies that offer workers' compensation insurance you're not going to impact the market well enough to have a... a true impact, the one you're actually, I think, trying to get at. Which is why... I understand your purpose of the Bill and I appreciate the intention, I don't think it's going to

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

have the impact you want. In fact, I'm certain it's not going to have the impact you want because \$10 million to start the company up, you're setting aside 3 million for start-up costs... that's not enough. You can't even get your message out with \$3 million in a state this large. Secondly, the exposure is going to absorb what you're willing to cover is just going to wipe out the idea of having very many customers for a very long time. This is maybe well-intentioned from the perspective of being pro-business, but in reality, it's not going to do what you want it to do. You compare this to other states like Kentucky in committee. Is that correct?"

Fine: "Yes. It's been successful in 27 other states. And the state would not be responsible for any debt. After that \$10 million loan is repaid, the state is out of it, financially, the state is out of it. That is our only responsibility with the upfront cost."

Wheeler, K.: "Right. So, I understand the exposure to the state. I'm trying to say that you're trying to get this insurance company to serve lots of companies throughout the state so you can there have... thereby have competition that's currently... currently that's not occurring in your opinion, which is occurring in every other version of how I look at things from a business owner's perspective. This is not going to solve the problem. To the Bill. Other states like Kentucky may have started this with \$7 million. We're at several times larger than Kentucky population wise and we're trying to start this with 10 million. Our workers' compensation costs are far outweigh what happens in Kentucky and yet, somehow, we're going to be able to make this work with a small amount of

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

money. Secondly, the intention behind this Bill is because insurance company profits are what's keeping workers' compensation costs for employers high. If you took all the profit out of what workers' compensation companies make, you still would not make a dent in getting Illinois back down to the middle of the pack when it comes to workers' compensation costs. While it may be well-intentioned, this Bill will not work. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reick."

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

Reick: "I've represented businesses that have gone into the capital market to try to obtain funding for new ventures and things like that and basically what they've had to provide is a business plan especially to explain to their investors how that money is going to be paid back. Do you have a business plan for this venture to show how much you need to generate in premiums and how much you expect to generate in premiums so as to be able to pay your debt back on time?"

Fine: "So, like I've mentioned earlier, you need \$1 in reserve for every \$3 in premium sales. So, we are starting our model with a \$10 million loan and considering \$3 million will go to all the start-up costs, so that will leave us \$7 million to sell premiums and that would be \$21 million in premium."

Reick: "Do you know how much... Have you done any projections as to how much it's going to cost to pay sales people to do your advertising to do all the things that are going to generate interest in this thing. It's not going to happen without you making a noise about it. I... We've got 300 companies eligible

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

to do business in this state for workers' comp. Not all of them are doing it because they know that they cannot generate the kind of revenue necessary to justify their investment. I don't know how it is that you think that a \$7 million investment in a state as diverse and as business intense as Illinois is will allow you to generate \$21 million and pay back the... the people of the State of Illinois the \$10 million that they're being asked to invest."

Fine: "So, our \$10 million is based on what has been successful in other states. And right now, in 8 states that have state-based workers' comp fund, more than 50 percent of their workers' comp sales come from this not-for-profit type company."

Reick: "So, what you're saying is that you're in favor of businesses making profits as long as they don't make profits any greater than a nonprofit company. Is that your point?"

Fine: "No. What we're saying is, we're giving consumers another option. You can... It's just like shopping at a store. You could shop at whatever store you want or you can shop at a store that has a lower price. People are probably going to stick... some businesses will stick with their current plan because the fact they like the people they work with."

Reick: "The only..."

Fine: "Other businesses are going to look for ways to save. This is one other option. And we have other Bills that are going to be coming up in these next couple days that are going to do other reforms to workers' comp insurance in order to save our businesses more money."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

- Reick: "The only instance I've ever seen of a not-for-profit grocery store that was... that existed were the old Soviet ... the ones that the Soviet Union and we know what those shelves looked like and what the quality of the merchandise was. You cannot make pro... you cannot run a business without expecting to make profit. Your idea of making this a not-for-profit inst... industry rep... is basically what the previous speaker over here said. When are we going to start talking about notfor-profit automobile companies, not-for-profit life and health companies? This is a slippery slope and you cannot compare Illinois's record with regard to paying out on workers' comp with Kentucky or other states which have significantly smaller economies, significantly smaller exposures to workers' comp industries and a significantly more advantageous structure of payment to people who are... who are injured. This is comparing apples to oranges and it is not going to work. And the State of Illinois and the people of the State of Illinois are going to get stuck with \$10 million in debt."
- Fine: "I'd have to say I do disagree with you because the business model is based on 20 ever... 27 other states that have found success in this type of model."
- Reick: "Would you be willing to show us the business model for the State of Illinois? I don't care about 27 other states; I care about what's going on here."
- Fine: "We're working on that and trying to mirror the Missouri model."
- Reick: "Then I would ask that you withdraw this Bill from consideration until we have that kind of projection because

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

we're voted... we're expected to vote here on... in con... in imperfect knowledge."

Fine: "We are not going to develop the business model. It is the board that is going to be appointed by the Governor that is going to develop this particular model. And what we would like to do is base it on the models that we have seen to be a success in these other states where they sell more than half of their workers' comp fund from this type of business."

Reick: "So, what you're saying is we have to see... we have to pass the Bill to see what's in it?"

Fine: "No, I'm not saying that. We can look and see what's in the other state, but I cannot tell this appointed board what to do. That is going to be up to them and they're going to be the ones who are more the experts."

Reick: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. This is a bad idea because what we're doing is we are taking... we are... we're putting a camel's nose under the tent flap here. What we're doing is we're taking the profit motive out of an insurance industry that has worked very well over the years which is not screwing or raping the people of businesses of the State of Illinois. All they're doing is paying out according to the... to the payment schedules that we here impose upon them. I think the better Bill is to change the way... change the level of coverage in workers' comp. Let's make this Bill... let's take this Bill off the floor until we know how we're going to be paid back, at the very least. This Bill is not the way to go to lower workers' compensation rates in Illinois. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ammons."

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

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ammons: "Thank you, Sir. Representative, I think I heard in debate just a few seconds ago that there are 27 other states..."

Fine: "That is correct."

Ammons: "...that have this kind of model. Can you... can you give me just a little bit of background on how it operates in a couple of those that you may be aware of?"

Fine: "So... so, where we see these programs taking place are in states like Kentucky, Missouri, California, Colorado, Iowa, Hawaii, Idaho, Kentucky, Louisiana, Minnesota, et cetera, et cetera. And what they have found is by setting up this independent company, who is not necessarily worried about making a profit but worried about giving proper insurance to the businesses that need it in the State of Illinois because, we have to remember, companies are mandated to buy workers' comp insurance in the State of Illinois. So, we don't provide them with something at a reasonable price. That's when we see the problems start taking place."

Ammons: "And so, is it your contention by establishing such a system in Illinois that you would... the board that's established to do this would, in essence, be able to provide lower cost workers' compensation insurance?"

Fine: "Absolutely. Because like I said, based on the changes that were made in 2011, our companies should be experiencing at least an 18 percent decrease in what they are paying out in workers' comp and they're not. And this is a way that we can ensure that they are seeing those savings."

Ammons: "So, why aren't they experiencing it... the 18 percent under the current system that they say is working well?"

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

- Fine: "That's a question you would have to ask the industry. But like I mentioned, when we were in committee, industry mentioned that they have made a profit."
- Ammons: "And so, my final question to this is, if this is... if this passes and this committee is set up, how is it formulated? Is it just something that we get to choose or who chooses who's going to run this... this nonprofit organization?"
- Fine: "Right. We... In the Bill it outlines how the board of directors would be appointed by the Governor and the CEO and how the actuaries would be hired and that's... that's listed in detail in the legislation. So, really what we're doing is we're starting this up and then the experts are taking it from there."
- Ammons: "Thank you so much. To the Bill. I think this is a great opportunity for us to not only set up a system that exists in half of the country, but also to provide the true savings that businesses claim that they really, really need in order to hire more employees. And so, to build in a nonprofit system that looks without regard to board members personal gain, in that insurance company we want a system that will allow them to experience the true savings that should be available in worker's compensation insurance. And so, I appreciate you, Representative, for bringing this as a great solution to what has started as reforms in 2011 around workers' compensation, but this gives us another step forward in bringing down the cost of workers' compensation insurance. And I urge an 'aye' vote."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Speaker Lang: "We have seven speakers remaining on this Bill. Mr. Phillips is recognized."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Phillips: "First of all, Representative, I'd like to start out by apologizing for what I'm thinking in my head. As an employer with skin in the game, with over 700 employees, I actually pay workers' compensation on a yearly basis. So, I was sitting here thinking about, you know, the businesses that I've created and the first thing that we've always done, as a previous speaker talked about, is what we call a pro forma. In that pro forma, we set out exactly how we're going to create the business, where the money's going to come from, and here's the most important part, where the reserves are going to come from. In other words, the first year, possibly the second year, most businesses will lose money. So, what is your reserve plan that you have created from this Missouri model that will pay the losses for the first year or two for the business to get going or some miraculously it's going to be profitable from day one?"

Fine: "This does not prevent the company, once it's out of state hands, from taking a private loan to pay for its expenses in order for it to be forward. You're right. There are businesses that struggle in the beginning to get off their feet and get moving, but like I said, 27 other states have done this successfully and I think Illinois can jump on that bandwagon, make it 28 states. And really, the… a piece of legislation

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

and an option that's pro-business because it would give businesses another option."

Phillips: "Well, let me ask you another question. I have secretaries and construction workers. What are your new rates that you've established for this model? 'Cause then I can actually go back and compare with the rates I'm paying, and I can have them here in a few minutes, and see if you're going to save money. 'Cause in year 2011, when you created that new Bill for reducing compensation in Illinois, do you know how much I saved? Zero. It went up 15 percent from year 2011 grand bargain change. So, I'm a little nervous if your... if you can't save money on the 2011 one that you brought out, this new model that you're creating I'm wondering how much more it's going to cost state businesses. So, I would really appreciate it ... I like the idea of working on workers' compensation. I would love to see a reduced workers' comp. I think it would go a long way in saving jobs, saving businesses and even, maybe, bringing a few businesses to Illinois because, see, I border Indiana on my district. And you know the number one problem I have... A friend of mine took his entire company across the border to Vincennes, Indiana, all because he could save over a million dollars a year in his workers' compensation premiums. So, I'm for working on reducing workers' compensation and I would love to see how this model actually is going to, through a pro forma, reduce costs for me and my fellow businesses. But just throwing this out there, throwing \$10 million at it and actually thinking that it's going to be profitable and actually redu ... even if it's not profitable, if it reduces workers' compensation without some

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

sort of a plan, I don't see how it's going to work, Representative. So, again, as the other, Representative, is there any way we can pull it. We can then work... I would love to work with you on the model and see if we can't... and I'll put every effort I got into it to try to help you make it work."

Fine: "That would be great. You could do it with the board when they are nominated by the Governor and then confirmed by the Senate. You could have your input on the board. As a business owner, I think what should irk you the most is insurers have grown in profit since 2011 by 15 percent and the amount the premiums they pay on claims is 50 percent. And so, as a business owner, I think you should talk to whoever's providing you with your workers' comp insurance to find out where are your savings."

Phillips: "Well, okay. Thank you very much, Representative."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Demmer."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Demmer: "Representative, I... your contention with this piece of legislation is that this not-for-profit board... this state created entity... could lower rates. Is that correct?"

Fine: "Yes."

Demmer: "Do you have any... There's not a guarantee of that though, right? We... this is a contention. You believe they could lower rates. Do you have any trigger or any provision in this Bill that addresses what happens if those rates are not lowered?"

Fine: "That's something that the board would have to discuss. But let me point out to you, as well, as I had mentioned the

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

insurance companies have made quite a bit of a profit since the 2011 legislation has been put in. Because this is a not-for-profit, the actuarial rates would be similar in our company versus every other company. But because this company would not have to be concerned about making a profit that money would be saved by the businesses who are the consumers."

Demmer: "But there's really nothing in this Bill that... that guarantees that rates go down? There's nothing that requires that rates go down? There's nothing that if rates don't go down or if they don't go down enough nothing else kicks in? There's no other provisions there? In fact, rates could go up under this... under this Act today. Isn't that right? Rates cou..."

Fine: "I can't tell you what rates are going to do in the future."

Demmer: "Rates could go up."

Fine: "Well, cost of living adjustments, rates go up on everything every year. But does that mean, even if the rates go up, they're not going to be less than what the other insurance companies are providing? That is the goal of this legislation."

Demmer: "Well, it's a goal, but there's nothing in this legislation that actually gets us towards that. So, I guess one of my questions would be, if... if the rates don't drop appropriately, if the rates don't drop by as much as you project they will, if the rates don't come down to what NCCI recommended rates are that everybody talks about, if the state's not able to deliver this service at NCCI rates, would you be willing to put a trigger into this Bill that says that we could institute, if the rates don't go down that much,

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

that we could institute a primary cause standard or one of the other things that we know will actually reduce rates?"

Fine: "Something I know that would actually reduce rates would be rate review so that our insurance companies have to abide by the rates that are considered a good adjustment."

Demmer: "But you're saying that even under your own Bill you don't know what's going to happen to the rates. You think they might go down, but they might not go down. I'm asking let's put some teeth into it. Let's say if rates don't go down by as much as... if rates don't go down to what NCCI recommended rates are, let's have something that kicks in and actually reduces rates like a primary cause standard or like there was... the suggestion that come from the people who actually pay these rates. They know what makes the rates go down. Yet, we're ignoring those recommendations. We're coming with a Bill that you admit you don't know whether it's going to reduce rates by any and all. They could go up; they could go down by 1 percent. They might not reach those... the same benchmark you're looking for. Why not include a provision that says if we can't deliver what you're saying we're going to deliver today, we have provisions kick in to actually retain workers' compensation."

Fine: "So, I think one of the benefits of this company is because of the fact that we're going to repay that loan within five years. It's no longer then the responsibility of the state. And then it would be in the marketplace for competition with the other companies. Like I said, we have seen success in 27 other states able to provide workers' comp insurance at lower

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

rates because they're not-for-profit. And that's our goal to help our companies in the State of Illinois."

Demmer: "Oh, thank you, Representative. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. I think what we have learned here is that we have ... we are really have no control over what's happening to rates. This Bill proposes that rates will go down, but we have no idea whether rates will go up, whether rates will stay the same. There's no provision, nothing... no accountability on this as they... if rates don't go down, we can do all these other things. Many other states may have a program like this, but Representative, many other states have a primary cause standard as well. This is not the only thing that makes Illinois's work comp different. This is not the only thing that contributes to us having some of the highest rates in the country. Let's listen to people who actually pay these premiums on a day-to-day basis to cover their employees. Let's listen to them and listen to people who operate in more than one state, see what's different here. See where we can actually make some meaningful reform that will reduce rates and make Illinois a better place to grow businesses. Thank vou."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Batinick."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Batinick: "A couple... a couple quick places I want to go. I want to talk about where you're getting the funds, Representative.

Going to have to have a little quiet in the chamber, please?"

Fine: "Right. Again, the \$10 million would come from the Illinois Workers' Compensation Commission Operations Fund."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

- Batinick: "And you said, and how much is in there now in that fund?"
- Fine: "There's about \$28 million in the fund right now."
- Batinick: "And I believe you said there's another 28 million coming into the fund."
- Fine: "Right, in about four months we'll have another 28 million coming in."
- Batinick: "So, I don't think the State of Illinois has a great track record of running things efficiently. I'm just thinking that maybe that \$10 million would be better spent, I don't know, maybe funding Eastern Illinois or Western Illinois University, just throwing it out there?"
- Fine: "You would have to sweep that fund that goes toward workers' comp insurance in order to use that money for the universities."
- Batinick: "Well, you're sweeping it to start a business. So, I would say that I would prefer to sweep that for... for something that has a little bit more of an imminent danger coming. Well, let me... let me take another angle with you. Who's going to... who might be a perspective client of this new state workers' compensation program?"
- Fine: "Any company in the State of Illinois that's mandated to purchase workers' comp insurance."
- Batinick: "Okay. Well, here's what's odd to me. I'm looking at the proponents and opponents. Your potential clients are all opponents to the Bill."
- Fine: "Well, I think once they see it up and working and they see how it's going to save their businesses money, it's going to change their mind."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Batinick: "Okay. To the Bill. So, at a time when we're not running things very well, we're going to start an insurance company with money that could be used for social services, for higher education or mandatory categoricals because we, the well-run State of Illinois, know how to start an insurance company. This is an absurd idea. We have no track record of running things efficiently let alone a business in a competitive marketplace. I strongly urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Guzzardi."

Guzzardi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Just to respond to a couple of comments from the other side. The Gentleman from Dixon talked about if we open this company might prices go up. It seems to me sort of antithetical to some core principles that the other side expounds quite frequently which is a competition in the open marketplace drives costs down. So, it's hard for me to see why you all would be opposed to adding an additional competitor to the open marketplace. It seems like based on free market principles that ought to drive costs down. So, it's hard for me to follow the line of argument that's suggested this might somehow make workers' compensation more expensive. And to my colleague from the 63rd District who suggested that the only not-for-profit grocery stores he ever heard of are in the Soviet Union, well, I invite you to come visit me in the people's republic of Logan Square where we have a cooperatively owned grocery store, the Dill Pickle Co-op. It's a nonprofit grocery store and the shelves are stocked just fine, I assure you. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hoffman."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would just like to ... if I could, I would just like to go through where we've been on this issue and where we're trying to go. Number 1) we had a Committee of the Whole hearing on the issue of workers' compensation. Number 2) we had subject matter hearings in front of the Labor Committee. Number 3) we passed a substantial Bill that would... would go a long way to reduce costs to employers last year that was a cumulative effort of everyone on this side of the aisle. In all of those efforts, while the people on the other side of the aisle continue to say they want to reduce the rates that employers pay and the premiums that employers pay, they've done nothing or put nothing forward that'll actually do that. You could talk all you want about primary cause standards or reducing the reimbursements to providers like hospitals and doctors or reducing the benefits of injured workers. All of that has been done or looked at in 2011. The testimony is clear. There should have been a 30 percent reduction in premiums as a result of cost reductions in our 2011 reforms. Why isn't there? Why isn't there? It's simple. It's simple, but you guys don't want to face it. You don't want to face the fact that insurance companies are taking these reduced costs and padding their pockets. Now, if that's not the case ... if that is not the case... if that's not the case and it's truly a competitive market, why... what do you fear of House Bill 2622? Let them go into the market. Let's make sure there is a competitive market. Now, there's 27 other states that do this, 27 other states. They're liberal bastions such as Idaho; that's a liberal bastion. Kentucky, Louisiana, New Mexico,

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Texas, Utah, Oklahoma, South Carolina, all Republican-led states, every single one of them. Yet, they decided that they were going to make sure that the insurance market was competitive by having a state-run system that's going to compete in the marketplace. It's that simple. There is relatively no risk. There's certainly no risk to our General Fund and \$10 million is coming out of a special fund that we've swept in the past. It's sitting there ready to do something good for employers in Illinois. We should have one goal and one goal only, that's reducing the cost of premiums that employers pay. That should be our goal. So, that we can make them competitive vis-à-vis Missouri, Iowa, Kentucky, Wisconsin, Indiana and other states. Those states have either prior approval of insurance rates or they have a state-run system that competes in the marketplace. Why can't you just say and be honest about it. You want to defend an insurance industry that has enhanced their profits as a result of cost reductions and benefit reductions that we passed in 2011. Serious, at least if you were honest about it we could... we could at least say, well, if you want to... if you want to... if you want to defend an insurance industry here in the State of Illinois that's raping the employers and not giving them competitive rates in Illinois and not passing on the cost savings that we should be passing on to consumers, that'd be one thing, but to hide behind... to hide behind the argument that this isn't going to work, when it's worked in 27 other states, that it's worked in Republican and Democratic states. The Representative has followed that model. She's put it up for a vote. And this Bill would do nothing more... nothing more

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

than allow further competition in the marketplace and help reduce the cost to employers throughout Illinois. That's why you should be voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Conroy."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Conroy: "Representative, since 2011 we know that certain things have drastically changed in terms... in terms of workmen's compensation. One, we know that the awards have been drastically lowered, correct?"

Fine: "That's correct."

Conroy: "We also know that the attorneys' fees have been capped at 20 percent, correct?"

Fine: "That's correct."

Conroy: "So, this has been interesting for my family because my family has a personal experience with workmen's comp. And it was after the law was changed. In our situation, I had an experience where we spent a lot of time working with the workmen's comp attorney for an injury. We were explained... it was explained to us that the attorneys' fees had been capped at 20 percent and that the awards had been drastically lowered because so many had been taking advantage of the system. So, fast-forward another year and I find myself in office as a State Representative with a district that has a very large industrial area. So, I begin touring my district and all of the industrial companies that are there. And when I do, I find myself asking them about their workmen's compensation. I ask them about the changes to the law and if they have helped them at all. And what they've told me is that, yes,

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

while the premium... what they are paying out has gone down. What the attorneys are receiving has gone down. Their premiums have not gone down. I continue to do so and as I continue to tour these businesses, now they are not only telling me they have not only not gone down, but many of them have gone up. I believe this Bill will create a savings for these businesses and we have done everything else we can possibly do. I believe the issue is that insurance companies are making way too much money and that is why we have so many in the business. I believe these other 27 states have shown that half of their companies have gone to the state... the state plan because they are seeing a savings. Thank you, Representative, for this. And would certainly encourage a 'yes' vote."

Fine: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davidsmeyer."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Davidsmeyer: "I'm not sure she'll be able to hear me 'cause it's been incredibly loud this morning. I couldn't hear the majority of the debate. But I'm going to ask some questions and I hope I'm not reasking because I didn't hear any of the answers. First off, I believe earlier you said how many companies were licensed in the State of Illinois. Can you restate that?"

Fine: "Yes. We have about 330 companies that are licensed to sell workers' comp insurance in Illinois, but most of them do not."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. Most of them do not. Do you know how many actually do write workers' comp insurance out of that 300 and some?"

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Fine: "I don't have the exact number in front of me, but I do know that the top 25 workers' comp providers in Illinois have about 40 percent of the market."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. Well, one of the previous speakers kept going on and on about the profits that insurance companies are making and I don't understand, if insurance companies are padding their pockets and making money hand over fist, why wouldn't more of these companies that are licensed to be in this write workers' comp insurance? I mean, it would seem like that would be an easy way to get in and a lot of times new companies hop in more easily because they have lower costs. So, I don't buy it. Do you have any idea what types of companies the State of Illinois is going to get in their workers' comp system?"

Fine: "Well, every company in the State of Illinois is mandated to have workers' comp insurance."

Davidsmeyer: "Correct."

Fine: "So, any company of any size could purchase from this workers' comp not-for-profit."

Davidsmeyer: "Yeah. So, my guess is most people that are happy with their workers' comp insurance will stay there and the reason they're happy is because they haven't had any accidents. The people that you're going to get into these state or the government workers' comp insurance are going to be the people with the high experience mods, which means they have a high amount of claims which means people get hurt often which means there's more payouts. So, as one of the earlier speakers said, especially in your first few years of business, you tend to lose a little bit of money. So, is \$10 million

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

going to cover the \$30 million that you think we're going to get into the system?"

Fine: "That \$10 million would cover the first \$21 million in premium."

Davidsmeyer: "Yeah. I would think that with the experienced mods that you're going to get, you're going to have much greater payouts especially in your first years. I... I don't know if also... I don't know if anybody has talked about this, but where does this magic \$10 million come from? Where you going to cut this \$10 million from to loan it to this new company that we're going to create in the State of Illinois, a government-run company?"

Fine: "As we have said earlier, the Illinois Workers' Compensation Commission Operations Fund. It currently has \$28 million in it and in four months, it will have an additional \$28 million. And that's where the start-up money will be coming from."

Davidsmeyer: "If... if there are... if there's too much money in that fund, we should probably look at opportunities to use it to lower costs for workers' comp. What is that money supposed to be used for and why is it not being used for that right now? I mean, we've got basically \$14 billion in unpaid bills. The only budgets you've tried to pass are 6 and 8 million dollars out of whack. So, why aren't we using that for something like that?"

Fine: "Well, the money is put there for the operation of the commission."

Davidsmeyer: "Where's it..."

Fine: "And it... it comes from..."

Davidsmeyer: "...where'd it come from?"

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Fine: "...it comes from companies that sell workers' comp insurance.

I believe it's .01 per... it's... the fund is supported by a surcharge of 1.01 percent on all workers' comp insurance and premium sold in the year prior."

Davidsmeyer: "So... so, will this new company that you're going to create pay into that fund?"

Fine: "Yes."

Davidsmeyer: "They will?"

Fine: "Mmm mmm."

Davidsmeyer: "Will they pay taxes?"

Fine: "It's a company."

Davidsmeyer: "It's a company. So, you told me you're starting a not-for-profit company..."

Fine: "But their... their employees..."

Davidsmeyer: "...that's going to pay taxes."

Fine: "...their employees will pay taxes, but the company itself is not-for-profit."

Davidsmeyer: "So, you're going to take business away from companies who are currently paying... paying taxes, who are apparently making money hand over fist so they should be paying a lot of taxes, right? So, then you're going to decrease the amount of taxes that are coming into the State of Illinois?"

Fine: "You know, what I don't understand with these arguments is the basis of this workers' comp insurance company is to save our businesses money. If our businesses save money on this workers' comp insurance, they could spend that money elsewhere. It could be an employee pay. It could be in

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

something else. And this is how we're going to get more money into our economy and more money going towards taxes."

Davidsmeyer: "So, are you trying to help companies by having the government openly compete with companies?"

Fine: "This is on..."

Davidsmeyer: "Is that what you're trying to do?"

Fine: "...this is only starting out with a \$10 million loan from the state. Then what happens is the board is nominated by the Governor and confirmed by the Senate and then the state steps out. And then it's a not-for-profit company and the State of Illinois is not running the business."

Davidsmeyer: "So... so, these politically appointed people will run this in perpetuity until they die or what? Who runs it after... after they die or..."

Fine: "It's very explicit..."

Davidsmeyer: "...or do they have a term?"

Fine: "...in the terms and it's highlighted in the Bill. And I believe the term is four years."

Davidsmeyer: "So, the term is four years. So, every four years you're going to have a political appointee or a bunch of political appointees come in and run this insurance companies... company, right?"

Fine: "Right. We're going to get experienced people who know what they're doing on workers' comp to be appointed by the Governor, confirmed by the Senate, so we can see success in this company. There's nothing wrong with seeing a successful business thrive in the State of Illinois. And I think by having this in place it's going to help the other employers in our state."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Davidsmeyer: "You're... you're right. We should be doing things to help successful businesses thrive by not directly competing with those businesses using their tax dollars to compete with them."

Fine: "The tax doll... these... these are not tax dollars. This comes from the Workers' Compensation Commission Operations Fund that are paid for by the insurance company based on 1.01 percent of their premium."

Davidsmeyer: "Do you know... do you know who that comes from?"

Fine: "That fund will be paid back within five years."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. It's not a tax. It is a fee on businesses."

Fine: "But that will be repaid..."

Davidsmeyer: "So, you're going to use a fee on businesses to compete with other businesses."

Fine: "It will be paid back with interest within five years."

Davidsmeyer: "All right. This... this is... it's actually insane that we are going to create... use the government to create a business to compete against other businesses. It..."

Fine: "I don't think it's insane."

Davidsmeyer: "...funded... funded by the very businesses that you're competing against."

Fine: "We've seen it be successful elsewhere. If it's been so successful in 27 other states where they're selling more than half of their workers' comp premium and their businesses are happy with these companies, what is insane?"

Davidsmeyer: "Have you ever ran a business? Have you ever dealt with a workers' comp claim?"

Fine: "No, I have not, but I've learned quite about it these last three years while I've been researching this legislation."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Davidsmeyer: "I'm sure you've talked to a lot of people about it and I'm not sure that you've gotten the whole story. But it's... it's very interesting and I guarantee that the state's going to get the people with the most injured people, we're going to lose money on this and in two years we're going to be going... they're going to be coming back to the... to the well asking for another \$10 million. Just to... to kind of wind down, can you name one thing that the government... that Illinois government is currently doing well?"

Fine: "We passed some good legislation this year; however..."

Davidsmeyer: "What are we currently doing well? I'm not talking about new legislation. What are we currently doing well in this state? I'm looking for a bright spot. Something that says that we can run an insurance company..."

Fine: "The state..."

Davidsmeyer: "...as well as we run the State of Illinois."

Fine: "...the state is not running this insurance company."

Davidsmeyer: "Yes, they are. They're directly appointing people..."

Fine: "We are appointing experts to run these companies."

Davidsmeyer: "...they are directly appointing people to this thing.

It's every four years the Governor, a political person, a

purely political person is going to make these appointments."

Fine: "But then the people on the board are going to be hiring employees and the employees are not going to be political appointees. They're..."

Davidsmeyer: "They're going to be hiring their political appointees..."

Fine: "...they're going to be actuaries."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Davidsmeyer: "...because we're going to have no oversight. There's going to be..."

Fine: "We are giving the opportunities for outside insurance agents to sell this policy to their customers as well. So, this is giving our independent insurance agents another opportunity of a product."

Davidsmeyer: "To... to the Bill. We are going to be openly competing with companies who currently pay taxes to the State of Illinois based on their profit. If their profits are so great, we are going to be taking a decent amount of money out of the system as this not-for-profit company continues to grow. And I will continue to tell you that the people that are going to come to the government for insurance are going to be the people that can't find it out on the open market. They're going to be the people that have such high experience mods that they're not going to be able to get their own insurance. If... if there is so much profit in this, 300 licensed insurance companies would be going after this business because there would be enough room to take a little bit of a cut in your profit to make a great profit. So, I would urge a 'no' vote. This is just another way for Illinois to become a bad business state."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Fine to close."

Fine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This piece of legislation is a pro-business, pro-consumer piece of legislation. It is going to provide another opportunity for our companies to save money when it comes to purchasing workers' comp insurance. The reason state workers' comp companies are successful, the ones that we've seen in 27 other states, are because they focused

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

heavily on safety, and they avoid accidents. They only carry one line of insurance which is workers' comp. And the company does not have a profit motive. So, in this one piece of legislation, not only are we going to resolve many of the issues when it comes to workers' comp insurance, but it's going to be business-friendly and worker-friendly at the same time. And I encourage your '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? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 67 voting 'yes', 51 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Turner in the Chair."

Speaker Turner: "House Bill 2461, Representative McAsey. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2461, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative McAsey."

McAsey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 2461 requires that information that is currently collected and maintained by the State Board of Education regarding gifted education and instruction including programs and number of certified teachers be displayed on school report cards. We know that there's been a sharp decrease in the offering of the gifted programs. Over the last... from 20... 2003, 85 percent of schools had them; 2016 only 27 percent. And we know that minority and low-income students have been really disproportionately impacted by this. So, we're hoping to shed

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

some light on this and make these gifted and academically advanced students more visible, ensure that our bright students don't fall through the cracks and have more information to allow policymakers to better do their jobs. I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Andersson is recognized."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Andersson: "So, Representative, my main concern here is the data that we're requiring to be included. Is this data readily available or are we creating a mandate, if you will, on the schools to collect and create more... more data that will result in expenses to the schools?"

McAsey: "Thank you so much for that question. This is data that is already collected and maintained by the Illinois State Board of Education. So, the schools are already transmitting this to ISBE. All that we are saying is, hey, ISBE you've got it. Please put it in an area where it's visible to the public and to educators by including it on school report cards. There's no additional mandate. And ISBE, the agency, is neutral on the Bill. They did suggest a technical Amendment with regard to some definitions, which was put on this legislation."

Andersson: "So, it sounds like there really is no additional cost to this."

McAsey: "I do not believe so."

Andersson: "Thank you very much. I appreciate it."

McAsey: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative McAsey to close."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

McAsey: "I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2461 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', 1 voting 'no', 0 voting
'present', House Bill 2461, having received the
Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House
Bill 3150... 57, Representative Harper. Mr. Clerk, please read
the Bill. Mr. Clerk, please move this Bill back to the Order
of Second Reading and 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. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Harper, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Harper."

Harper: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members. The... the Amendment changes and makes the Department of Public Health the primary agency on the Bill to track the food desert. It also removes opposition from the Department of Agriculture."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Harper moves that the House adopt Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 3157. 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. Representative DeLuca, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

DeLuca: "Thank you, Speaker. I'll be brief. A point of personal privilege."

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Sir."

DeLuca: "Ladies and Gentlemen, I'd like to recognize a constituent who's here with us today. Please stand, Lisa. This is one of the finest people you'll ever meet. You may remember her from the Comcast Newsmakers. This is my good friend Lisa Aprati from the City of Chicago Heights. Good to see you, Lisa. Give her a warm welcome."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you. And welcome to your Capitol. Leader Bellock, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. And I have with me today as a Page, Emily Tomkinson and she's a senior at Hinsdale Central High School. And she's part of their AP... their advanced placement government class. And so, she's using her volunteer hours to come down here today to see what Illinois government is really like. And her mom and dad are with her today. So, I'd ask everybody to give her a warm welcome from the General Assembly. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you. And welcome to your Capitol.

Representative McAuliffe, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

McAuliffe: "An announcement."

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Sir."

McAuliffe: "Lunch is being served on behalf of Mayor Brad Stephens, Village of Rosemont. It's ready in the back. We have containers. So, please, everybody enjoy and Mayor Stephens is walking around here somewhere, so feel free to thank him. Thank you."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

- Speaker Turner: "Thank you. House Bill 3817, Representative... Out of the record. House Bill 2732, Representative Beiser. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2732, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Beiser."
- Beiser: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a clean-up Bill at the request of the Illinois Emergency... or the Environmental Protection Agency. In 19... or in the 99th General Assembly, there was a Bill passed that tau... took away their ability to regulate biosolids. Biosolids can contain some sort of waste that they need to be able to regulate going forward. So, this is simply cleaning up a Bill from last year."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2732 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 114 voting 'yes', 4 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 2732, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3036, Representative Walsh. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3036, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Walsh."
- Walsh: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

  House Bill 3036 amends the Counties Codes. It provides that
  by January 1, 2019, each county shall adopt and implement a
  predictable fee schedule that eliminates surcharges and other

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

additional fees to record... to record standard documents with the county recorder. This is an initiative of the Illinois Land and Title Association and the Illinois Association of County Clerks and Recorders. And basically, it's making recording fees more predictable and uniform across the state to avoid consumer confusion and streamline the recording process for companies involved in the transaction and county officials recording the documents. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3036 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 81 voting 'yes', 32 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 3036, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Committee Reports."
- Clerk Hollman: "The following committees are meeting at 12 noon.

  Meeting at 12 noon is Agriculture & Conservation in Room 122;

  Environment in Room 114; Business Incentives for Local

  Communities in C-1; Construction Industry & Code Enforcement

  in D-1; Judiciary-Criminal in Room 118; Transportation:

  Vehicles & Safety in Room 413."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Gordon-Booth, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Gordon-Booth: "Thank you so much, Mr. Speaker, for your indulgence. Gentlemen, if you could please rise so that all the Ladies and women of the House of Representatives can see you. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is the 5A State Championship

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

High School Football Team from Peoria, Illinois, Peoria High School, the pride of the city. Please give them a resounding round of applause. These ... these are some resilient, phenomenal young men that are truly the pride and joy of our city. They are resilient because they fought any number of obstacles. There was a young man from Peoria unfortunately, lost his life far too early, named Tommie Forest. And he was a Peoria High School football player who was simply playing video games with high school... with other high school football players before a football game and unfortunately, lost his life due to gun violence. And these young men played in his honor this year. And they were able to go all the way to the University of Illinois and play on that field and beat Vernon Hills High School in the 5A State Championship game. And we all know that you don't get resilient young men without phenomenal men and women in their life leading them. And so, I would like to give an extra special thanks to head coach Tim Thornton for always putting his all into these young men, not just during the football season, but during the off season, making sure that they're doing well and getting good grades and being phenomenal ambassadors of good will throughout the community. I also want to thank Coach Adam O'Neill, Jeff Roper, Coach Max, Coach Shaun McGinnes, Coach Mike Deg, Coach Jeff Bloom, Coach Montgomery, Coach Sean and Coach Montell Burton. This is clearly an ongoing effort for any of the city of us that have ever been involved with high school sports. I happen to be married to a high school coach, so I know the... the work that goes into this and it does not go unnoticed. And I just want

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

you all to know that this team was led by two phenomenal young men by the name of Coran Taylor and Kendrick Green. And we want you to know that we believe in you. We want to continue to encourage you to aspire for bigger and greater heights and we love what you're doing. This is not the end; it's just the beginning. Congratulations and thank you for all that you do."

- Speaker Turner: "Congratulations and welcome. Representative Williams, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Williams: "Well, 1987 was a good year. I don't know what you guys were doing in 1987, but it's the year that Will Guzzardi was born, to this day, 30 years ago. Happy 30th birthday, Will."
- Speaker Turner: "Happy birthday, Representative. Representative Bryant, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Bryant: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege."

  Speaker Turner: "Please proceed."
- Bryant: "I would like to introduce to the Body my Page for today, Angelina Bruggen. Her mom, Autumn is up in the gallery. And Angelina is a seventh grader from Woodlawn Middle School where she is a cheerleader and a beautiful young lady. And I'm very happy to have her here today. Would you all give her a very warm welcome?"
- Speaker Turner: "Congratulations and welcome to your Capitol.

  Representative Ammons, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Ammons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is my greatest privilege... I'm smiling way too much... to introduce to this great Body my granddaughter Ashura and my daughters Tatiana and Andrea who

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

came over to visit me this afternoon. Please welcome them to the great City of Springfield."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you and welcome to your Capitol.

Representative D'Amico, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

D'Amico: "For an announcement."

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed."

D'Amico: "I want to let everyone know that the softball game will be coming up, May 17... So, you can call your Bill... May 17. So, when we come back from break, bring your stuff. We're going to start having practice. We want to make sure we keep the trophy here in the House, all right. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative. Members, the House will recess until 12:45. Mr. Clerk, Committee Reports."

Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Costello, Chairperson from the Committee on Agriculture & Conservation reports the following committee action taken on April 27, 2017: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 2028. Representative Beiser, Chairperson from the Committee on Environment reports the following committee action taken on April 27, 2017: recommends be adopted is House Resolution 268; recommends be adopted as amended is House Resolution 234. Representative Scherer, Chairperson from the Committee on Business Incentives for Local Communities reports the following committee action taken on April 27, 2017: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 3418. Representative Moylan, Chairperson from the Committee on Construction Industry & Code Enforcement reports the following committee action taken on April 27, 2017:

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 3751."

Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, Adjournment Resolution."

Clerk Hollman: "Adjournment Resolution. House Joint Resolution #55, offered by Representative Currie.

RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ONE HUNDREDTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE SENATE CONCURRING HEREIN, that when the House of Representatives adjourns on Friday, April 28, 2017, it stands adjourned until Tuesday, May 09, 2017 at 12:00 o'clock noon, or until the call of the Speaker; and when the Senate adjourns on Thursday, April 27, 2017, it stands adjourned until Tuesday, May 02, 2017, and when it adjourns on that day, it stands adjourned until Wednesday, May 03, 2017, and when it adjourns on that day, it stands adjourned until Friday, May 05, 2017, and when it adjourns on that day, it stands adjourned until Friday, May 05, 2017, and when it adjourns on that day, it stands adjourned until Tuesday, May 09, 2017, or until the call of the President."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Currie moves for the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. The Chair recognizes Representative Andersson. For what reason do you seek recognition?"

Andersson: "Thank you. Would you please let the record reflect that Ba... Representative Barbara Wheeler is excused for the remainder of the day."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

- Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative. Representative Reick, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Reick: "Point of personal privilege, Sir."
- Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Sir."
- Reick: "In my previous comments on the floor, I used a term that are low by even my low standards of decorum and I wish to stand here and apologize to anyone... Well, no, I just wish to apologize. If you were offended or not, I apologize for my comments and hope to think that they will never happen again. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative. Members, on Second Reading we have House Bill 2764, Representative Moylan. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2764, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. This Bill was read a second time a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Moylan, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Moylan."
- Moylan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I'd like to adopt... adopt Amendment #2."
- Speaker Turner: "A sentence about the Amendment?"
- Moylan: "Yes. Right here. It amends House Bill 2764 by replacing everything after the enacting clause with the following. The Department of Natural Resources is amended by adding Section 21 as follows. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 2764. 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."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

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

Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, House Bill 2764."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2764, a Bill for an Act concerning

State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Moylan."

Moylan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today I'm presenting House Bill 2764. This legislation would direct the Department of Natural Resources and the Historic Preservation Agency to only sell products that are made right here in America and Illinois. This measure's a way to help highlight some of the businesses that manufacture goods throughout our wonderful state."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Andersson."

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

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

Andersson: "So, we had a couple of these Bills the other day.

Those Bills had certain exceptions where something couldn't
be built or found there would be an exemption. Do you have
that sort of thing built-in here?"

Moylan: "I have an exception for one facility."

Andersson: "What's that?"

Moylan: "I have an exception for one facility."

Andersson: "What's that?"

Moylan: "Said that at this facility it would be okay to have other items brought in from around the world because it is a world-class facility."

Andersson: "What facility is that, Sir?"

Moylan: "Yes. I will get that in a second. Where's he at? World Shooting and World Complex."

Andersson: "And why did you exempt them?"

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

- Moylan: "There were certain items that were coming from worldwide that were not being able to be made in America. And we felt that this Bill would be... at that facility would actually hurt that facility."
- Andersson: "So, again, back to my main question. The Bills we discussed yesterday and the day before, I've honestly lost track, if there was... if there was a dramatic price increase between the goods sold in Illinois versus the goods that could be purchased elsewhere, the Representative in those Bills said that there was an exemption. Do you have such an exemption?"
- Moylan: "No. And I... 'cause I believe that we can build Americanmade products with, you know, competition and good pricing right here in America and Illinois."
- Andersson: "Yeah. But this is Illinois products, right, not just America?"
- Moylan: "Yes. Yes. And let me just give you a couple examples."
  Andersson: "Sure."
- Moylan: "So, we could build... make... we make fudge which we could sell. We make Beer Nuts. And right here, Representative Wheeler's area, we make those great candy, that's right there, Skittles. So, I believe that our machines should have all great Illinois and American-made products so we can foster jobs right here and across the country. There's this great, well... great wave of nationalism to sell American-made products and put American people back to work. That's why I'm proposing this Bill. And I ask for an 'aye' vote. And I'm sure glad that I'll have all of your support."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Andersson: "Well, I'm not so sure you have that, Sir. But my concern is that, once again, we are legislating something that really is a management issue for our museums, for our historic sites. We have... we have people who work there who are professionals who can determine what can and can't be sold, what should and shouldn't be sold. I bet you they look for Illinois products. But I think mandating this is not the right way."

Moylan: "Okay."

Andersson: "Thank you, Sir. Thank you."

Moylan: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Long."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Long: "My question to you is have you ever heard of Starved Rock State Park?"

Moylan: "Yes, I did."

Long: "Okay. All right. Do you know what Starved Rock Park is?"

Moylan: "I'm familiar with it. I've been there numerous times, previously, not lately."

Long: "It has a lot to do with Indians and... and how the process...

Go ahead. You were going to say. Go ahead."

Moylan: "No, I'm listening."

Long: "Okay. Well, I'll tell you, Starved Rock National... or State Park contacted me and they are strongly opposed to this Bill because they can't buy their Indian products in the State of Illinois. They have to get a lot of their Indian artifacts and products from outside the State of Illinois. This would

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

put a really big damper on Starved Rock State Park. And that's
a big industry in my district."

Moylan: "Well, I think we should do everything we can to help Native Americans. And this Bill will help by promoting people to work and more Native Americans."

Long: "Well, I understand that, but in the meantime, you pass this and we... we're struggling to get places to produce the Indian artifacts or the Indian products for Starved Rock, they suffer. That's... that's making Starved Rock suffer in my district."

Moylan: "Right. That's why we got DCEO and they are surely going to help."

Long: "Well, thank you. All right. I will tell you... To the Bill. I'm opposed to this because by doing something like this what you're doing is you're tying the State Park's hands by buying products that they desperately need to encourage, all right, tourism to this State Park. And I oppose this Bill. Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Butler."

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

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

Butler: "Representative, have... have you spoken with anyone at the Illinois State Museum in management there or any of these other organizations about the impact of this legislation?"

Moylan: "I've spoken to numerous people."

Butler: "Like ... could you give me some examples of who ..."

Moylan: "I... I'm very interested in putting American people back to work and making American... productive and making our factories build American-made products right here."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Butler: "So, we have... we have several facilities in the state that are world-renowned not the least of which is the Abraham Lincoln Presidential Museum. Is that... is that included in this Bill?"

Moylan: "Yes, Sir."

Butler: "So, Abraham Lincoln is the second most written about person in the history of the world after Jesus Christ."

Moylan: "That's actually exempt and I believe that Abraham Lincoln was born in Illinois and would be proud to know that Marty Moylan was born in America."

Butler: "Well, technically, Abraham Lincoln was born in Kentucky, raised in Indiana and even though we're the Land of... we're the Land of Lincoln."

Moylan: "Right. Thank you. But I believe he raised his family here in Illinois."

Butler: "What's that?"

Moylan: "I believe he raised his family here and went on to become the President of the States... State of Illinois."

Butler: "So, another... another facility just right next door here is the Illinois State Museum. And in the Museum's committee yesterday, we had a wonderful hearing about the arts and cultural enhancements and museums in the State of Illinois. One of the organizations that testified yesterday is the National Museum of Mexican Art in Chicago. So, if the National Museum of Mexican Art would like to come and display at the Illinois State Museum and maybe have some of the artists sell their wares, will they be able to do that at the Illinois State Museum?"

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Moylan: "I think that we should do everything we can... everything we can to promote Illinois and American-made products."

Butler: "So... Is that a yes or a no?"

Moylan: "I think that we should do everything we can. There is a great groundswell of support. There's been Executive Orders signed that we got to promote American-made, Illinois-made products and let's put our country... let's put our state back to work."

Butler: "I agree with selling Illinois products because very good Illinois products programs throughout the State of Illinois, through state agencies including the Department of Natural Resources, including the Department of Agriculture. So, back to my point about... So, if we have someone who wants to sell their book about Abraham Lincoln because they think he's such a great man and they happen to be from another country and they've written that book, will they be able to sell it in the Illinois State Museum or any Illinois facilities under this Bill?"

Moylan: "Well, we have great publishers right here in the country, right in the United States of America."

Butler: "Yes, we do."

Moylan: "They should be able to talk to one of our publishers."

Butler: "And we have... we have plenty of good books..."

Moylan: "Right."

Butler: "...about Abraham Lincoln..."

Moylan: "Right."

Butler: "...that are written internationally."

Moylan: "Right. And they sold."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Butler: "So... so, Representative, again, tell me... tell me what facility is exempted under this legislation?"

Moylan: "That's the facility that's in the southern part of the state."

Butler: "And... and can you be more specific in that because we have a lot of facilities in southern..."

Moylan: "Yeah. I will..."

Butler: "...part of the state?"

Moylan: "I will get you, after this discussion is over ... "

Butler: "No. I'd actually like to hear it on the record which facility it is."

Moylan: "Yes. I will present you that with you in a few minutes."

Butler: "No. I'd like to hear it on the record."

Moylan: "Hang on a second. Yeah. It's called Sparta."

Butler: "So, the World Shooting Complex in Sparta, Illinois?"

Moylan: "Correct."

Butler: "Can you tell me in which Legislative District that facility sits?"

Moylan: "Yes. It's in Jerry Costello's. Yep, that's it."

Butler: "And can you tell me why that facility's exempted?"

Moylan: "Because it's \$26 million in revenue. Plus, with this Bill, not only will that \$26 million we could increase not only the people working here in the State of Illinois, but all across America. And as I go up and down Route 66, which you are a proud proponent, I want to buy America-made products and Illinois products. So, I can display that Route 66 sticker right in my window and say Marty Moylan has gone up and down this road and has purchased this icon of Abraham Lincoln made right here in the State of Illinois."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Butler: "Mr. Moylan, I'm so glad you're concerned about the economic impact of facilities in the State of Illinois and the business climate in our state."

Moylan: "Yeah."

Butler: "I hope that goes to other pieces of legislation..."

Moylan: "Right."

Butler: "...as well. So, colleagues, I would just say I think this is a wrong-headed piece of legislation. I... I respect the intent of the Sponsor. As I said before, we have had good programs in the State of Illinois to promote and sell products made in Illinois, but I think this is severely limiting our facilities on the things that they can sell and the products that they can... they can offer to the patrons of their facilities. And I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Ives."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Ives: "Representative Moylan, I absolutely agree that we ought to be using Illinois products when we're doing Illinois business on state property. I a hundred percent agree with that. I was wondering though if you could just maybe tweak your Bill and say... and do something in terms of like in good faith if the product cannot be manufactured or found in the State of Illinois that... that, you know, that then you can go outside. So, if there was some mechanism where you first have to look to State of Illinois manufacturers for such a product, then I would feel..."

Moylan: "Yeah."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Ives: "...much better about your Bill. Is there a way that we could fix this?"

Moylan: "We would maybe consider that in the Senate, but I strongly remind you, let's buy American. And thank you, Representative, for your questions."

Ives: "Okay. Thank you very much."

Moylan: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Demmer is recognized."

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

Speaker Turner: "He indicates that he will."

Demmer: "Representative Moylan, I... I appreciate some of the answers you've given previously in debate here. One that actually kind of caught my attention was I didn't realize that you carved out a facility here..."

Moylan: "Yes."

Demmer: "...so somebody gets an exemption from the rest of this law the... the end of the... the Amendment #2 says this Section does not apply to the World Shooting and Recreational Complex..."

Moylan: "Yeah."

Demmer: "...under the jurisdiction of DNR. How did you choose that facility to carve out on this?"

Moylan: "With much... much discussion of looking over all the facilities, a \$26 million revenue enhancement to one of our southern communities was enough for me to consider an exemption. Which your..."

Demmer: "What was it? Do you know what the economic impact of all the other locations we've been talking about today is?"

Moylan: "Yeah. Here's what I know. That the impact for us will be greater when we sell American-made, Illinois-made products."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Demmer: "So, you're exempting the biggest... the biggest location..."

Moylan: "Yeah."

Demmer: "...but ignoring all the small businesses?"

Moylan: "Right. Do you like Juicy Fruit gum, Doublemint gum, Skittles? That's made right at the yawk... Yorkville plant."

Demmer: "All right. That's great. That sounds great. But let me...

let me ask you this. You're... you're carving the largest
facility but then applying this restrictions to all the small
businesses?"

Moylan: "I think, again, there's a great wave of nationalism that we should do everything we can to make sure..."

Demmer: "And that doesn't apply in Sparta?"

Moylan: "...that we should... that we should do everything we can to put Illinois Americans..."

Demmer: "Except in Sparta."

Moylan: "...Illinois workers to work..."

Demmer: "Except for Sparta."

Moylan: "...do everything that we can to make our plants productive.

Have you been to the Route... Route 66 in Lincoln and Pontiac

where they have postcards made in America. Again, you know..."

Demmer: "You know, Representative... Representative, I'm not asking for a list of products made in Illinois."

Moylan: "Well, I'm giving you a list."

Demmer: "There are several products made in Illinois. I'm asking you why you chose one facility to carve out from this. You're telling me it's because they are... they have a large economic impact."

Moylan: "And it's going to be larger."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Demmer: "You don't know the economic impact of some of these other small businesses."

Moylan: "I think..."

Demmer: "I represent a community called Shabbona with a population of 936, 936 people in that community. At Shabbona Lake State Park there's a private concessionaire, a small bus... a family-owned business. They provide services to 475 thousand visitors a year in a community of 939. But what, they're still... this Bill still applies to them because they weren't big enough to get the Sparta exemption?"

Moylan: "No. We think they are great. We love our small businesses and we're going to make them great again. With my Bill..."

Demmer: "But you... there is such a limited restriction. There's individuals..."

Moylan: "...with my Bill let's make Illinois great again and with your help, I'm expecting every one of you to vote 'yes'..."

Demmer: "But..."

Moylan: "...for a great America. This is nationalism. It's sweeping across the country. Thank you, thank you, thank you."

Demmer: "Except in Sparta."

Moylan: "Thank you, Representative Demmer. We love everyone."

Demmer: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. Let's understand..."

Moylan: "It's going to be a huge for Illinois."

Demmer: "To the Bill. Let's understand what this does. Let's understand what this restriction does. It puts limits on small businesses all across the State of Illinois. And why, because they weren't large enough or they didn't talk to the right people to get this special exemption that Representative Moylan has carved out from this Bill. Because they have too

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

big of an economic impact in Sparta, they can't be subject to this. But his fake nationalism that he's trotting out on the floor here applies to every other business in the State of Illinois unless they were able to come into his office and get a special exemption. I'm standing up today to talk about Shabbona Lake State Park in my district, a community of 936 people. A small family-owned business sells supplies there to people who come fishing, who come camping. They sell bait and tackle. They sell RV batteries and boat batteries, boat parts. They sell snacks. They sell food. They sell equipment supplies for people who spend a large amount of their time and money revitalizing the economy of southern DeKalb County and the town of Shabbona. This... this restriction applies to them and it applies to every other small business across the state, but we hear today there are special carveouts, if you talk to the right people and knew where to look. This Bill limits the scope. If the family who runs this business at Shabbona Lake State Park can't find these supplies there, they'd just have to tell the folks who are camping, sorry, we can't sell it to you because we couldn't find it in the State of Illinois or in the United States. You're out of luck. Good luck with you. This is not the way to go about building strong businesses and communities across the state. Vote 'no' today. Don't buy into what you hear on the floor. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Willis is recognized."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Willis: "Representative, isn't your intent truly to be if we go to visit and let's use our wonderful Illinois Lincoln Mus...

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Museum and Library... if I go and pick up a souvenir from there, isn't it sort of tacky if I get something that touts the State of Illinois and on the bottom it says made in China?"

Moylan: "Exactly... exactly right. And this is why my Bill is intended to correct that."

Willis: "Right. If we're spouting our State of Illinois, I think that we should certainly support it with making sure that we have goods and certainly souvenirs that are coming from our own state."

Moylan: "Yep."

Willis: "Does this Bill prevent them though from having a special exhibit that may come in? Would that then be an exception to this Bill or not?"

Moylan: "Correct. We have no problem with maybe a special exhibit. What I would like to have is a special exhibit of Skittles. I would like them to come in 'cause it's made right here in Illinois. Let's have a special exhibit. Of let's go to the store called P.R.O.U.D. Illinois. It's in Marketplace, 218 West Main in Pontiac, Illinois. You know what they sell there? They sa... they sell products made in Illinois. And that's in Representative Bennett's area. I've been there personally and bought everything there that they can sell at these stores."

Willis: "Representative, I'm very proud to have Snapple, Dr. Pepper Distributors right here in my district up in Northlake. I would certainly hope that we could have more Snapple and Dr. Pepper in many of our state agencies so that we can make sure that we help promote Buy Illinois. I think your Bill's a good Bill. I will strongly support it. I think you got on

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

the right track. I think this is something that everybody should support as proud Illinoisans. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative McCombie is recognized."

McCombie: "Thank you, sorry. Just to the Bill. I wanted to add to Jerry Long's... Representative Long's with Starved Rock. They have 2.5 million visitors a year. They have four concession stands... or four concession stores there. They employ 22 American people. And they have an inventory of about 400 thousand in retail merchandise. They really feel that this is going to be a detriment because they're not able to only sell Dr. Pepper, Snapple and Skittles, although they do have those options there. They need to be able to have options and this ... this shop... one of these shops alone generates \$58 thousand in sales tax that comes back to the State of Illinois. So, you know, as much as I support you, Marty, and the State of Illinois and the United States of ... and the United States as a whole, we can't always rely on those. And I... and I cannot support this because of that, because I do support all of our State Parks including those in my district that have small concessions. And unfortunately, we're just not able to give the consumer what they need if we can only rely on us, unfortunately."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Swanson is recognized."

Swanson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In my local communities, smaller community of Bishop Hill, less than 200 people that live in that community and their sole business in this community is selling Swedish heritage items. The museum sells a Swedish doll made in Sweden and many other Swedish-made products because that's the heritage of this community. Would they no

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

longer be able to bring in Swedish-made products to sell in this Swedish community or can we request an exemption to this Bill?"

Moylan: "This legislation important to... to items that are mass-produced."

Swanson: "I'm sorry. I didn't hear that."

Moylan: "This... this legislation is more set for items that are mass-produced."

Swanson: "I don't... which part in the Bill did talk about mass-..."

Moylan: "Yes."

Swanson: "...produced item?"

Moylan: "Numerous mass-produced items. As I said... as I mentioned earlier, we want our... we would like our businesses that are State of Illinois-owned businesses to sell Illinois and American-made products. What's so hard about putting American people to work and Illinois people to work and selling Illinois products? I'm going to go to the State Museum and I want to buy a statue of Lincoln made right here in Illinois. I want to buy one made right here in America. This Bill is huge for Illinois and America. I don't know what you don't understand. Thank you."

Swanson: "Well, the point I don't understand is where it talks about mass-produced and the other part is, is this museum is run by Illinois people. This museum's income is provided to the people of this community and they certainly need to be able to keep their doors open by marketing items of heritage from Sweden. Thousands of people visit this community. The king and queen of Sweden have visited Bishop Hill because of the heritage to the community of being a commune. So, back to

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

- my initial question, where does it talk about mass-produced items only?"
- Moylan: "I look forward to the king and queen of Sweden coming here and purchasing American and Illinois-made products.

  Thank you."
- Swanson: "Well, I think the point of that comment was is that this is a national and a state museum and historic landmark. They appreciate what the heritage of this community is and what it meant to our area in Henry County. But back to my point of this Swedish heritage, this Swedish museum, state museum main income for the people of this community supports many families and now, these products will no longer be available causing this museum to potentially have to close their door. We're not funding it right now. It's maintaining its doors open especially as we move into the... to the vacation season and tourist season. This is a major tourism location in Henry County. We need to be able to sell items that people want to come see of Swedish heritage."
- Moylan: "If there is a specialty item that needs to be sold and could be sold, that will... we will correct that in the Senate, as I stated earlier."
- Swanson: "So, are you going to amend this Bill and take it back?"

  Moylan: "No. I'm not going to amend it today. I want to vote on it today. I would like to vote today. I want to see who's going to support American workers; who's going to support Illinois-made products. And if there's a change, it may be made or corrected in the Senate."
- Swanson: "Well, as a product of American families and a product...
  and a past soldier of America, I certainly appreciate and

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

support America not only through my military uniform but also through my service today. I support America; I support Illinois. But I also support keeping small businesses open within my district and this certainly will cause doors to close. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative David Harris is recognized."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Harris, D.: "Representative, your enthusiasm is so infectious I was almost tempted to vote for this Bill. But a couple of questions before I do that, if you... if you don't mind. You... you indicated that the Abraham Lincoln Presidential Library and Museum would be covered by this Bill. Is that correct?"

Moylan: "Correct. Well, actually, I like the first part of your question. You could stop right there."

Harris, D.: "No. Is... is the... I'm sorry. I didn't hear you. Is the Museum here in Springfield, is that covered by this?"

Moylan: "I didn't hear the second part. Excuse me?"

Harris, D.: "Is the..."

Moylan: "I heard you say..."

Harris, D.: "...is the Abraham... is the Abraham Lincoln Library and Museum covered by this Bill?"

Moylan: "Right. The way the statute is written they have their own Codes and they are not included."

Harris, D.: "They are not included."

Moylan: "Right."

Harris, D.: "So, the previous... one of the previous speakers who asked the question about... about the Abraham Lincoln Presidential Library and Museum and all of those folks who

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

are going to be covered are... visiting the Museum, they're going to buy products which may not be made in the United States, that's a travesty. I think the Bill should be amended to include them. What about, as an example, what about the Illinois Military Museum, which is a... which is a great facility out there at Camp Lincoln but is not covered under the Department of... of Natural Resources. What do we do about them? Are they covered in this Bill?"

- Moylan: "Well, the... you just stated it wasn't covered by the Department of Natural Resources. Well, it wouldn't be covered."
- Harris, D.: "So, what is the largest... and one of the previous speakers made reference to this... what's the largest facility visited by the... by visitors that's under the auspices of the Department of Natural Resources?"
- Moylan: "I don't have that information."
- Harris, D.: "Well, it's the… it's Starved Rock State Park. And most… many people don't recognize that Starved Rock State Park has more than 2 million visitors a year, 2 million visitors a year. So, we're leaving out the Abraham Lincoln Presidential Library and Museum, but we're putting in Starved Rock. And think of the impact there. Now, I'm with you. I want to buy America. Boy, I want to buy America, but why exclude the Abraham Lincoln Presidential Library and Museum? Why not make this applicable to every single facility in the State of Illinois not just those under the Department of Natural Resources?"
- Moylan: "Thank you very much. And next year that may be my next Bill."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Harris, D.: "I would not be surprised if that's... that's the case.

And your enthusiasm is overwhelming. It just didn't convince

me enough. And I have to recommend a 'no' vote."

Moylan: "Okay."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Davidsmeyer is recognized.

Representative Phillips is recognized."

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

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

Phillips: "Marty, I have it from a very reliable source that the tie you're wearing comes from China and says Donald Trump on it. Is this true?"

Moylan: "I'm going to read you something."

Phillips: "All right."

Moylan: "Nice suit..."

Phillips: "Okay."

Moylan: "...nice suit. Add to that the tie."

Phillips: "Read it, buddy."

Moylan: "Drum roll, please."

Phillips: "All right. I can do that; I was a drummer. Hee haw."

Moylan: "Made in U.S.A. since 1887 of imported products. Made at Hartmarx made in Des Plaines, Illinois, where 600 workers work paying taxes."

Phillips: "Good. I won't go any further than your jacket, okay?

'Cause I don't want to get in any trouble. I got a feeling
we're going to find China or something."

Moylan: "One other thing. Just recently, I bought a pair of jeans made in Chicago, Illinois, from Dearborn Incorporated. Those are our American-made products that you can actually look for, find and buy."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Phillips: "Very good."

Moylan: "Thank you."

Phillips: "I'm proud of you."

Moylan: "Thank you."

Phillips: "I have one other comment to you."

Moylan: "Yes."

Phillips: "And I was just interested in, yesterday we passed House Bill 137 and 138 which was Representative Hoffman's Bills. And in that, he had a clause in there that as long as the product that we're purchasing doesn't exceed 12 percent. And I'm not sure how that affects your Bill as it amends the Procurement of Domestic Products Act for the State of Illinois. Would that be a part of your Bill or that has nothing to do with your Bill?"

Moylan: "Abraham Lincoln said something like this. I'm not going to say it exactly what he said. That was yesterday; today's today. So, I don't know."

Phillips: "So, in other words, even if it's 50 percent higher, we won't be able to work this in."

Moylan: "We should do everything we can to buy American-made and especially, Illinois-made."

Phillips: "All right."

Moylan: "That's what I would say. Thanks, Reggie."

Phillips: "See you, buddy."

Moylan: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Batinick is recognized."

Batinick: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Batinick has moved the previous question. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the previous question is moved. Representative Moylan to close."

Moylan: "Well, I want to thank everybody because the conversations were very lively. And I really appreciate all the support. I know in your heart you're with me. And please, please, press green and you know why, because this is huge for the State of Illinois and the country. Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2764 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 73 voting 'yes', 40 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', House Bill 2764, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 188, Representative Thapedi. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 188, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Thapedi."

Thapedi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 188 is the Civil Litigation Reform Act. This Bill restructures Section 301 of the Illinois Code of Civil Procedure to ensure that justice is done to all defendants especially pro se defendants who are not properly served in litigation but still are hit with default judgements. The issue... this particular issue was overlooked in 1999 when we did away with special limited appearances. And at this point, Mr. Speaker, I want to make clear that these issues often happen in mortgage foreclosures actions and in lesser exposure litigation where judges are

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

quick to find waiver of jurisdictional challenges defendants. I've, personally, seen judges strip away rights and homes on this issue. This Bill allows an aggrieved defendant to first and foremost attack a default judgement. If he or she is successful in obtaining the relief from the default judgement, via 1301 motion or a 1401 petition, he or she may then lodge a jurisdictional challenge relating to the improper service if brought within 60 days of resolution of those two types of pleadings. Under current law, first moving to vacate the default judgement would waive the right to lodge the jurisdictional challenge because only a motion to extend the time to answer a life plead would be allowable in this scenario. This is an anomaly in the law. And this Bill actually cures that. In the event that an aggrieved defendant does not initially move for an extension of time to un... or answer, otherwise plead or relief from a judgement under 1301, 1401 or 1401.1, that defendant prospectively waives those objections and this is consistent with the Mitchell case that was decided by our own Supreme Court in 2014. I want to personally thank Chris Hurley and his plaintiff trial lawyers; Jim Covington and his ISBA lawyers; Mark Mifflin and his defense trial lawyers; Steve Olson with the lenders; Dave Manning with the Creditors Bar, with their swift work on this important issue. There are no opponents to this litigation that I'm aware of. The intent is for this Act to apply prospectively to cases that are filed immediately after an enactment. And they also, Mr. Speaker, that the legislative intent of this particular piece of legislation is to ensure that BAC Home Loans Servicing, LP v. Kim Mitchell, a 2014

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

7-0 Supreme Court decision, is still good law. I'm available to answer any and all questions."

Speaker Turner: "Is there any discussion? Representative Andersson is recognized."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Andersson: "Representative, so I... we worked pretty hard on this in committee. As I recall, one of the... one of the objections to it was the retroactivity."

Thapedi: "Yes."

Andersson: "I believe you said, if I want to be clear, with the third... third Amendment we made clear that this is prospective only in nature, correct?"

Thapedi: "Yeah, yeah. That's exactly right, Steve. I mean, and that was the last Amendment that we did. The idea was initially... you'll recall that initially we look at the waiver being both prospective and retrospective. We look at the Mitchell case again, which again as I said, was a 7-0 Illinois Supreme Court decision that made clear that retrospective waiver would not be appropriate. That's why the Bill now is only prospective waiver in those... in those scenarios."

Andersson: "And as a result of that, I believe the… all objection was removed from the Bill?"

Thapedi: "All objections have been removed."

Andersson: "Thank you very much."

Thapedi: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Thapedi to close."

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

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 188 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 113 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 188, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 189, Representative Thapedi. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 189, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Thapedi."

Thapedi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 189 is the Condominium Owners Protection Act of 2017. This Bill is the omnibus condominium townhome Bill that revises and adds 10 Sections to the Illinois Condominium Property Act as well as the Common Interest Community Association Act. The issues in this Bill relate to accounting, surpluses, deficits, a combination of units, litigation, governance and the sales of the global property in general. This omnibus Bill was a collaborative effort led by attorney Jacob Meister for the homeowners who, I should note, have no representation down in Springfield; attorneys Pat Costello and Kris Kasten from management and attorney Gina Harrison from Speaker Madigan's legal staff, who's here with me today. The omnibus Bill, while revising and modifying 10 different Sections of the current law, meshes together the Bills and hard work from Representatives Fine, Cassidy, Andersson, Gabel, Williams, and Ives. What is missing, Mr. Speaker, from this omnibus Bill are revisions that would consolidate litigation between

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

unit owners and their respective associations. The best place, in my opinion, to do that is the Forcible Entry and Detainer Act. But because we cannot reach an agreement on that issue or the issue raised by Representative Drury's Bill, which should be in this omnibus Bill, those will be left for another day. The litigation issue that we did agree upon is the issue of unit owner's access to records of the association. This portion was led by Representative Fine and clarifies that if not, overrules the First District Taggart decision. I'm available to answer any and all questions."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Andersson is recognized."

Andersson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. This is an example, Ladies and Gentlemen, of what was truly an agreed Bill process. I've never done a committee Bill before, but Representative Thapedi did an excellent job of shepherding it through. What we did was, any of the Bills that had a problem, any stakeholders had a problem, we tried to resolve them. Some of them we did and they're in the Bill. Some of them we didn't; they're not in the Bill. So, this is literally about as agreed as you can get. And I want to thank the Sponsor for his hard work on it. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Thapedi to close."

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

Speaker Turner: "Question is, 'Shall House Bill 189 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', 1 voting 'present', House Bill 189, having received the Constitutional Majority, is

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

hereby declared passed. House Bill 2820, Representative Andersson. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2820, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Andersson."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2820 deals with farmers' markets in the State of Illinois. Currently, there's a great disparity in regulations between the 102 counties in Illinois as to both the required temperature preservation for goods that are being sold at a farmers' market and number 2, with regard to handwashing stations, believe it or not. Some regulations require that you have to literally have a refrigerator on site; others say that you can provide the temperature control through something as efficient as a high efficiency cooler. Similarly with the handwashing, some counties require every single booth to have a handwashing station; others say you can share. This Bill makes uniform the requirement that handwashing stations can be shared and that you can use, if the cooler is sufficient to bring the temperature down to 41 degrees, you can use that and not be required to bring a refrigerator on site, electricity, et cetera. This is a way of promoting farmers' markets making it possible for these small businesses to... to actually make what is usually a very small profit. It's good for the State of Illinois. It's good for our farmers. And I would be happy to answer any questions, but I do urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Davis is recognized."

Davis: "Mr. Speaker, will the Spons... Well, you ask everybody else questions, so I thought I'd ask you some."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Andersson: "Very fair, Sir."

Davis: "Okay."

Andersson: "Very fair."

Davis: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will definitely yield."

Davis: "So, if I heard you correctly, you said that if it could be determined that a cooler will keep the temperature down."

Andersson: "Right."

Davis: "So, what type of cooler that... are you specifying what that cooler can be used? Can it be a Styrofoam cooler that somebody could keep beer in or are you talking about plastic Igloo coolers? And how do you determine whether or not it has the capability of keeping the temperature down?"

Andersson: "That... that's an excellent question. That will continue to be determined by the county officials who regulate this, so they can certify that, yes, you know, an Igloo cooler, whatever works, you know, is certified versus like a Styrofoam that wouldn't. So, the control there is left with the... with the locals, but the standard is established at 41 degrees. If they can meet that standard, they can use it."

Davis: "So, are you suggesting that before you purchase a cooler you have to determine whether or not it has the ability to keep something at 41 degrees? But that also means that if even it's ice, that means you got to keep putting ice in it 'cause ice does melt in the summertime, temperatures could rise. So, again, I'm just trying to make sure I... and I appreciate what you're attempting to do in terms of regulating, you know, keeping food safe, but it just seems

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

like there's still not enough parameters that exist with what you're suggesting that would keep food safe."

Andersson: "I... I understand your point and I guess what I'm trying to convey is that we're establishing what the standard must be, the 41 degrees, okay? The counties themselves can determine if the cooler... whatever methodology needs to be used... if... if it can meet that. And so, yeah, it is going to take some research on the part of the farmers' market vendor to make sure that they have the right equipment. I mean, that's... that's a given, but if they can meet it, then they don't have to haul a refrigerator around and worry about electricity."

Davis: "So... so, then is the 41 degrees a standard being set by the FDA, by..."

Andersson: "Yes."

Davis: "...whatever our regulatory body..."

Andersson: "Yes. It..."

Davis: "...is here at the state?"

Andersson: "Well, I believe it's set by Federal Law."

Davis: "I'm sorry?"

Andersson: "I believe it is set by Federal Law; it's uniform."

Davis: "So, the Federal Law determines that who can they..."

Andersson: "The 41 degrees."

Davis: "And is that across the board food? Is there distinctions between beef versus pork versus fish?"

Andersson: "No. All of them at 41 degrees. With meat and there are certain... certain things that certainly wouldn't need refrigeration at all, you know, corn, tomatoes, et cetera.

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

But for those things that do, it's 41 degrees across the board."

Davis: "Well, again, I'm just making it a distinction..."

Andersson: "Sure."

Davis: "...and you're right, certain vegetables, but I'm talking about in terms of meat and poultry."

Andersson: "Yeah."

Davis: "Is 41 degrees a standard that's works for all types of meat, poultry, pork, chicken, you know, venison..."

Andersson: "Yes."

Davis: "...kangaroo, I mean, whatever anybody's selling..."

Andersson: "Okay, okay."

Davis: "...at a food market."

Andersson: "Okay. I'm going... I'm going to pull back on kangaroo.

I don't know, but I suspect, yes."

Davis: "Thank you very much, Representative."

Andersson: "Thank you."

Davis: "Appreciate it."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Mah is recognized."

Mah: "To the Bill. I'd like to say that this is a good Bill that removes bars to entry into participation into farmers' markets. I have a number of small farmers' markets in my district and they're always struggling to recruit more vendors. I think that with these new regulations that standardize the rules across the state I think that it would remove some of the barriers especially some places where there is a requirement for refrigeration and handwashing stations at every booth. I think that for small vendors that poses an

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

issue. And so, I think this is a good Bill and I urge support for it."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Costello is recognized."

Costello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And to the Bill. I noticed on the Democratic analysis we don't have anything about the Farm Bureau. I reached out to them and the Illinois Farm Bureau is in support of this Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Ammons is recognized."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Ammons: "Just for the clarification on the refrigeration requirement. So, if... an item has a different temperature requirement that you would only get from a grocery store, you're saying that this change would meet all of those requirements regardless to what the cold held item is?"

Andersson: "Correct. For all... all of the food products that would require refrigeration, 41 degrees is the standard."

Ammons: "And does this Bill address how the re... the compliance portion of this will work?"

Andersson: "We will leave that to the individual counties to determine. They won't be able to refuse a cooler, for example, that meets the criteria. They can't mandate... if this Bill passes... they can't mandate that electric refrigerator, but they can require verification that the proposed unit functions as it's supposed to at 41 degrees."

Ammons: "So, if there's no... as you have prepared for this Bill...
and I've looked at this as you know... are there certain kind
of performance requirements that the cooler must meet in order
for it to be acceptable by a public health department?"

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Andersson: "So, the public health departments themselves will do the verification. What we're doing is we're establishing the benchmark. If it can meet the 41 degrees, however it does that, if it can meet that it passes. If it doesn't, they cannot use it, but the Bill itself does not specify how to do that. The counties themselves will be able to do that."

Ammons: "But it does not preclude a county from allowing a vendor to continue to use standardized travel-size refrigeration unit, if they so chose?"

Andersson: "Oh, absolutely. They can certainly go above... above the minimum. They can do whatever they want in that regard."

Ammons: "Thank you very much."

Andersson: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Arroyo is recognized."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Arroyo: "Representative Andersson, I stand in support of this farmers' market Bill. But I got... there's two questions. Everybody's talking about refrigeration..."

Andersson: "Two questions."

Arroyo: "...and stuff like that and different types of meat there's going to be in the refrigerant."

Andersson: "I... I can't hear you, Sir."

Arroyo: "A lot of people have questions about the refrigeration and the meat that's going to be kept in this refrigerator. Is this refrigerator American-made?"

Andersson: "No. I mean, it could be. I would encourage it, but there is no buy American mandate in my Bill."

Arroyo: "Okay. And do you have lion meat in that refrigerator?"

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Andersson: "Since I don't have a refrigerator and I don't sell these things, I do not."

Arroyo: "Thank you."

Andersson: "Thank you."

Arroyo: "I support your Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Andersson to close."

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

Speaker Turner: "Question is, 'Shall House Bill 2820 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 113 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 2820, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3164, Representative Stratton. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3164, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. Second... This Bill was read a second time a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 1 and 2 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Stratton."

Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, this Bill is on the Order of Second Reading."

Clerk Hollman: "Correct. This Bill is on the Order of Second Reading. Floor Amendments 1 and 2 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Stratton."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Stratton."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

- Stratton: "On House Amendment 2, the Amendment simply added an additional location for a license exemption. I ask for the adoption."
- Speaker Turner: "Lady moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 3164. 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: "Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Stratton and has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Stratton."
- Stratton: "All right. I stand... stood corrected on the prior. On House Floor Amendment 2, it does add an additional location for the license exemption."
- Speaker Turner: "Lady moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 3164. 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 this Bill, 3164."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3164, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Stratton."
- Stratton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 3164 amends the Liquor Control Act and authorizes the issuance and renewal of a license to sell alcohol liquor at premises located within 100 feet of specific places of worship and/or schools within the City of Chicago. I do have support from all of the aldermen of each of these... where each of these

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

premises are located as well as support from the places of worship and the schools. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Andersson is recognized."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Andersson: "So, Representative, for the new Members of the General Assembly, can you explain why we have to go through this process for individual businesses?"

Stratton: "So, it's my understanding that the... also as a new Member... that the..."

Andersson: "It is your Bill though."

Stratton: "Yes, it is. That the City of Chicago under these circumstances could authorize a liquor license for a business to be licensed; however, under the state statute it prohibits... it requires certain prohibitions on being able to have a place... an establishment selling liquor within 100 feet of a church or a school..."

Andersson: "And so, we... we have to legislatively exempt those, if you will. Now... now, I think I heard you say that you'd... that in each of these cases the... the church or school was approached."

Stratton: "Each of the cases, I have the support of both the schools and the places of worship."

Andersson: "So, the places that are arguably affected support the Bill."

Stratton: "They support the Bill as do the aldermen of each of those Wards."

Andersson: "Thank you very much."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Stratton: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Stratton to close."

Stratton: "I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3164 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 79 voting 'yes', 37 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 3164, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3293, Representative Scherer. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3293, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. This Bill was read a second time a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 1 and 2 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Scherer."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Scherer."

Scherer: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This just removes all opposition and it's just a technicality changing the word 'buyer' to 'recipient'."

Speaker Turner: "Lady moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 3293. 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: "Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Scherer and has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Scherer."

Scherer: "Okay. So, what this Bill does is it takes school buses..."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Speaker Turner: "Amendment #2, Representative."

Scherer: "Oh, Amendment 2 is just a technicality with the word."

Speaker Turner: "Lady moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 3293. 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 3293."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3293, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Members, please bring the noise level down.

Representative Scherer."

Scherer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today I'm presenting House Bill 3293 with two Floor Amendments. What this Bill does is... I had a constituent come to me about a school bus being painted yellow. And it's an extra layer of protection for sexual predators and pedophiles. So, the school bus has to be painted some other color than yellow. And I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote. Open to any questions, of course."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative David Harris."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Harris, D.: "Representative, we talked about this and the question came up in committee and I just would like to put it into the record so that we're clear. If a school district sells the... the bus from... or transfers the bus from itself to another school district, as the recipient, that recipient school district is not required to paint the school bus that it is

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

receiving. It can leave it as is. Is that fully your intention?"

Scherer: "Yes. That's my full intention. And I'll say it so that it's in the record. My intention is for someone other than a school or a church. So, if one school purchases it or is given it from another school, they can keep it yellow, of course."

Harris, D.: "I appreciate your clarification. And I recommend a
 'yes' vote."

Scherer: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Unes is recognized."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Unes: "Representative, just so we're clear. You did adopt the Floor Amendment that you spoke about in committee."

Scherer: "Yes. We've adopted Floor Amendment 1 and 2."

Unes: "Okay. And I appreciate that, Representative, 'cause that did clarify some confusion that... that was happening especially with School Management Alliance. As we spoke, though, in committee, there's still... the concern here is adding more attention to this... and I understand what you're trying to do and that a constituent brought this to you... but covering up all the signs is already law. You do understand that."

Scherer: "Yes, I'm aware of that."

Unes: "And... and having the color of the school bus, if it's not used for school purposes, be something other than school bus yellow is already law."

Scherer: "Yes, I'm aware of that."

Unes: "So... so... so..."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Scherer: "And as we said in committee, the issue is if the bus is just parked somewhere, which is was in this case, the law doesn't care... clarify on that."

Unes: "I underst..."

Scherer: "And I don't think we can ever be too careful when it comes to sexual predators..."

Unes: "I understand..."

Scherer: "...and pedophiles."

Unes: "...I understand totally and don't disagree. To the Bill. My point to exactly what the Representative just said. Since we know it is already law, adding more could... could potentially produce some unintended consequences, which is my concern and why I will be voting 'no'. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Scherer to close."

Scherer: "Yes. This just clarifies existing law. It doesn't, you know, draw flashing lights or anything. I would just like to request an 'aye' vote. I think it's for the good of the children in the State of Illinois."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3293 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 78 voting 'yes', 37 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', House Bill 3293, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3449, Representative Williams. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3449, a Bill for an Act concerning business. This Bill was read a second time a previous day. No

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Williams, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Williams."

Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is a Geolocation Privacy Protection Bill. We have a number of cosponsors on this item. House Amendment #2 removes the private right of action from the Bill and provides enforcement to be limited to the Attorney General and the state's attorney. So, I would ask to add the Amendment for further discussion and consideration."

Speaker Turner: "Lady moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 3449. 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 3449."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3449, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Out of the record. Mr. Clerk, House Bill 3449."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3449, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Williams."

Williams: "No, this is not my first Bill. Thank you. So, House Bill 3449 we've heard a lot about. And this Bill would provide that tech companies that have apps that track your location must notify you when your location is monitored and must require approval of the app user before we can proceed. Again,

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

the big issue with this Bill was whether it utilizes a private right of action. And we've removed that limiting enforcement to the AG and to the state's attorney. So, I do want to let... say for the record, there are some items still to be added that we will be adding in the Senate. And those include exclusions for groups that are otherwise covered in other parts of the statute. For an example, I have an Amendment taking the cable providers out. So, there will be further Amendments. You will see this Bill again."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Andersson is recognized."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Andersson: "So, my understanding is this is going to protect that geolocation information, but I'm also to understand that with my phone I can turn that on or off at will. Isn't that correct?"

Williams: "Well, there are opportunities to turn off some of the data lo... the data apps and the location seeking apps, but as it was illustrated in committee yesterday that's not always easy to do. One of our colleagues was having difficulty in the committee determining how exactly to do that. I think the problem with that is consumers aren't aware of which apps track their location and which apps don't. For example, everybody knows when they use Uber or Lyft their location needs to be tracked for virtue of the person picking them up, same with weather specific apps to your location. But there are other apps maybe an app... shopping app or apps, you know, calorie counting apps or exercise documenting apps. You know how many apps there are. I just downloaded Dropbox, for

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

example, to do another item. Not sure if they're tracking my location, I wasn't asked. So, what we're doing is letting consumers know when an app is tracking where you are, how long you're there, where you're going. It's just something we think consumers need to know. It's very, very personal and private information."

Andersson: "What is the ... what is the penalties for this?"

Williams: "Again, this is enforceable through the Attorney General and the state's attorney through the Consumer Fraud Act. So, it is going to be something that they pursue like any other consumer fraud action, if there's a violation."

Andersson: "So... I mean, is there a monetary penalty involved?"

Williams: "My answer is, you'd have to know the specifics of the Consumer Fraud Act, but if you give me a moment, I can certainly do that."

Andersson: "I'd like to know the answer."

Williams: "It's going to be monetary penalties probably injunctive relief just from my memory of working at the Attorney General's Office, but I can't tell you specifically what. It depends on the violation."

Andersson: "And are attorneys' fees included as well?"

Williams: "I don't believe so."

Andersson: "Is there a... is there a... What's the standard for... is it an intent-based standard or is it simply if it happens they owe the money? What's the... What's the burden of proof here?"

Williams: "Well, it's you either have done what the Act requires or you haven't. For example, we do provide that their contracts can... this conversion provides that a contract that

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

is pursuant to a location base app can be void if there's a violation. That issue actually came up in committee. And I'm going to take a look at that as it moves through the process to ensure that it's fair. For example, we don't want a consumer to have their private information released if there's a violation. So, we want to make sure it's a two-way street. So, violating the app is enforceable only again by the AG or the state's attorney."

Andersson: "Are there any other states that have Bills similar to this?"

Williams: "You know, you may remember President Trump came out with a lot of language regarding privacy recently and it was not proconsumer at all. So, since then, we've started to see a lot of activity on the state level to address privacy issues. I think it's been introduced in a couple other states:

Nevada and there's an Eastern state that comes to mind. So..."

Andersson: "Introduced but not yet... not yet passed anywhere?"

Williams: "I don't believe so."

Andersson: "Okay. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I certainly laud the idea of protecting peoples' safety in... in these circumstances, but I think that this paints with an awfully broad brush. There are ways to use our... our cell phones, our apps to be able to shut this information down, if we choose. It's been a personal responsibility to be able to do that. I am concerned though that with the monetary penalties that are included with this enforcement that we are, again, discouraging businesses from coming to Illinois, a type of business, by the way, that I think we would all desire. This, you know... you know, this sort of Silicon Valley type of

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

business. We don't know how this is going to play. We don't know how this will... will either encourage or discourage business from coming to Illinois. We have no data from any other state because no one's ever done it before. I, with respect, I think the general concept is good, but I have to urge a 'no' vote. It just... this is not business-friendly. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Wheeler is recognized."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Wheeler, K.: "Representative, we had a good discussion last night in committee about this. I just want to put a few things on the record..."

Williams: "Sure."

Wheeler, K.: "...while we discuss this. First of all, I'm a user of an Apple device for my cell phone. And Apple and Google represent about what... 99-plus percent of the entire mobile phone market right now. Do those companies already require a user to give permission to the device to use their location right now?"

Williams: "I think it's depends. I mean, you know there's... I don't even know how many apps are out there, hundreds of thousands, I'm sure... of apps. So, I think it depends on all the particular applications."

Wheeler, K.: "Okay. But actually prior to the loading a single app on your phone, you have to give permission for the location service to be turned on broadly. So, you can turn them all off if the device..."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Williams: "I don't... I don't think that's the case. I have numerous apps on my phone I don't recall making that election."

Wheeler, K.: "Oh, no, no. I thought when..."

Williams: "It would have to be an affirmative."

Wheeler, K.: "...when you first turn the... when you... when they set up your device for the first time. One of the questions you get asked is, are you an enabling location services?"

Williams: "On some... on some apps. It's not required right now."

Wheeler, K.: "Not on the apps. I'm talking about the actual device itself, the actual Apple IOS."

Williams: "Okay."

Wheeler, K.: "If you... if you..."

Williams: "That's not covered in the Bill. We're talking about apps only in the Bill."

Wheeler, K.: "No, I understand. I understand, but a user has already made a decision to turn the location services on or not before they even get to the part where they started loading apps. So, this... Part of, I think, what the Bill's trying to address does exist now, okay. I know you want to take it further. So, I'll just put on the record that some of things do exist currently in the App Store for Google. I'm not as familiar with it... with the Google... their play Store like I am with the Apple one."

Williams: "I don't know. I submit that the majority of people using the apps have no idea whether a particular app is tracking their location or not."

Wheeler, K.: "I'm not disputing that part of it."

Williams: "Yeah."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Wheeler, K.: "Okay. And I think that comes back to one of the points we talked about yesterday was educating users about what's being done with data, what can be done. When you put data out there of any variety, you are actually, you know, subject to and it goes somewhere else. And geolocation data is part of that concept, this overall issue. So, I appreciate you bringing the concept forward. The other one I'm thinking of is that... that when you start your phone for that first time you also have to give the permission for location service to be used as well. So, you turn it on and you have to give permission; there's two steps already in place on the Apple side of it. Now, that doesn't mean that this is all the concerns you have about geolocation data. I want people to be able to understand that... be aware that there are some elements that already are protecting users. So, they're not completely irrelevant. The apps... the question you're bringing about apps still has relevance because you don't always know. You can turn them on or off. That part is indisputable; that's part of the location settings, at least in the Apple version of it. So, again, I don't think this Bill is going to do all the things that you want it to do right now. So, I won't be supporting this Bill. I do reinforce my commitment to you, Representative Williams, that if you want to work on a Bill that would enhance user education and awareness of these things, I'm happy to work with you any time you'd like to." Williams: "I just want to make a note to follow up. This Bill is very, very narrowly tailored only to address geolocation data

only to you... only for application use. And I think what the point that we're getting to... perhaps we have a philosophical

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

difference... and I made the point yesterday in committee, the Illinois Compiled Statutes are full of regulations companies and organizations that probably would rather regulate themselves. I think that's what we're talking about here. The tech companies, some of whom are very responsible, others that are frankly not, many... if they want to regulate They want to establish their own themselves. principles. They want to establish their own regulations. And I get that; however, I think what I'm hearing from residents of my community and otherwise and broadly... we're broadening the State of Illinois as they want the government to provide some protections as a non-interested party particularly with regard to what's happening on the federal level. And I said yesterday in committee, I think many of us would agree, we don't have a lot of confidence in our current administration, that they will be out in front fighting for our privacy protections. So, I don't think Americans trust the industry to regulate themselves, certainly don't trust the Federal Government, so we're looking at the state to protect privacy rights."

Wheeler, K.: "Well, thank you for that response. I will say quickly to the Bill. I appreciate the Sponsor bringing this forward. And I look forward to working with her on future endeavors where we can really improve the user experience and that feeling of comfort that they know what's happening with their own data on their own device. Again, thank you for bringing it forward."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Williams to close."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

- Williams: "Thank you so much for the debate and the discussion that's been ongoing. As I stated when I introduced the Bill, I will be coming back to the House for a couple of clean-up type items. However, I want to reiterate, I am very open and interested in hearing from the tech industry. We don't want to stifle development and innovation. We do want to find that right balance between protecting consumer privacy and still allowing robust development of the apps that make our life much more convenient. So, again, this is a work in progress. I'd appreciate your consideration and an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3449 pass?'
  All in favor say 'aye'... 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 69 voting 'yes', 42 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', House Bill 3449, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed.
  Representative Mitchell, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Mitchell, B.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Sir."
- Mitchell, B.: "Yeah. In the gallery on the Republican side, I would like Robbie Wester, Robbie, would you stand up? Robbie will turn 13, I believe, next month. And he's here with his mother, a good friend of mine, Carla. So, I wanted to give them a big Illinois House welcome. Thank you for coming."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

- Speaker Turner: "Thank you and welcome to your Capitol.

  Representative Brady, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Brady: "A personal privilege please, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Sir."
- Brady: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I, too, would like to welcome to Springfield some folks from my Legislative District, and that of Representative Keith Sommer, who's behind Representative Sommer in the gallery. The Concklins, the Schroeders, the Ulbrichs, and the Andersons, all from the Bloomington-Normal area, here for Springfield government today. Please give them a nice warm welcome to Springfield."
- Speaker Turner: "Thank you and welcome to your Capitol.

  Representative Bryant, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Bryant: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would you let the record show that I intended to vote 'yes' on 3293? My... my finger didn't get on the right button."
- Speaker Turner: "The record will reflect your request, Representative. House Bill 1970, Representative Brady. Out of the record. House Bill 1952, Representative Cabello. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1952, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Cabello."
- Cabello: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1952 allows ambulance assistance vehicle providers to be upgraded to provide flexibility for EMS systems and for better responses in emergencies. Right now,

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

if you are having a medical emergency, a firetruck could arrive on the scene and does not have all the necessary equipment that an ambulance may have. We're trying to let the communities contact the medical directors of that community to apply for putting those in... Oh. I had to adopt #1. And so, give local control to the people that wish to make sure that the firetrucks are actually... have the necessary equipment to maybe save somebody's life. Requestfully ask for an 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 1952 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 113 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', House Bill 1952, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2577, Representative Soto. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2577, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. This Bill was read a second time a previous day.

  Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Soto, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Soto."
- Soto: "Yes. Thank you, Speaker. House Bill 2577 extends the sunset Bill of the Marriage and Family Therapy..."
- Speaker Turner: "Excuse me, Representative, on the Floor Amendment first. You did... you're giving me the details of Floor Amendment #3?"

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Soto: "Yes."

Speaker Turner: "Okay."

Soto: "Okay. House Bill 2577 extends the Marriage and Family Therapy Licensing Act for nine years, from January 1, 220... to 2027."

Speaker Turner: "Lady moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 2577. 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 that Bill a third time."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2577, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Soto."

Soto: "Okay. House Bill 2577 extends the sunset and Marriage and Family Therapy Licensing Act, first signed into law in 1991. Marriage and Family Therapy refers the evaluation and treatment of mental and emotional problems within the context of human relationships, marriage. House Bill 2577 extends the Marriage and Family Therapy Licensing Act for nine years to January 2027. House Bill 2577 is agreed Bi... is an agreed Bill between DFPR and the industry. And I ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2577 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 113 voting 'yes', 1 voting

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 2577, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 459, Representative Ives. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 459, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Ives."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I appreciate the committee that this came through. We went through a number of iterations to come up with this solution for this Bill. And what, essentially, this Bill does is that it provides for the purpose of calculating the debt limit for school districts in relation to its equalized assessed value that the debt shall include all debt issued and its associated interest and issuance cost. Instead of just the debt and... which also excluded alternate revenue bonds, privately placed debt and all interest on debt. The other thing this does is it builds off of HB760, which we passed earlier, which was Representative Lang's Bill, and it provides some additional transparency when school districts go out for referendum. So, this provides that the bond referendum question allowing school districts to issue bonds must include the following information: it's a description of the project for which the bonds will be issued, an estimate using Representative Lang's language, an estimate of the number of years during which the bonds will be outstanding, 3, an estimate of the total debt service to be paid on the bonds including principal, interest and cost of issuing bonds. Currently, they only discuss the principal on the debt. The

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

other thing that this does it also says that it provides that the school district presents information to the public about the bond issuance, the debt information must include an estimate of the average and what property tax needs to pay the principal and interest on the bonds, extendable against a property containing a median-priced home in the school district's boundaries. Number 4) it's important to note this Bill in no way restricts any school district at any time from petitioning this Body through legislation to exceed their debt limit when they find it so necessary. We have passed a number of Bills in relation to that and we are in no way restricting their ability to still do that when they need to do so. The other thing that this Bill does is about the debt limit. If it does say that ... it limits your refinancing of debt to a lower interest rate or a shorter term. You cannot extend your debt past the terms that you told taxpayers you were taking it on for and that the debt must be 20-year level debt. So, that we are getting rid of capital appreciation bonds. Capital appreciation bonds allow you to pay interest only in the beginning and then pay off the ... pay off the principal at the backend. It's a terrible form of ... of putting debt on other taxpayers. So, that's another item it does. Now, I have heard from opposition. And I'm committed to fixing this Bill in the Senate and specific and al... specifically allowing tax anticipation warrants to exceed the debt limit for all school districts. And I recognize the schools are in financial straits because the state continues to pay them late and that they continue to wait on property taxes. So, with my commitment, I give you right now, that we will not

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

pass this Bill in the Senate until we fix it for tax anticipation warrants. The rest of it is really good government facets for taxpayers and transparency. So, I'm open to questions."

Speaker Turner: "Representative McDermed is reco... is recognized." McDermed: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Some of you may know that I represent almost all of the Lincoln Way High School district where one of the four high schools in our district had to be closed because the district became on the financial watch list. One... well, actually many of the practices that would be covered by this Bill are practices that the board and the district engaged in. One of the biggest complaints that the citizen taxpayers in my district had was that they did not understand how much debt, what type of debt, the length of debt that the board was incurring because the process was so opaque and so lacking in transparency. In fact, lacking in transparency that the former it was SO superintendent is now under investigation by the Securities Exchange Commission. I would urge an 'aye' vote to prevent further tragedies like we had in my district at the Lincoln Way High School Board. I think this is a great Bill. As taxpayers we need to have a lot more insight into what's going on with the financing of ... of our schools. Thank you, Sponsor Ives, for this Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Mayfield is recognized."

Mayfield: "Thank you so much. I going to speak to the Bill and to the Sponsor. I chair the committee that this Bill came out of. And Representative Ives has worked very hard on this Bill. And I want to give her credit for that. We've had a lot of

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

opposition on this particular Bill. Representative Ives, as you can see, we're on the third Amendment, has taken those criticisms into consideration and has amended her Bill to address a lot of the concerns that were brought forth. When the third Amendment, which is the one we're looking at now, came through committee on Tuesday not one person stood up in opposition to speak against the Bill. All of the ... all the that have called all of organizations you, superintendents that have been ringing your phones not one took the time to come down here or have their lobbyist speak against the Bill. And I really think that does a disservice for them to wait until the Bill passes out of committee and then try to kill it on the floor. They had an opportunity to speak against the Bill. Representative Ives has stated that she will continue to work on the Bill. There were additional concerns that came up after committee. And she gave me her commitment that in the Senate she would continue to work on the Bill. She's been very good about keeping her word. And I would just ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Jones is recognized."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Jones: "Representative, I'd like to direct some questions going to legislative intent. You have part of your Bill reflects that it limits elementary or high school districts from issuing debt above 6.9 percent."

Ives: "That is current law."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Jones: "So, if... Do you know of any school districts that have any of their EAV above 6.9 percent, say, 100 percent above the EAV or 800 percent above the EAV?"

Ives: "I know that..."

Jones: "Are you aware?"

Ives: "...I know that we do have school districts that do have debt that is above this limit right now and that's why this Bill is prospective. So, if you are in that situation, this Bill allows you to work yourself out of that... that and with no penalty."

Jones: "So, another portion of your..."

Ives: "And it also says that if you got exceptions here in this Body to exceed your debt limit that that still stands."

Jones: "Thank you, Representative. There's another Section of your Bill that goes to if the Governor declares a disaster in the school districts."

Ives: "That was Amendment 2. That was taken out."

Jones: "So, Amendment..."

Ives: "Amendment 2 was completely taken out."

Jones: "Okay. So, Representative, why in this Bill would you direct the State Board of Education, if there's an issue, to immediately place a school district above 6.9 percent on the financial watch..."

Ives: "No. That's... that's... that was all part of Amendment 2 when I had a much stricter Bill in the initial interaction of this Bill. I then was looking for a way to solve some of the opposition and that was Amendment 2. Amendment 2 has been then now taken out, so Amendment 3 stands. So, essentially,

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

it's... it's basically debt transparency and debt control in terms of your interest."

Jones: "Thank you, Representative."

Ives: "Mmm mmm. You're welcome."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Lang is recognized."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Lang: "Representative, I understand that this Bill changes the definition of debt. Can you explain that to us?"

Ives: "Yes, it does change the definition of debt 'cause currently in law what districts have to report for debt is their principal. This would include all debt including the interest, the issuance cost, capital appreciation bonds, backdoor referendums that are... are held. So, it includes all your debt. What we plan on doing in the Senate side is allowing them to exceed debt limit for tax anticipation warrants, and so that would be coming out of a debt limit."

Lang: "So, did you say you had an exemption for tax anticipation warrants?"

Ives: "No. I will put that in in terms on the Senate side."

Lang: "So, you recognize that the way your Bill is written today most schools would not be able to even issue tax anticipation warrants. Is that correct?"

Ives: "I don't know about most schools. I do recognize that the state has not been paying schools on time and for that... that there's a reason for them to... to allow them to issue anticipation warrants."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Lang: "Well, wouldn't it be fair to say that under your Bill most schools, if you count everything under your new definition of debt, would not be able to have any additional debt at all?"

Ives: "I... No, I totally disagree with that. What we would find is that they would be... they would be more upfront to their taxpayers about what their debt really is. So, in the case, for example, of my home district that just tried to pass \$132 million referendum, the real cost for that was \$206 million. So, interest... even though they don't want to recognize it, interest has to be paid when you issue a referendum. So, this Bill simply says you have to include that interest cost as part of your debt limit because you don't... you're not taking on debt without interest. So, that's what... that's what we're getting at here."

Lang: "Representative, I totally disagree with your assertion that this will not impact most school. It absolutely will impact most schools because most schools have debt and most schools have... you have to pay interest on that debt."

Ives: "That's right."

Lang: "I think you're changing the rules in the middle of the game. Let's... let's go back... let's go to one portion of your Bill that I find particularly disturbing and that relates to the issuance of short-term debt. So, what you've said here is that no school that's beyond their debt limit, even by referendum, can issue any... either long-term or short-term debt. Is that correct?"

Ives: "Except for the tax anticipation warrants and we change it
 in the Senate."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Lang: "So, if a school is beyond their debt limit, under your Bill, if their boiler blows up and they needed a short-term loan of let's say \$5 thousand to fix it, if they were that tight on expenses, they wouldn't be able to do that, would they?"

Ives: "If they're that tight on expenses and with having zero reserves for a \$5 thousand payment and they couldn't find that in their budget, then they... they must have some bigger problems and they should not be taking on additional debt. I mean, we have debt. I recognize we have debt. We put in limitations way back, probably 20 years ago, saying you can't exceed your debt limit. Since I've been down there, a number of times we have let one school district after another exceed their debt limit and... and that's fine. They came to us; they asked for relief. It was given. What's unfortunate though is the taxpayers have never been told the true cost of that debt limit. So, I don't think... Now, what it does say though also if they had to exceed their debt limit, they could come down here and ask for that relief as well."

Lang: "To the Bill. As the Representative indicated earlier, I had a Bill that's similar to this subject but doesn't do what this Bill does. My Bill said that if a school district needs a debt limit exemption for a long-term debt. In my... the case of my school, they were building a new school building and they went through referendum and they were... they had public hearings and they disclosed all the costs. And the people voted for it at a... at a referendum that they should be allowed to do it. This Bill goes way beyond that. And this is an important Bill for your school districts, Ladies and

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Gentlemen. Under this Bill, if your school district needs a short-term loan to fix an emergency problem, they will not be able to do it if they're beyond their debt limit. Now, we may not want them beyond their debt limit, but the fact remains that these schools have to run. If they have a leak in the roof, if the boiler blows up, if there's some emergent problem in the school and they're beyond their debt limit, then they would not be able to fix that roof, they would not be able to fix that boiler, they would not be able to deal with the emergency problem in their school. Additionally, we elect school board members so that we have local control. Now, in the City of Chicago they don't elect their school board members, but there's a wonderful Bill to accomplish that. But everywhere else in the state school board members are elected. Now, are we about the business of taking the power away from school boards? Why do we let them elect school boards if we don't give them the ability to fix problems in their own schools? Some people around here on this floor talk about local control until they have a Bill that says, well, I don't want local control on this thing. We have a responsibility to have a philosophy in this chamber that we are either for local control or not. So, if you want to be for local control, you can't be for this Bill. The Bill we already passed out of this chamber with a substantial number of votes protected local control and protected taxpayers by being open and transparent and have public hearings and do all of those things. This Bill takes the power from local school districts. This Bill takes away their ability to deal with emergencies.

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

So, accordingly, this Bill is not well drafted; it's not even well intended. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Ammons is recognized."

Ammons: "Thank you, Mr. Sponsor. Just one quick question to the Sponsor of this Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Ammons: "Thank you. So, if a school district is unable to issue tax anticipation warrants during the cycle of funding where either the state is slow or the tax roll is off-cycle, what would a school district do until that money comes through?"

Ives: "Well, that's what a tax anticipation warrant's for. It allows them to issue that debt as they wait for those taxes to come in."

Ammons: "But if their limit... If they've already reached their limit, then what would the school district do in that case?"

Ives: "Well, they can... they... in the Sen... in the Senate, if we get this part fixed, then they can issue a tax anticipation warrant above their debt limit."

Ammons: "And what would they do like right now... what do they currently do right now, if they... if they have a... a financial issue they need to address?"

Ives: "They take on more debt and they never tell taxpayers about it. And they do a backdoor referendum; they never tell taxpayers about it. And then they come up and they've never been responsible for their debt. And then they just add it on to debt and then when they want to run a referendum and they're over their debt limit already, they come back down here and they ask to take on more debt. And they give them... dig themselves a bigger and bigger hole until we have District

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

210 that took on a half a billion dollars in debt with less than 7 thousand students. And then you find yourself with no flexibility at all. So, essentially what I'm doing is I'm adding transparency so the taxpayers know how much debt their school district took on including all the costs, the interest cost, the issuance cost, all the debt, the backdoor referendum debt. Everything that they try and do when they sneak past taxpayers, they need... we need to control this. And if you're after a debt limit, they can work themselves out of it. But essentially that's what this Bill does. This Bill says..."

Ammons: "I appreciate the Lady..."

Ives: "...that you need to understand what your debt is. You need to be responsible about your debt. And if you haven't built up reserves, then maybe you need to build up a cushion in case your boiler blows. But that's right. This is why I call it the Debt Control Taxpayer Protection Act 'cause it's important that we do this. Now, at any time... at any time..."

Ammons: "Representative, if I could just finish out..."

Ives: "...they're free to come down here and do it."

Ammons: "...I'll just let you have the floor back..."

Ives: "Okay. Thank you."

Ammons: "...and others can answer questions."

Ives: "All right."

Ammons: "I just want to speak to the Bill, quickly. That under this Bill, without fixing what is an obvious gaping problem in this Bill, your school districts who absolutely have to have public meetings to talk about issuing tax anticipation warrants currently it is a public meeting held by your school board. So, if your school boards are having secret meetings

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

that are not public so that the public knows what debt that they're issuing, that you actually have a different problem that this Bill does not address. And so, what I would ask our Members to do is to vote 'no' on this Bill because this Bill would make sure that your school districts cannot function or that they will have to raise property taxes even further in order to address the needs of the school district. And I'd ask for you all to vote 'no' on this Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Moeller is recognized."

Moeller: "Thank you, Speaker. To the Bill. It's my understanding that this... that this Bill, were it to pass, would prohibit school districts from actually saving taxpayers money. It would prohibit school districts from refinancing existing debt to achieve a lower interest rate and to spread out the payments and their debt burden in order to alleviate the tax burden on its citizens. It's contrary to good government. It's contrary to local control. And I strongly urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Zalewski is recognized."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Zalewski: "Jeanne, my..."

Ives: "Yes."

Zalewski: "...my analysis says that a provision in this Amendment says that you... the Bill removes the school district's ability to exceed their debt limit. If the Governor declares a disaster within the..."

Ives: "That..."

Zalewski: "...school district..."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Ives: "That's Amendment 2 that was taken out."

Zalewski: "House Floor Amendment..."

Ives: "Yes. And the House Amendment 2 was taken out. Amendment 3 governs... I had a much stricter Bill. So, anyway, I explained that."

Zalewski: "I... why... well, I want to clean the record. Just... so, sure, our analysis of House Floor Amendment #3, which is the one that was adopted, correct?"

Ives: "Yes, it was."

Zalewski: "Says it removes the school district's ability to exceed their debt limit if the Governor declares a disaster within the school district or upon the Governor's approval for any other reason. Is that accurate?"

Ives: "No. That is not accurate. That should be out of the Bill at this point and it... that was part... that was to answer a question that came up earlier in the first iteration of the Bill."

Zalewski: "I apologize."

Ives: "We then take... took that out."

Zalewski: "Okay."

Ives: "No problem."

Zalewski: "I apologize."

Ives: "No problem."

Zalewski: "I misread our analysis."

Ives: "No, it's very confusing. I understand."

Zalewski: "This... Do you still have opponents to the Bill? All of them?"

Ives: "I'm sorry, what?"

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Zalewski: "So, do you still have your... Are all of the opponents on the Bill still opponents?"

Ives: "Probably."

Zalewski: "Can you... can you ex... can you briefly explain their opposition?"

Ives: "Okay. So, obviously, school districts want to be able to take on as much debt as they ... as they possibly can. They know that it's easy for them to take on backdoor referendum debt. They know that they can... like in our school district they can take up to \$10 million every year and really not have anything but one meeting about it. So, they'd have to go to referendum for that type of stuff. So, they want... and they also don't want to include the interest as part of their debt. So, they al... the other thing that they've been trying to do is they're doing capital appreciation bonds. So, they stack debt and then they stack on interest, so when we can do... And this really happened a lot in Chicago. And where you take out interest only loans and then towards the end of the debt servicing period you pay off the principal. Well, one, that's very costly for taxpayers. Two, it allows them to then have ... they had normal referendum debt and then they're willing to take on more debt. They say, well, if we take an interestonly loan at the front side of this, we don't have to count it against our debt limit because the interest doesn't count against our debt limit. So, we're going to stack principal on top... for one loan on top of interest with the other loan. And we'll just not exceed our debt limit at all and it'll be fine so."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

- Zalewski: "What if... what if a school district finds itself in a position of being low on cash flow and having to take a short-term interest for the purposes of payroll? Under this Bill, would they be able to do that?"
- Ives: "Well, if they had tax anticipation loans, they... they... when we fix it in the Senate, then they would be able to do it, if they were anticipating taxes coming in. If the state was late in paying them, then they would be able to do so."

Zalewski: "Who... who's your Senate Sponsor?"

Ives: "Well, I have a hostile Senate Sponsor right now, be honest
 with you. You know that."

Zalewski: "So, what hap... how are we going to be able to fix a..."

Ives: "We're trying..."

Zalewski: "...House Bill in the Senate with a hostile Senate Sponsor?"

Ives: "Yeah, exactly. Isn't that sad? So, we're trying to change
 sponsorship."

Zalewski: "Jeanne, I appre... To the Bill. I appreciate your passion on this issue. You always give a rigorous evaluation of our Bills and I think you've been able to answer the Bills in a rigorous way on this. But with a hostile Senate Sponsor and a commitment to fixing it in the Senate, that creates a very difficult dynamic for, I think, our side of the aisle on this. So, unfortunately and respectfully, Mr. Speaker, I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Willis is recognized."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Willis: "I'd like to read an e-mail that I got yesterday from the opp... number of opponents to this Bill. And hopefully, it will give some clarity. And while I did substitute into committee when the Amendment came through and I agree that many of these people were late to the table, I think we need to still take their concerns into check on this. So, let me go through some of the key points that they brought out. So, the amount of interest to be paid on bonds since the calculation of the debt limit which would be different from how debt is calculated in other states and how it is considered traditionally in Illinois as affirmed by the Illinois Supreme Court is a main concern. It also prohibits refinancing beyond the term of the original bonds and cannot exceed final maturity date or push out the payments... the payment of the debt service longer than two... 20 years even if its statutory exemption to the maximum 20 years has been granted or could be granted by the General Assembly also is prohibited. It prohibits of the issuance of new debt including the tax anticipation warrants of a district that exceeds beyond the debt limit. It also prohibits the issuance of capital appreciation bonds."

Ives: "This is a great Bill."

Willis: "This Bill requires certain information to appear on the ballot questions for the voted bonds. It also requires certain information be given to the public regarding the amount of property taxes needed to pay for the bonds extendable against a median-sized home. These are challenging financial times in Illinois. Given the continued stalemate in Springfield over an official budget, significantly delayed mandated

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

categorical payments to school districts and legislative proposals calling for a property tax freeze and changes to the educational funding formula, school districts need the ability to responsibly manage their own finances, possibly issue new debt beyond the state not resolved in the finance... the fiscal issue and as necessary relieve the tax burden on the community. This was a letter that was sent to me by the opponents and then he lists off the opponents to this Bill or this ... certainly this final Amendment: the Chicago Public Schools, ED-RED, Illinois High School District Organizations, LEND, LUDA, SCOPE, the Illinois State School Management Alliance, IEA and IFT. That's a list of pretty much everybody that is in the education field. This came from three different superintendents in my district. Pretty much all of the districts in DuPage County are opposed to this Bill. You, as a Member of a Legislature in DuPage County, cannot ignore these superintendents. You have admitted that we need to do additional... you need to do additional work on this. I would urge you to pull it from the record, fix it, come back next Session and let's look at it better. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Ives to close."

Ives: "Thank you very... thank you very much for the spirited debate. I... I do understand that for many of you this is difficult; however, I... just a couple of points of clarification. One, you can... you should not refinance your debt past the term that you told taxpayers in the first place you were going to have. Number 2, this Bill fully allows you to refinance at a lower rate or for a shorter term. So, that was incorrectly stated on the House Floor. I will tell you

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

this is really important for taxpayers to understand the debt that's being taken on and for it to be an all-in amount. I will also say, having just gone through a referendum in our local school districts, the school districts themselves provided all the information on the median cost of a homeowner. They proudly display that all the time. So, that's not really burdensome. Again, I think taxpayers, especially when you look at District 210 and around other states, have no idea of the amount of debt. We put a Bill in place years ago saying your debt is limited. This Bill simply clarifies exactly what is debt. Interest is debt. Interest is debt when you go to take a mortgage out. They look at your property taxes. They look at your cost. They look at everything. And we need to be just as fair to our taxpayers when our school districts decide to take on debt. I would appreciate your support on this Bill. And I... I, with the intent to work on this in the Senate, I ask for your 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 459 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. With a count of 43 voting 'yes', 70 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 459, having failed to reach the Constitutional Majority, does not pass. Mr. Clerk, House Bill 1776, Representative Martwick. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1776, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Martwick."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Martwick: House. House Bill 1776 is a Bill that would create an elected governing board for the City College system... the Community College system of the City of Chicago. This is a Bill that was run in the 99th General Assembly; then it was House Bill 4312. And that Bill passed out of this chamber 112 to 2. So, clearly it was a Bill that received broad bipartisan support. The Bill is unchanged. It is the exact same format. It passed out of here sort of later in May and it never got through the process in the Senate. So, we're bringing the Bill back. Again, this would create an elected representative school board for the Chi... Chicago City Colleges. Currently, that board is appointed by the mayor of the City of Chicago. This board... this Bill would create a board of governance that would cut the City of Chicago up exactly as the CPS Bill that I carried last year would do, cut it up into 20 unique districts and there would be a President of the board that would run at-large in the City of Chicago. Again, this is a Bill that was worked on bipartisan... in a bipartisan fashion. It received 112 votes last year. I ask for an 'aye' vote. Be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Andersson is recognized."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Andersson: "It looks like, according to our analysis, the Illinois

Community College Trustees Association is opposed to the

Bill. Is that your understanding?"

Martwick: "Yes."

Andersson: "Do we know why?"

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Martwick: "Yes. So, their opposition was technical in nature. They believe that... that the... and again our legal staff, this is... disagrees with their analysis, but they believe that there needs to be a referendum in the City of Chicago in order to change the governing structure. Our legal staff believes that we can do it via legislation."

Andersson: "Yeah. I would tend to agree with your analysis on that. All other community colleges, higher ed, colleges like this, are they all elected?"

Martwick: "All of them. All public universities and community colleges have elected governing boards."

Andersson: "Except these."

Martwick: "Except for the City Colleges."

Andersson: "All you're doing is bringing this in line with the rest of the state."

Martwick: "That's my hope, yes."

Andersson: "I think it's an excellent Bill. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Martwick: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Martwick to close."

Martwick: "I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor... Representative Lang in the Chair, Mr. Clerk. Thank you all. Pleasure... it's a pleasure to work with you. Those in favor of Mr. Martwick's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Meier, Spain. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes', 3 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

declared passed. House Bill 3817, Mr. Clerk. Representative Nekritz. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3817, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Nekritz."

Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In April of 2016, the Juvenile Justice Commission issued a report entitled Burden for Life. The Juvenile Justice Commission is a federally mandated state advisory group to the Governor, the General Assembly and the Illinois Department of Human Services. They had three report. One was to enhance recommendations in their confidentiality protections for the juveniles involved in the criminal justice system. The second... the recommendation was to increase access to expungement. And the third was to confirm that a juvenile adjudication is not a criminal conviction. House Bill 3817 implements the recommendations of the Juvenile Justice Commission. Ιt didn't ... it enhances the confidentiality protections by including municipal ordinance violations in the confidentiality protections and closing some loopholes that exist in current statute. It also require... allows for automatic expungement for a number of crimes provided that there has been no additional arrest or involvement with the criminal justice system by the juvenile. And it does confirm in a very clear statement that juvenile adjudications are not criminal convictions. Be happy to take your questions."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Durkin."

Durkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. This past week there's been a lot of emotion on the floor and a lot of

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

tension. I just want to say that we got a long month ahead of us, the month of May. And there is... there are issues that we going to have agree... disagreements and disagreements. But I think that starting today we need to work in a more collaborative manner. I'm prepared to do that. Now, with respect to this Bill and also a Bill that Representative Lilly's going to present to you in a little bit, which is another issue regarding reforms within the criminal justice system, expungement and sealings, things which we have seen over and over again. Some people have suggested that there is some fatigue on this side of the aisle and yes, there is 'cause we continue and we will continue to work with you and we have in the past on issues of this nature. But in the spirit of bipartisan cooperation and also to try to make our lives a little easier and for us to work in a collaborative manner, I would suggest that Republicans... that we support this Bill as a gesture of good faith for us to continue to work in a good manner where we can have good discussions but also know that while we will support matters that are important for you, all we ask is that you return the same type of good will. And I know that you're that type of person, Representative Nekritz, so I'm encouraging the men and women on this side of the aisle to vote 'yes' in favor of this Bill. And also, there's another Bill which I've had a number of ... a number of discussions with Representative Lilly which is a Bill which deals with sealing of cri... certain past convictions. And in that vein, I will be supporting that legislation as well, as I stated with this, for us to be able

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

- to foster more cooperation and a better dialogue between both sides of the aisle. Thank you."
- 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Chapa LaVia, Hurley, Rita. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 82 voting 'yes', 33 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, House Bill 3539, Mr. Halpin. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3539, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. This Bill was read a second time a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Halpin, has been approved for consideration." Speaker Lang: "Mr. Halpin on the Amendment."
- Halpin: "Yes. The Amendment, Floor Amendment #1, Mr. Speaker, amends the process by which a contract could be voided under the… under law, moves it to the CPL."
- 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. Mr. Clerk, House Bill 3539, Mr. Halpin. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3539, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Halpin."
- Halpin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What House Bill 3539 does is create a program for contractors that do business with the

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

state to certify that they are an equal pay employer. It provides for a four-year certificate at a small cost of \$150 and it requires those employers to provide information to the state that they are governing under equal pay and they're treating their men and women employees the same way. I believe we have an obligation to the people of Illinois to make sure that our vendors and our contractors are meeting their federal and state duties to pay men and women equally for that equal work. And I would ask for a 'yes' vote. Happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andersson."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Andersson: "So, businesses that want to do business with the state have to provide this certificate, correct?"

Halpin: "Yes. They apply for that certificate and they... they represent to the state that they meet the requirement for the Equal Pay Act."

Andersson: "Is there... And how often do they have to do that?"

Halpin: "Once every four years."

Andersson: "And you said it was \$150 fee to do that?"

Halpin: "That's correct."

Andersson: "Okay. And what form of certification is this? Just I hereby certify that I am obeying the law in these various categories or do they have to pri... provide proof? What's the standard here?"

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Halpin: "They do have to provide proof and there is an audit procedure from the... from the state in order to try to verify that that is correct."

Andersson: "There's an audit procedure? Is that..."

Halpin: "Yes."

Andersson: "...what you said, yes?"

Halpin: "Yes."

Andersson: "And how often is that going to occur?"

Halpin: "Mr... Mr. Representative, that is at the discretion of the agency, their procurement officer."

Andersson: "Do we have any idea of the fiscal impact of that to IDES?"

Halpin: "I... Yeah. On first read... My understanding is that the... the fiscal impact cannot be determined with certainty based on they're not sure how many... you know, how many people need them. Okay. So, according to the Department of Employment Security, the... I mean, the initial start cost for the program range from seven and a half million dollars to 11 million dollars."

Andersson: "Seven and a half million to what?"

Halpin: "Eleven million."

Andersson: "All right. And you said that there is some requirement of proof in the submission. What is that? What do they do? What do they have to prove?"

Halpin: "That the... they track number of employees, number of male employees, number of female employees, the wages paid, you know, on an equal basis."

Andersson: "Okay. So, on an individual name by name basis they..."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

- Halpin: "Well, you know, my intent is certainly not to require individual identification information. But they are required to provide on an individualized basis to... to demonstrate their payment on women equally."
- Andersson: "Okay. I also understand from our analysis that the audit can be triggered by a complaint as well. Is that correct?"

Halpin: "I believe that's correct, yes."

Andersson: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. Seven and a half million to eleven million dollars startup, as you have often heard me say and I will say again, we can't afford it. We are broke. I think that the concept is good. I certainly support the idea that people obey the law, but quite frankly, right now, we cannot keep passing, day after day week after week, more expense to the state. At this point, I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davis."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

- Davis: "Representative, I certainly appreciate what you're attempting to do. One question that I do have, could you explain what the penalty provisions are with regard to this Bill?"
- Halpin: "As part of the penalty provisions you can have your equal pay certificate revoked under which you would not be able to bid on additional contracts with the state. Another potential penalty would be that an existing contract could be revoked or voided."
- Davis: "Okay. When you say they are unable to bid on contracts with the state, is that for a specified period of time?"

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Halpin: "It is not. It's my intention that, you know, if at a certain point they could demonstrate that they are now following the equal pay regulations, that they would then be able to reapply. It's not my intent to be a permanent debarment."

Davis: "Well, I just wonder, unless there is some type of real hammer... and I appreciate what you're doing and I'm going to support it... if there's not a real hammer, I'm just wondering, you know, how easy someone can violate this and then get back into good standing with the state. So, I would strongly consider that as this moves to the Senate that you consider maybe not allowing participation on contracts for a specified period of time. If you're serious about wanting them to comply to make sure that equal pay is important not only just to get the certificate and whatever the audit procedures are, but if they violate it and maybe they violate it more than once or twice, you know, two or three times in a period of time that they then be barred from participating in contracts for a period of time. I have a Bill that's coming up, hopefully very soon in the next day or so, House Bill 2664 that speaks to violations with IDOT contractors that they will be barred from participation for a period of time if they fail to... to do some things. So, it is something that's reasonably acceptable, I think, at least on IDOT's side maybe on some of the other contractual obligations as well. So, I would strongly encourage you to consider it."

Halpin: "And I certainly appreciate that feedback, Representative."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hays."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Hays: "I want to be sure I'm clear on the dynamic here. Would it be accurate to say that following the pay law now... I mean, that is the law now... I mean, the companies are currently required to follow the letter of the law as it's written now, I mean, literally. Is that accurate?"

Halpin: "That is correct."

Hays: "And so, what your Bill proposes to do then is charge a company or a contractor \$150 for a certificate to suggest that they are following a law that's already required to follow."

Halpin: "That is correct. What we have seen over the past several years is even though we have these equal pay laws and regulations on the books women are still making 79 cents or even less if you're a woman of color and so, this is a way for the Illinois... for the State of Illinois to prioritize and reemphasize that if you're going to have the privilege of doing business with the state, then you've got to demonstrate that you are following those laws. We hold you to a higher standard, if you're going to be getting taxpayer money."

Hays: "And I appreciate that answer. And to the Bill. You know, I agree that the equal pay issue is very important. I voted for the Bill yesterday, but I do think that the notion that we're going to now charge businesses to get a certificate to prove something they're already required by law to do and would be eliminated from participating in public contracts if they don't follow the law and then layer on top of that a cost… at least my analysis suggests… would be seven to eleven

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

million dollars that I think we could all readily agree we simply do not have, is really duplicative even if the goal and the intention of the Sponsor is a noble one. I think in this case it's duplicative and it's really charging business to get a certificate that only suggests that they're doing what they're already required to do. I would... I would suggest a 'no' vote as it's simply not necessary. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davidsmeyer."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Davidsmeyer: "So, what... what size company would this apply to?"

Halpin: "It's all... all companies that are seek to have a contract with the state. It's not restricted to any particular size."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. So, if I run a dump truck and I'm delivering a load of rock to a prison, I would have to show that I personally pay myself as much as the empty seat in my truck."

Halpin: "If you have, as a truck driver are... have bid on a project or bid on a grant that... with the State of Illinois..."

Davidsmeyer: "Yeah."

Halpin: "...and as part of that application process you would have to demonstrate that you already have an equal pay certificate.

That's correct."

Davidsmeyer: "So, as a small business, I'd have to pay 150 bucks for that... for the right to do that."

Halpin: "It'd be \$150 for a four-year certificate, less than \$40 a year."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. What about large companies that actually contract with the State of Illinois to do some of these audits. Would they also have to do this?"

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Halpin: "If they are doing business with the State of Illinois, they are covered and would be required to have that equal pay certificate."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. So, would this be just for people who are con... from those companies that are directly cron... contracted to the state or would it be every single employee from that company. So, if it's a large accounting firm that's a nationwide accounting firm, would you have to show all of your pay records for your entire corporation throughout the... throughout the nation or would you just have to show it for the individuals that are specifically working on that job?"

Halpin: "Yeah. And part of... part of that will depend on whether or not the... the contractor or the business entity is abiding by the Federal Law or the particular state regulation. He would need to provide enough... enough evidence that you're meeting your state and your federal obligation."

Davidsmeyer: "So, how... how would one... how would one do that? I mean, it... explain a nationwide corporation."

Halpin: "Well, the first thing..."

Davidsmeyer: "How would they show that they are?"

Halpin: "Sure. The first thing I would mention is that a lot of this data that is going to be required under this Bill is data that's already required to collect for the purposes of Federal Law. So, I mean, the information you're talking about is all information within the control of the company. As a Representative earlier said, this is already the law and they need to be providing this information or at least tracking this information anyway to make sure they're in compliance. This is not an additional burden other than that

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

information has to now be provided to the state in order to get the certificate."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. And that would depend on the type of contract. I mean, if you're a... if you're a... a building contractor or something of that sort, you're paying prevailing wage. So, do you still have to provide that information? And... and on those jobs, they currently have to provide that information for anybody who directly works on that job as opposed to anybody who may work in their accounting department..."

Halpin: "They..."

Davidsmeyer: "...or who may do their HR or whatever other areas that their business has?"

Halpin: "It's not my intent to restrict it just to the folks working on that job. The intent is to make sure that the employer as a whole is following the state and federal equal pay laws."

Davidsmeyer: "So, you're going to request the wage information for every single person that works for that company?"

Halpin: "We're requesting enough information so that the employer can demonstrate that they're following the law and making sure they're paying men and women equally. It doesn't necessarily need to be on an individualized basis and... but they have to provide enough to demonstrate that they're paying men and women equally."

Davidsmeyer: "Are we... are we lacking requirements and things like that on businesses as is? I mean, our business environment already requires all sorts of, you know, prequalifications and all that stuff. So, we're adding another layer to that?"

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

- Halpin: "We need to have whatever layers are required to make sure that people are following the law. You can have as many member or business regulations as you want. If those businesses aren't... if those regulations aren't being enforced, you know, they're worthless. What we need to do is make sure that we're making it a priority, if you want to do business with the State of Illinois and take taxpayer money that you are following those equal pay laws. That's really the bottom line for this Bill."
- Davidsmeyer: "So, currently, my understanding is if you... if you violate a contract with the State of Illinois, you're barred from bidding on work for three years. Would that be the case under this?"
- Halpin: "Okay. So, a violation of this results in your... your revocation of the equal pay certificate. It's not a specific board debarment. If you, at a later time, would reapply for that equal pay certificate to demonstrate that you are meeting the obligations of the law, you would be reinstated under those circumstances."
- Davidsmeyer: "But if you... if you get this certificate pulled, you can no longer continue working on the contract that you currently have, which means you're walking out on that contract which also causes you to have a three-year disbarment from bidding, even if it's an accident. Even if it's something that nobody knew about."
- Halpin: "Yeah. That would... that would depend on the procurement officer. So, if you're in the middle of a contract and you're certificate gets revoked, the procurement officer has the

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

dis... I think they have the discretion to... to reratify a contract or continue that going forward."

Davidsmeyer: "I just think we're going above and beyond to make sure that we have as little possible competition in the State of Illinois when we currently have no money. Do we have any idea... have you talked to the department of... I assume this is the Department of Revenue or who's going to handle this?"

Halpin: "It would be the Department of Employment Security."

Davidsmeyer: "Department of Employment Security. Are they lacking work to do over there right now?"

Halpin: "I mean, I think that's a silly question. I mean, they're
working hard. We have plenty of state employees that are
working hard so."

Davidsmeyer: "We... we've done plenty of silly stuff today."

Halpin: "Yeah."

Davidsmeyer: "I can... I can name a ton of Bills. But I'm asking if they're lacking things to do. I mean, are... are the current..."

Halpin: "I'm sure the department has plenty of things to do on a... on a daily basis."

Davidsmeyer: "So, are the current employees..."

Halpin: "Yeah."

Davidsmeyer: "...going to be able to handle this?"

Halpin: "Excuse me. I'm sorry. I didn't hear the last part."

Davidsmeyer: "Are... are the current employees going to be able to handle this?"

Halpin: "I believe they are, yes."

Davidsmeyer: "So, they won't have to hire a single soul."

Halpin: "I can't... I can't promise that, but I... I believe the department is capable of executing this program."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. They literally have... I'm being told, they literally have to hire people to do this. To be able to audit companies and the additional audits that will happen and... and to go through the paperwork. That's what that seven to eleven million dollar cost is."

Halpin: "Yes."

Davidsmeyer: "And what program are you going to cut seven to eleven million dollars out of to be able to provide this?"

Halpin: "The Department of Employment Security, I believe, is capable of executing this program. I believe the department has estimated these numbers based on another program currently in operation. It's a good program; we need to prioritize it."

Davidsmeyer: "So... so, you're telling me that the Department of Employment Security is currently over budgeted seven to eleven million dollars without this?"

Halpin: "I'm afraid..."

Davidsmeyer: "Because you're telling me that they can handle this, so the extra seven to eleven million dollars they don't need now."

Halpin: "They can absolutely handle this work."

Davidsmeyer: "If you... if you find seven to eleven million dollars to cut from somewhere else."

Halpin: "We need... we do need to fund this program. It's a priority for me. It should be a priority for us."

Davidsmeyer: "Where... where is that coming from? I think if it's important enough to do, it's important enough to fund. So, you tell me, if it's that important, where are you going to find the funding for this?"

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Halpin: "We're going to find the funding for this. It's my hope that we get a..."

Davidsmeyer: "My hope."

Halpin: "...a full year... it's my hope that we get a full-year budget. I hope that we continue to have discussions on that.

And this is a program we need to prioritize."

Davidsmeyer: "With the full-year budget, you have to cut this money from some other program."

Halpin: "I... I disagree."

Speaker Lang: "Representative... Representative..."

Halpin: "I disagree."

Speaker Lang: "I haven't used the timer on this Bill, but you've had the microphone for some time. Can you bring your remarks to a close, Sir?"

Davidsmeyer: "That's fine. I can find other people to yield me a little more time. I don't think you understand. Every day in this place we make new promises. We find new costs. Everything that costs money are you going to cut from senior citizens Meals on Wheels? Are you going to cut from the developmentally disabled? Are you going to cut from K through 12 education? Are you going to cut from higher education? Where are you going to cut from? Or what taxes are you going to raise? You have to do something to find this money. It doesn't magically appear. I think you're... and I'm not talking down to you. I think you completely understand this. I think there's a way that we can come together, but the more costs, the more burden we put on ourselves as a state, the less we're able to handle, the worse we're... the worse we handle everything else. We are currently not doing anything well as a state. So, we're going

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

to add additional things to make sure we continue to not do anything well. We just kind of limp by. So, I think, right now, we have to vote 'no' on this. We can't add any additional cost or burden to the state until we figure out how we're going to fund the current problem... the current programs that we have right now. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Swanson."

Swanson: "Thank you, Mr. quest... Mr. Speaker. Got a question for the Sponsor."

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Swanson: "Just a quick question. A company like John Deere who contracts equipment to IDOT, would they be required to pay this fee and would their reports include their business in Moline or would it also include all the... the payrolls from Waterloo to anywhere else across the United States?"

Halpin: "So, it's not a... it's not a matter of providing the specific payroll identifying information, but they would have to demonstrate on their employer-wide basis that they follow those laws. And I have no... I have no reason to believe that John Deere doesn't already follow those laws. They are a global company. They are a responsible employer. And I have no reason to think that otherwise."

Swanson: "But... but they would be required to pay that \$150 every four years."

Halpin: "Yes. If they are a bidder, offerors, contractor, vendor
 or potential contractor as defined in the procurement Bill,
 yes."

Swanson: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

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

Harris, D.: "Representative, first thing I'll do is I'll come to your defense about the fact that we're not taking money away from social service agencies or individuals that may need it because the Department of Employment Security is a non-GRF agency. In other words, it relies on no GRF; however, it does rely on any number of fees. It relies on dollars which are used for unemployment benefits for individuals who are looking for a job. So, in that respect, if we use seven to eleven million dollars for ... for ... are being used for employment services, we're now taking that seven to eleven million dollars away from individuals who may need them for employment services. But I want to key in on a second on the audit provision of your Bill. It says the Department of Employment Security may audit the business compliance with this Act. So, it's not a... it's not a mandatory 'shall', but it is 'may'. And it says as part of an audit upon request. So, what triggers an audit?"

Halpin: "Well, it says upon..."

Harris, D.: "I mean, as an example..."

Halpin: "So, it says a... Okay."

Harris, D.: "...if I'm... if I'm an employee of... take any company...

Caterpillar... if I'm an employee of Caterpillar and I say I
don't think Caterpillar... let's say I'm a female employee... I
don't think Caterpillar is paying me equitably in relation to
the males. Do I then file a request with the Department of
Employment Security for an audit?"

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Halpin: "I believe anyone can make a... make a complaint or request if they believe that there's a problem with the law. It'd be up to the department to decide whether or not that would actually trigger an audit or require that kind... that level of investigation."

Harris, D.: "Okay. Just briefly then, Ladies and Gentlemen. One, the dollars that he's talking about or may be talking about here by way of seven to eleven million dollars would come out of funds which are used for individuals who are looking for employment because that's how the Department of Employment Security uses its dollars. They do not appropriations; however, I'm concerned about the audit provision of the Bill because if an individual can request an audit and if you look at what's required by the audit: name ... excuse me... numbers of male employees, and female employees, average annual salaries, information on their performance, payments, benefits. It's fairly extensive. And you can take a company like Caterpillar that has ... an individual employee says, well, we're not getting treated fairly or equa... or I mean, not being paid equitably. Then this could trigger an enormously complicated, time-consuming audit, which is nothing more than a business expense for those businesses located in the State of Illinois. I think we have to look at this very carefully. I'd like to clean it up and make it a better Bill. We passed the equal pay Bill yesterday, which is now hopefully going to become the law of the State of Illinois. But I think this one goes a bit too far. And I'd recommend a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Wallace."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields. Ladies and Gentlemen, could we hold the noise down in the chamber, please?"

Wallace: "Thank you. Representative Halpin, I think you've already explained this, but it has been pretty loud. The information that the companies would have to provide to the State of Illinois, it's already information that they have to gather for federal purposes, correct?"

Halpin: "Yes, it is."

Wallace: "But are we at any point now collecting that data as a state?"

Halpin: "I... I'm not aware that we're act... we're collecting that data as a matter of course. But I do know they're required to keep that information. I can... I can check and get back to you though."

Wallace: "Okay. And then, the other question I had was, do you know why companies choose to relocate or what are some of their reasons that they do relocate to states, since that seems to be a major issue in this debate?"

Halpin: "I apologize. Could you repeat that?"

Wallace: "What are some of the reasons that companies choose to go to a state? It seems like they constantly have discussed this idea that Illinois would be less competitive. But I was wondering if you knew a few of those reasons why they would come here and why they would see us as competitive?"

Halpin: "Well, I would hope that they'd see Illinois and our trained workforce and they'd want to relocate here in order to make sure they have qualified employees. And I think that

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

they'd also want to come here to, you know, because we have good infrastructure."

Wallace: "Thank you. To the Bill. I want to thank the Sponsor for bringing this Bill forward. I believe it's a great companion to the Bill that we passed yesterday especially given the fact that yesterday's Bill removed the prohibition from employees to discuss information about salary. I think it's very, very important for us to be able to recognize the value in the work that is provided by all workers in the state whether they are male, female, trans or cis. I think that we also need to recognize the fact that the quality of life is extremely important for when companies make a decision to relocate. Part of that quality of life has a tie to the economic factors. Can you provide for yourself? Can you have a wonderful neighborhood to live in? And I think that women deserve that equally as their male counterparts do. Again, appreciate this particular measure being brought forward. I do encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Halpin to close. Mr. Halpin."

Halpin: "Thank you. Thank you... Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This needs to be a priority for the state. We need to put our taxpayer money where our mouth is and encourage men and women to get... be paid equally. We need to remedy the rights... or the wrongs from the past. A lot of this information is already required on the federal level. And it's less than \$40 per year for a business to get this equal pay certificate. I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

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

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Ford. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 67 voting 'yes', 49 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Rules Report."

Clerk Hollman: "Introduction of Resolutions. Senate Joint Resolution 28, offered by Representative Crespo, is referred to the Rules Committee."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sims is recognized. For what reason do you rise, Sir?"

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

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Sims: "In the gallery on the Democratic side of the aisle, we have some wonderful students visiting us from Iliana Christian High School. Under leadership of their teacher, Jeff White, they are here to learn about State Government and the process of government and this... this laboratory we call democracy. They are leaving Springfield and heading to Indiana... Indianapolis, to learn more about their system of government. So, I'd like you to welcome them to Springfield."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome to the House chamber. We're happy you're here. Representative Bryant is recognized. For what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Bryant: "Sitting in the gallery on the Republican side of the aisle are some ladies from Carbondale, SIU. They're part of the women in leadership, public service and civic engagement.

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

And they're here in Springfield today to kind of watch us in action. I was privileged this morning, along with Representative Flowers, to speak to these ladies. And it was... we had a little bit of fun with each other talking about how we can be on different sides of an issue and we can disagree on things but not be disagreeable with each other. So, I'd appreciate a warm welcome for the ladies from SIU here today to watch us in action."

- Speaker Lang: "Thank you for being with us today. We appreciate it. Mr. Batinick, for what reason do you rise?"
- Batinick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege." Speaker Lang: "Proceed."
- Batinick: "Next to my granola bars here, I have a stack of papers that actually is a budget. It's a rack up of the McCardor, Conti budget with the Bills that were filed. So, if anybody would like just a little four-page synopsis of what a budget looks like, I have one here for you. Come and talk to me about it and grab a copy. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "And take a granola bar. Mr. DeLuca, for what reason do you rise, Sir?"
- DeLuca: "Mr. Speaker, on House Bill 3817, 3817, I'd ask to be recorded as a 'yes'."
- Speaker Lang: "The record will reflect your intention, Sir. Mr. Mitchell, for what reason do you rise?"
- Mitchell, C.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Lang: "Proceed."
- Mitchell, C.: "Members, one year and one day ago, I posted on Representative Kelly Cassidy's wall a very large selection of

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

blondies, with the intention of her just making one recipe, but being Kelly, she decided to make all of them. This year Kelly has in front of her a very large baking book that you can come over and make a selection from and she will bake it sometime before the end of Session along, I believe, with Representative Avery Bourne. So, please come over. Oh, apparently, and Jen Walling is going to be helping as well. And it's her birthday today. So, please come over and select a sweet treat for the rest of Session. I'm very sure that we'll need it. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Sir. House Bill 3785, Representative McDermed. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3785, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative McDermed."

McDermed: "This is a clean-up Bill from the Department of Labor. And it's a fun little Bill because we're trying to clean up some language that remains in their department charter dating back to the late 1800s. So, this Bill removes references to the telegraph, yes, the telegraph, from work that the Department of Labor has to undertake. They no longer inspect employment agencies and... or have police power over employment agencies. They haven't had it in the memory of any person that can even remember back that far. If anyone has any questions about this Bill, I'd be happy to answer them, otherwise, I ask for your 'yes' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andersson."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Andersson: "So, you removed the telegraph?"

McDermed: "We removed being able to give notice to agencies regulated by the department via telegraph. Yes, we did. We're so radical here."

Andersson: "We are. How do you feel about cursive? Do they have to use cursive?"

McDermed: "There's no reference whatsoever to cursive in this Bill."

Andersson: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves, Members. Flowers, Mah. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 102 voting 'yes', 13 votina 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Members, please listen. In an effort to keep moving in the Calendar and get these Bills finished, we're putting... we're going back to the Short Debate rules which includes a two-minute timer. But the Short Debate rules also say one person on each side will debate. So, we're going to enforce that rule and we're not going to allow any extension of time. So, when the microphone turns you off, we move on. The next Bill is House Bill 3216, Representative Wallace. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3216, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. This Bill was read a second time a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill for a third time."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3216, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Wallace."
- Wallace: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a Bill that puts some safeguards in place and puts the basic notion that we should not be doing third-party contracts that may or may not save us any money on to the record. I encourage an 'aye' vote."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

- Andersson: "So, does this apply to all contracts in the State of Illinois that the state enters into?"
- Wallace: "We do need to make sure that these contracts are in the best interest of the state. I do believe that it would be applicable to just about every contract."
- Andersson: "Just about every contract. And so, who's going to determine whether or not a third-party contract is in the best interest of the state?"
- Wallace: "Well, right now, the... the department that is already handling that will continue to..."
- Andersson: "Well, they don't currently do that. So, how are they going to do it?"
- Wallace: "Well, they curr... they currently handle the procurement."
- Andersson: "What's the standard going to be by which they determine this rather nebulous concept of best interest of the state?"

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Wallace: "Well, we do have some examples of just a few dollars being saved and yet, an outside entity was performing the work that perhaps the state workers could have performed. So, I would say that we need to be really looking at this notion of what is best for the state. Or we have instances where it really didn't save any money."

Andersson: "Thank you. To the Bill. This is just another example where now we're going to try to take away some more flexibility from our State Government being able to save money. You know, we have professionals in these organizations. They know how to do their job, Ladies and Gentlemen. We shouldn't be legislating nebulous concepts like what's in the best interest of the state as far as saving money. This sounds to me like just a way of banning, outright, third-party contracts. Third-party contracts are businesses in the State of Illinois. We deserve to have the opportunity to use them and support them. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Wallace to close."

Wallace: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a good sense measure.

And I encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Davis, Drury, Martwick, Nekritz, Sente, Turner. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 64 voting 'yes', 52 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3061, Mr. Guzzardi. Please read the Bill."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3061, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this House Bill." Speaker Lang: "Mr. Guzzardi."

Guzzardi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Pardon the delay. I rise today in support of House Bill 3061. It's a piece of legislation that would divest Illinois's pension funds from any company that takes a contract to build a border wall in Mexico pursuant to President Trump's Executive Order. This Bill is modeled on legislation that we passed in the 99th General Assembly pertaining to companies that boycott the State of Israel. That legislation passed by a vote of 102 to 0. So, the state has clearly... the Legislature has clearly set a bipartisan precedent that we are comfortable with forbidding certain transactions from our pension funds if, indeed, we feel those transactions are not in the public interest. So, with that, I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "This Bill is on the Order of Short Debate. Mr. Andersson, do you rise in opposition? Mr. Andersson for two minutes."

Andersson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, this is the wall, right, Will?"

Guzzardi: "Yes, Sir."

Andersson: "Yes, Sir. All right. So, under... under the language of your Bill, it appears to me that you... we cannot invest in companies that contract with the Federal Government for construction of this wall, correct?"

Guzzardi: "Yes, Sir."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

- Andersson: "Okay. Now, you're familiar with the fact that there are portions of our southern border that are, in fact, fortified right now, correct?"
- Guzzardi: "Yeah. This Bill only refers to wall construction as indicated by the Executive Order of the President on January 25 of this year, so not existing construction."
- Andersson: "Yes, yes, I agree with you. In fact, I read that Executive Order to see what it said. And it includes the existing 2006 wall security requirements. So, right now, we do have sections of wall that need to continue to exist. In many areas of our border, we want to make sure that people can't just sneak around our border control, right? Those are covered by your Bill. So, now, we can't repair those, right?"

Guzzardi: "We certain..."

Andersson: "We can't invest in companies that repair those."

Guzzardi: "Right. So, this Bill pertains specifically to the construction of the border wall as, I mean... you can read in the legislation... it's building the border wall as made to... as it's described in the Executive Order. The Executive Order describes building thousands of miles of new wall along the United States border."

Andersson: "To... to the Bill. The statement that was just made is inaccurate. If you look at the Executive Order, it very clearly does cover what he described, but it covers far more than what he described. It covers the existing maintenance of our existing border controls. And by the way, the other thing you might want to notice is that this prohibits contracts with the Federal Government, says nothing about subcontracts. Well, guess what, Ladies and Gentlemen? Most of the work that

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

is being done will be done by subcontractors. So, there's a huge hole in the theory of what he's trying to accomplish. And all of that... what's the reason for that... to... to stop us from investing. This is a bad Bill. It sends the wrong message. We should not be engaging in this sort of symbolic gest..."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Guzzardi to close."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To refer to the previous speaker's point. In this Executive Order... I'm just going to read it for you... it says in accordance with existing law take appropriate steps to plan, design and build a physical border along the southern border. This is ... this is precisely the language that we're referring to. And... and as you mentioned, it is indeed a symbolic gesture, but I think it's an important one. Today, you know, we celebrated the Holocaust Memorial Day. The United States, unfortunately, has a tragic history of turning away refugees at their time of need, sending them back home to conditions of extreme violence. There are many stories... I don't have the time to tell you now... but the short version is, we have refugee children, women escaping violence coming over our southern border seeking a welcoming home in this country. And I think erecting a giant barrier to those people sends a very wrong message. And I urge your support of this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Those in support 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? Time to vote, Members. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 57 voting 'yes',

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

57 voting 'no'. And the Gentleman asked for Postponed Consideration. House Bill 737, Mr. Meier. This Bill is on Short Debate. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 737, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Meier."

Meier: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. This Bill refers to our CILAs when we... we had the *Chicago Tribune* report. We had one CILA up there that kept moving residents around. This Bill will state clearly CILAs, if they've had their license taken away, they have to continue to care for those residents until the agencies come in and find the proper care for them. The appointed not-for-profit organization will come and give them their options, tell them where they possibly can go and help them get relocated. They cannot be moved around, dumped out on the streets. They will be cared for. I appreciate an lie... 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen, do you stand on this Bill?"

Breen: "I stand on a point of parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Well, let's finish this Bill first."

Breen: "Fair enough."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you. 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? Cavaletto. Mr... Mr. Clerk, please take the record. There are 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Mr. Breen."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Breen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the work of trying to move this forward. If... if the Members do de... want to move for Standard Debate, will we be following the practice? I believe the prior General Assemblies is where you just point and seven Members raised their hand then we moved to, I believe, it's five minutes per side, if that's Standard?"

Speaker Lang: "Sir, we will follow the rules. So, if Members think they want more than Short Debate, let... that Chair will acknowledge that. There's no problem with that."

Breen: "Okay. And... and then, just to be clear. Is that five minutes per side, then or is that moving it?"

Speaker Lang: "We'll get the rules out and..."

Breen: "Okay."

Speaker Lang: "...that seems to be in front of you, Sir."

Breen: "Well, I..."

Speaker Lang: "So, I'll assume you're reading it to me."

Breen: "Well, I'm not quite... No, I'm actually... it's a little bit unclear to me, so I didn't want to..."

Speaker Lang: "Well, we'll clear it up for you shortly."

Breen: "Thank you. Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Ford: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I have the great pleasure and honor to introduce a person from the 8th District. He's down in Springfield because he got accepted at UIS and he will be going to UIS in the fall. And he's in the gallery today, very elated to be here. Prince Washington,

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

will you stand. Stand Prince Washington. Welcome Prince Washington to the Univer... Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Good to have you here. Thank you. Mr. Breen. Mr. Breen, in answer to your inquiry. Seven Members can request Standard Debate, would leave the principal Sponsor with a five-minute presentation, debate by two additional proponents, three Members in response."

Breen: "So, I think that's five per. If they need five, they take five. Is that..."

Speaker Lang: "That's correct, Sir..."

Breen: "Okay."

Speaker Lang: "...I believe."

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

Speaker Lang: "Just so you understand, Sir. The idea here is to move this along and not have 20 people debate a Bill where we're stalling for no reason. House Bill 3083, Representative Hernandez. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill. Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. House Bill 3755, Mr. Drury. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3755, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Drury."

Drury: "Mr. Speaker, House Bill 3755 is what I refer to as the condo owner litigation parity Act. What this Bill does is it levels the playing field between homeowners and condo owners and the condominium associations. Under current Illinois law, the law's extremely unfair to condominium owners when they're in dispute with their condominium association. Specifically, if there's a dispute between the owner and the association, the association can fine the owner. The… the owner has a

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

legitimate dispute the association says you now have to pay our attorney's fees, which can lead up to a hundred thousand dollars or more of attorney's fees. I actually have a case sitting right here where the fees were around a hundred fifty thousand dollars. Any homeowner in their right mind would say even if I'm right I'm forced to pay the hundred dollar fine, the two hundred dollar fine. What House Bill 3755 does is level the playing field. It allows a unit owner who's in a dispute with an association to attain his attorney's fees if he or she is successful in the litigation. There's been a lot of misinformation put out about this Bill about what it does and doesn't do. So, I just want to clarify. This Bill does not take away any rights from the condo associations. They can still, if they're successful, get their attorney's fees. So, if someone is in clear violation of the rules of the association, they can sue and get their attorney's fees just like they did today. What this does is it stops there being in so much litigation amongst neighbors. It requires them and will force them to come together and resolve the disputes without the lawyers involved and all the money that goes into that. I think, you know, the opponents of this Bill there's only... the opponents of the Bill is CAI. And it's important to know that they stand to lose a lot of money from the... they're the lawyers. And they're not going... there's not going to be as much litigation, so they're going to lose the money. So, if you're for homeowners, and there's a lot of them in all of our districts... if you're for the homeowners, you should be for this Bill. If you're against the lawyers just making money off of homeowners, you should be for this Bill. So, I

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

appreciate and would ask for your 'aye' vote on House Bill 3755."

Speaker Lang: "This Bill is on the Order of Short Debate. Mr. Breen, do you stand in opposition?"

Breen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Breen: "And then, Representative, just to be clear. So, this is going to add mandatory attorney's fees if a unit owner sues their condo association and wins."

Drury: "That is not correct."

Breen: "Okay. What... what... Is it not mandatory attorney's fees 'cause it says prevailing party? Then the court shall award of the unit owner from the non-prevailing party reasonable attorney's fees and costs incurred by the unit owner in the litigation or arbitration."

Drury: "The Bill simply allows for attorney's fees. A judge would have to decide whether or not those fees would be awarded just like it has to do today for the condo association."

Breen: "So, it's... so, the word 'shall' award that's usually a mandatory provision, as I understand it."

Drury: "It's the same as it is for the condo right now whenever their attorney's fees are allowed in courts. The court has to... the fee petition has to be filed. I'm actually holding a fee petition right here from the condo association for a hundred fifty thousand dollars' worth of fees."

Breen: "Okay. Wait, wait. So, just to be clear..."

Drury: "I'm... I'm answering your question."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Breen: "Yeah. I know. You know..."

Drury: "Hold on one second. I just want to answer your que..."

Breen: "...to the Bill."

Drury: "I want to answer your..."

"To the Bill. To the Bill. To the Bill. Ladies and Breen: Gentlemen, the word 'shall' is mandatory. We are adding massive attorney fee liability on our condomini asso ... associations. That's the condominium reason consistent opposition amongst numerous organizations and others to this Bill. With respect, there are already ways to deal with these... these disputes. It is unfortunate maybe that sometimes you've got attorneys that have ... jacking up fees on folks. Well, shame on them. But that is not a reason to then start paying everyone's attorney's fees on both sides. Again, this is a mandatory attorney fee provision and that's the reason why you see so many people opposed. Again, we've got a balance here. And we've just passed a lovely condo Bill that was, you know, unanimous through this chamber. Let's wait for that to... to go into effect, see how that works. And then, if something like this is necessary, then we can always bring it back. But certainly it's not necessary today. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Drury to close."

Drury: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "This Bill's on Short Debate. Mr. Drury to close."

Drury: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think it's disappointing that even during the Short Debate that we're going to have misinformation put out there. The fact is this Bill levels the playing field. Right now, attorney's fees are allowed for

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

the associations. Attorney's fees are not allowed for the unit owner. This simply levels the playing field. I've met with the opponents of this Bill. I've told them I'm willing to work on it with them in the Senate. I've been willing to do that all along. But it's important, if we care about the unit owners and we care about them having equity in their homes, that the unit owners be able to have this. This does not add a mandatory fee. This fee would only happen if there's litigation and a party wins and then the court awards the fees, just like it does right now for the associations. This Bill has bipartisan support. I have support from city people who... who have lots of condominiums in their district. I've got support from suburban people. And I've talked with a number of you, have addressed your questions. And I'm willing to continue working on it. So, I ask that today that we stand up for the unit owners. We stand up for having honest debate and not misinformation and that we vote 'yes' on what is a very important Bill and a continuation of the hard work that Representative Thapedi has done and that we show the unit owners, and there's hundreds of thousands of them in the State of Illinois, that we care about them and that we want them to be able to live in their home and settle disputes amongst themselves without all the lawyers involved. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 60 voting 'yes', 49 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

declared passed. Chair recognizes Representative Feigenholtz. She does not wish to speak. House Bill 3044, Mr. Hoffman. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill. 3044. Bear with us. There's a glitch."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3044, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. This Bill was read a second time a previous day.

No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Hoffman, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3044 deals with the... Amendment #1 deals with the issue of prevailing wage. It indicates the Department of Labor shall publish the prevailing wage rates no later than August 15."

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. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3044, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "I was just looking at the bor..."

Speaker Lang: "The... the LIS that we're looking at shows you as the Chief Sponsor. Are you the Chief Sponsor, Sir? Then..."

Hoffman: "I am the Chief Sponsor, yes."

Speaker Lang: "Then ignore the board and do your Bill."

Hoffman: "I'm just very compliant, Mr. Speaker. And when I see something like that, it makes me worry."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Speaker Lang: "Don't worry."

Hoffman: "Okay."

Speaker Lang: "We've got you, Sir."

Hoffman: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "You don't see Mr. Wheeler complaining, do you?"

Hoffman: "No. I..."

Speaker Lang: "All right. Please proceed."

Hoffman: "On the other prevailing wage Bills he would be complaining. I can guarantee you that. Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3044, I believe, has no opposition. What it indicates is that the Department of Labor would publish the prevailing wage rates by August 15. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Davis, Flowers. Please take the record. There are 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3803, Representative Cassidy. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3803, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Cassidy."

Cassidy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House. House Bill 3803 is a new and improved version of something that I brought last year. After hearing some concerns from folks from the other side of the aisle, we worked on new language. We simply ran out of runway. We didn't have time. What this Bill will do is clarify an existing law that create... that

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

really results in simply a tripwire for folks who are returning from prison. The ... the law as it's currently written permits someone to be arrested for association with a known street gang member. What that results in, in many of the communities that folks return to, is someone being arrested simply for being in the company of a member of their family. I've seen arrest reports where a man was being driven to work by his brother. The arresting officer actually wrote that he was being driven to work by his brother, a known gang member and so the guy was arrested. He lost his job. He lost all momentum towards rehabilitation. What this Bill will do is clarify that the person has to be in... involved in activities in furtherance of gang activity. So, that there is clarity and simply being in your neighborhood, simply being in your home, simply being in your community is not a crime. I'm grateful to the folks on the other side of the aisle who helped work on this language. And I ask for your support."

- Speaker Lang: "This Bill is on the Order of Short Debate. Mr. Andersson, do you rise in opposition? The Gentleman indicates he does. Mr. Andersson for two minutes."
- Andersson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, I just want to clarify, Representative. So, this is a separate criminal offense. This is not a parole violation, correct?"
- Cassidy: "Exactly. It does require that someone be on parole for that new offense, but it is not a... it is not simply a violation. I will say that... that of the 216 people who were arrested in 2016 in Cook County, who were charged with this... this offense, absolutely none of them, zero, of them actually had their parole violated. Their parole officers were

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

notified and none of them chose to use this as a parole violation. These folks were then released at their first court date with a new charge, with a new case against them but no parole violation."

Andersson: "And in fact that, when we discussed this before, the parole officer still has the option of violating the person, separate and apart from this criminal act. They have that discretion right now. Nothing about this changes that. Is that correct?"

Cassidy: "That is absolutely true. And the reality remains, this is not a factor that parole officers choose to violate someone over, but that option remains."

Andersson: "Right. So, they have that chance. The reason I ask that question is that there was a Bill... maybe a week or so ago... where it was changing those standards for parole. This is distinct in the sense that we are dealing with a separate criminal statute. The parole officers still can violate, if they choose, apparently they don't and that's fine; that's up to them. Thank you very much..."

Cassidy: "That's absolutely true."

Andersson: "...for the answers to the question."

Cassidy: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 67 voting 'yes', 48 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

- Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 136, Leader Currie. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 136, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. This Bill was read a second time a previous day. Amendments 2... No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 2 and 3 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Speaker Madigan."
- Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie on Amendment."
- Currie: "Thank you. This is an Amendment that would just made some technical clarifications in the Bill that establishes the Abraham Lincoln Presidential Museum and Library as a separate entity of State Government."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reick, do you stand to discuss the Amendment?

  No, you do not. 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 Speaker Madigan and has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. Another technical correction in the... in the underlying Bill. I'd appreciate your support."
- 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. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 136, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."

"Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. There's Currie: been a lot of discussion over the last several years over the proper status of the Abraham Lincoln Library and Presidential Museum. Currently, it is underneath... it is a... a part of the State Historic Preservation Agency. The Governor has proposed by Executive Order to make it a freestanding operation. And this Bill, actually introduced before the Governor's Executive Order, will do exactly that. The idea is that the Museum, a national treasure, the largest archive of Lincoln memorabilia in the world, really needs to be able to operate on its own. It should not be a small appendage to what is essentially a small agency. So, this Bill does exactly what the Governor's Executive Order suggests with one exception. The members of the Board of Trustees, all 11, would actually serve six-year rather than four-year terms. Under the Executive Order authority, the Governor was limited to saying four-year terms, but the Governor's Office is certainly content with what we propose to do here. I would be happy to answer your questions and would be grateful for your support for the Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reick, do you stand in opposition to this Bill?

No. 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? Mr. Clerk, please
take the record. On this question, 113 voting 'yes', 3 voting
'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional
Majority, is hereby declared passed. Now, the Chair

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

- recognizes Representative Reick. For what reason do you rise, Sir?"
- Reick: "Thank you, Sir. I just... I was asleep at the switch on 3803 and would have cast a 'yes' vote on that Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "The record will reflect your intention. Mr. Welter, for what reason do you rise?"
- Welter: "Mr. Speaker, please have the record reflect on House Bill 3803 my intention was to vote 'no'."
- Speaker Lang: "The record will reflect that intention. Mr. Long, for what reason do you rise?"
- Long: "Thank you, Speaker. I was also asleep at the wheel here and I intended to vote 'yes' on 3755. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "The record will reflect your intention. Under the Order of Resolutions, Supplemental Calendar #1, House Resolution 353. Leader Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. This is a Resolution saying that we approve of the... part of the Governor's Executive Order that would make the transfer of the Abraham Lincoln Library and Presidential Museum to its own freestanding agency rather than being part of the State Historic Library. So, I know of no opposition. I would appreciate your support for the Resolution, as you supported the Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Speaker Madigan to close."
- Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of the Resolution. But I also wish to speak to House Bill 136. Both the Resolution and the Bill go together and they're concerned with the Abraham Lincoln Presidential Library and Museum. People from across the globe

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

come to Springfield to experience and learn at the Abraham Lincoln Presidential Library and Museum. It is one of Illinois's greatest resources. Today, the Library and Museum, are under the Historic Preservation Agency, the executive director and advisory board appointed by the Governor. The Bill and the Resolution makes the Library and the Museum its own independent agency. It replaces the current advisory board with a new governing board with the 11 positions appointed by the Governor, subject to Senate confirmation. Members will have knowledge in matters related to history, business administration, libraries and museums, historic preservation, cultural tourism and digital conservation. The current executive director Alan Lowe will continue to serve, but at the end of his tenure the board, rather than the Governor, will appoint the next executive director. Allowing the Museum and Library to thrive on its own is an idea that I have been advocating for quite some time. I introduced this idea and started working on legislation more than three years ago. The Governor spoke of the need to separate the Library and Museum during his first address to the General Assembly in 2015. This past March he issued an Executive Order 2017-1 which made the Library and Museum a standalone agency. I commend the Governor for issuing the Executive Order. I am happy that the Governor and I can agree on this issue. The Bill and the Resolution implements the Executive Order with some changes. Number 1) the Executive Order would establish four-year terms for members; whereas, the Bill would give them six-year terms. For the record, the Gubernatorial Executive Order cannot provide for terms of more than four

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

years. The Governor's Office has agreed to establish longer terms through legislation. Number 2) the Bill allows the board to take necessary actions to transfer the Library and Museum to the federal office of Presidential Libraries under the National Archives. Again, the Governor has agreed to this change. I'm certain that the Library and Museum will become a better institution because of this legislation, the Resolution and the Executive Order. And I would recommend an 'aye' vote on the Resolution. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes', 3 voting 'no'. And the Resolution is adopted. Mr. Butler is recognized."

Butler: "Yep. A point of personal privilege, please."

Speaker Lang: "Proceed, Sir."

Butler: "Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say thank you. Something you probably don't hear a lot from this side of the aisle. I know about your passion for the Lincoln Presidential Museum. I have worked on this issue for a long time, as well as you have, as well as Mrs. Madigan. This is a true treasure for not only our community in Springfield, but the entire state and the entire country. So, I'd just like to thank you for your leadership and your willingness to work with the Governor's Office on this... on this important, important issue. And hopefully, this will lead to other things that we can work together on. So, thank you, Sir."

Speaker Lang: "House Bill 1914, Mr. Reis. Please read the Bill."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1914, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reis."
- Reis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1914 simply allows water co-ops to bury sewer lines along with their... in conjunction with their fresh water lines. We got the fresh water going out to many subdivisions now. We want to bring the sewer back into the city where it can be treated. It's cost-effective. It's environmental friendly. And I ask for your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2771, 2771, Mr. Mitchell. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2771, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mitchell."

Mitchell, C.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I come before this chamber today with the Healthy Workplace Act, also known as paid sick leave for the State of Illinois. This is an incredibly important economic issue and also one of fairness and acc... and access. Right now, more than 40 percent of all private sector workers in Illinois, which is more than 2.5 million people, have no right to paid sick leave. More than three-fourths of the lowest wage workers do not receive paid sick days; whereas, that number is less than

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

20 percent for the top quintile. Let me explain a bit about what this Bill does on some of the concessions we made to business advocates. So, this Bill would provide five days of paid sick leave. It would occur at a... it would accrue at a rate, I should say, of 1 hour for every 40 hours worked. An employee would not be eligible to take that paid sick time until they've worked there for more than 180 days. That eliminates seasonal workers. Originally this Bill provided for 7 days; originally that accrual or that... the employee would have been eligible to start taking those at 120 days rather than 180 days. We made that concession for business. An increment can be as small as 4 hours; originally it was 2 hours, but to accommodate that being half of a retail shift, we also made that change. This is incredibly important issue whose time has come. I believe it is a bedrock principle of the State of Illinois that no worker should lose their job because of a sick kid or a snow day. This has already passed in Cook County and the City of Chicago. And my belief is if it's good enough for Cook County, it ought to be good enough for the rest of the state. I respectfully request an 'aye' vote and look forward to any questions."

Speaker Lang: "This Bill, Ladies and Gentlemen, is on the Order of Standard Debate. Mr. Wheeler is recognized."

Wheeler, K.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You said you were on Standard Debate. Is that correct?"

Speaker Lang: "Standard Debate."

Wheeler, K.: "Can I..."

Speaker Lang: "You can speak up to five minutes..."

Wheeler, K.: "Five minutes."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Speaker Lang: "...if you really want to."

Wheeler, K.: "Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Sir."

Wheeler, K.: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "The Sponsor yields."

Wheeler, K.: "Thank you. Representative, we... I talked on this Bill in committee. I want to just hit some of the points that were made there. Can you explain that construction exemption that's in the Bill, very quickly?"

Mitchell, C.: "I'm sorry. I'm having trouble hearing your question. Repeat it, Mr. Wheeler."

Wheeler, K.: "There's a... there is a construction exemption in the Bill. Is that correct?"

Mitchell, C.: "Yes, that's correct. So, that also exists in the City of Chicago and Cook County. And basically, that is because for the most part... similar also to park districts, school districts... those units are generally covered by collective bargaining agreements that have already sort of negotiated that. You'll note that there's also exemptions for... for other folks who have a benefit that is already sort of equal or greater, for example, paid time off. So, it's sort of holding consistent with that principle saying if someone is already doing something greater and that they ought to be remoted... rewarded as a high... as a high road employer."

Wheeler, K.: "And just to be clear, for construction employees that are not union does this exemption apply to them as well?"

Mitchell, C.: "I believe the answer to that question is yes."

Wheeler, K.: "Okay. That's what you said in committee. I wanted to make sure we had that on the floor as well. There was a

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

couple of different sparks to the language I wasn't clear on. So, for legislative purposes and intent, that is correct, correct?"

Mitchell, C.: "That is correct, Sir."

Wheeler, K.: "Thank you. And then, I have one question about the...
the limit. How soon can a... Let me back up a second. How soon
can an employee take advantage of paid sick leave under this
Bill?"

Mitchell, C.: "So, you have to… so, your… it begins to accrue the second that you start the job, Representative Wheeler, but you have to have worked for at least six months to take your first paid sick day."

Wheeler, K.: "Okay. Thank you for that. And then... that is... Can you describe the fiscal impact of the Bill on the state itself?"

Mitchell, C.: "I would have to check. I don't have a note. The Department of Labor usually does one. Let me look."

Wheeler, K.: "Okay. Our analysis shows that an impact of \$843 thousand."

Mitchell, C.: "That's... that's the number I have, Representative.

I just found it. That's correct."

Wheeler, K.: "All right. Thank you. The limit on the number of sick days that can be accrued, is that set in statute?"

Mitchell, C.: "Yes, it is. It's set at five days."

Wheeler, K.: "At five days."

Mitchell, C.: "Yes."

Wheeler, K.: "Okay. But an employer can raise it higher if they so choose. Is that what I read?"

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

- Mitchell, C.: "They can. So, if an employer... For example, if an employer right now and there are a couple of these and it's actually giving us an opportunity to note... there are some employers who were concerned, hey, we give a more generous benefit. We want clarification to make sure that our benefit applies. Ameren is an example of this. There'll be clarifying language in the Senate assuming it passes over. But right now, there are folks who are offering more generous benefits than five days. They are more than allowed to do that. This is a minimum standard to ensure that every worker in Illinois has at least five days of paid sick time over time."
- Wheeler, K.: "All right. Thank you, Representative. Are any of the business groups of your Amendment been removed from their opposition?"
- Mitchell, C.: "No. This... the business groups, and I thank them for working in good faith on this, have made this a better Bill. But because it remains a mandate, they remain opposed."
- Wheeler, K.: "Okay. Thank you. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, I do appreciate the Sponsor's good intentions and a willingness to work with business groups on this. However, this is just one more item that a small business is going to have a difficult time trying to accommodate because, frankly, they're... we are putting a lot of mandates on them recently in the state and then, the... the end of all things, the Federal Government was request a few, it becomes a difficult process to want to be a small business owner in this state. I believe the Department of Labor said they don't have a way to really track and manage this system as far as accommodating who is in compliance and who is not. While I, again, appreciate the

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Sponsor's approach, I don't think this is going to be a great Bill for small business. At this time, I'd urge you to vote 'no'. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hays for up to five minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Hays: "Representative, some companies have taken to allowing paid time off, in other words, they don't distinguish between a pool of sick days..."

Mitchell, C.: "Yeah."

Hays: "...and vacation. They will say, for the sake of this discussion, you have 28 days. And so, if you call in sick, if you go on vacation, if your child is sick, instead of going through the gyration of I'm taking a... you know, I'm taking a sick day, but I'm really going to the Cubs game or whatever, they say, you know what, whatever the use of your day is, is your business. And what some of these businesses have found is the result is a frequent flyer, the employee that tends to call in sick once a month or so, ends up using their paid time off for that purpose and the employee who rarely calls in sick, et cetera, loves it because they, in essence, can use those days off for their own enjoyment and pleasure. Would this have any impact on an employer who has moved to that kind of a system and finds it to be a win-win situation?"

Mitchell, C.: "I don't believe so, Representative. In fact, the reason why the Bill's written the way it is in terms of talking about sort of benefits there are either substantially similar or, in fact, greater than the ones in this Bill, are exempted is because I... we believe in paid time off especially

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

when it has reached, you know, at least five days or more. It's actually a more generous, more flexible benefit and that those employers ought to be rewarded for offering it."

Hays: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor to close."

Mitchell, C.: "Well, I want to thank everyone for the debate. And I want to thank our partners in the business community for continuing to help make this a better Bill. This is about making sure that someone in the State of Illinois simply does not lose their job because they had a sick kid, ensuring that folks who are our most vulnerable in our economy have a chance to live a halfway decent life and to make sure that our lower income workers who are least likely to have paid sick days will now have access. So, with that, I ask for 'aye' vote. Thank you."

'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Sente. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 66 voting 'yes', 51 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2453, Representative Stuart. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2453, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Stuart."

Stuart: "Thank you. Today I'm presenting House Bill 2453, which changes the way revenue collected from sales tax is deposited into the Downstate Public Transportation Fund to help fund

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

transit districts in 96 counties. People throughout the state depend on public transit to get to work, school, medical appointments. This Bill will ensure that transit districts will not have to drastically reduce services or even shutdown entirely. I'd appreciate a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andersson. This Bill's on Short Debate. Do you stand in opposition?"

Andersson: "Yes."

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

Andersson: "So, my understanding is... I apologize. My... I apologize. My computer is not working. So, my understanding is that this is bypassing GRF and having these funds deposited directly in a Downstate Transportation Fund. Is that correct?"

Stuart: "Yes."

Andersson: "What's the basis for doing so?"

Stuart: "Excuse me?"

Andersson: "What's the basis for doing so? Why are we doing this?"

Stuart: "Because we have transit districts downstate that are under threat of closing and we have people that can't get to school and jobs and medical appointments."

Andersson: "So, wouldn't... wouldn't that be the same argument that we've used for everything that we have a problem with right now?"

Stuart: "This Bill is concerning transportation."

Andersson: "Well, I understand that, but you're taking GRF dollars and now, moving them into a segregated fund, correct? Well, and I don't know if you have an answer to that, if not, what about the lockbox Amendment? How does this affect the lockbox Amendment?"

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

- Stuart: "I'm just... This... this Bill is just really asking for parity with the RTA, making sure that our transit districts get funded. I mean, I've got bipartisan sponsorship on this Bill 'cause we've got people in areas across the state that don't want to lose their public transportation."
- Andersson: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I move to move this to the Order of Standard Debate."
- Speaker Lang: "Do I see 7 hands? I see 7 hands. We'll move it... I see 70 hands. The Bill will be put on the Order of Standard Debate. You may complete your debate, Sir."
- Andersson: "Thank you. So, to the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, once again we're trying to take from GRF to a segregated amount and spend it on things that are laudatory. I don't deny that. But the problem is without a complete budget, without the ability to resolve all our problems, this is just another example we're effectively trying to do a stopgap for now, another small thing. We need a complete budget solution. This doesn't do it. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

Ives: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. So, right now, what you just heard from the Sponsor of this Bill is that essentially it allows parity with the RTA and actually, that's not correct. Because what we have in the downstate transit fund is we don't have parity with the collar counties and City of Chicago folks who use transit. For example, the RTA and its associated entities: the CTA, Pace, Metra, all have a requirement for fare box recovery. That fare box recovery is that essentially that 50 percent of the fare must be... the cost of the fare must be borne by the person who is actually

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

using that transit. That is not true in the downstate system at all. In fact, in the Springfield area, when we looked at the analysis on this, in Springfield, for example, the fare is actually about 9 percent of the entire cost of the fare. So, they are getting a lot of contributions towards that fare. So, I mean, while we're in this budget crisis, we need to just really get a full budget in order to fund this. But the last thing we need to do is start syphoning off special money for special funds especially when there's really not parity up in our area. So, I urge you to vote 'no' on this. It's just... we have need to have a better conversation surrounding all the things that deal with transit and... and talking about the fairness and parity. And this is the wrong direction to go for this Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives, have you completed your questions? Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Yes. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is very simple. And I don't believe what the... I think maybe there's just some misunderstanding what this does. Currently, under our current law, 3/32 of 80 percent of the net sales tax revenue generated by municipalities and counties within the boundaries of any given downstate transit districts. So, that's money that's collected within those districts gets put into a special fund. However, that money has... this just says that money will automatically... automatically be released to the local transit districts. It's their money. It's money we say they're supposed to get. And now, we're not going to wait on the inaction or action of us or anyone else before they get their money. That's all

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

- this does. It's not new money. It allows them to get the money that they... they have been statutorily allowed to get."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davidsmeyer is recognized, the third and final person under Standard Debate. Mr. Davidsmeyer."
- Davidsmeyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this Bill. I think there's a little bit of lack of understanding of rural mass transit. The... the issues that we deal with in rural areas are... there's a lot more lengthy travel to doctor's appointments, to dialysis, to things that are actually needed. All we are asking for here is something that is... already has a current appropriation. So, this is currently appropriated; the money's just not being allocated to it. So, we're not asking for a new appropriation. We're not asking for anything that's not already there. We're just asking that the... the money that we have said should go to it, we're asking that it does go to it. So, I rise in support. And I ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "So, this... the Chair misspoke. The Gentleman was in favor of the Bill. Mr. Wehrli, do you rise in favor or su... or opposed to the Bill?"
- Wehrli: "I... I rise to yield my time to Representative Andersson."

  Speaker Lang: "We can do that. Mr. Andersson for five minutes,
  the last speaker on the Bill."
- Andersson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And actually, I rise to correct an earlier misstatement that I made. My understanding was we were taking from GRF, literally, GRF money to segregate it to this. It has been explained to me that it is not the case. The funds are dedicated and it's a pass-through. So, I

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

apologize for that. With that understanding, I urge an 'aye' vote."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Cassidy, Chapa LaVia, Rita. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 102 voting 'yes', 12 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2810, Mr. Spain. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2810, a Bill for an Act concerning animals. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Spain."

Spain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2810 is an initiative from the Animal Control Association and the Illinois Humane Society. It closes a loophole that exists currently whereby if you are convicted for abusing an animal within your possession, that animal is forfeited from you, but you could potentially get the animal back by having a friend or family member that lives with you adopt the animal and bri... return it to the household where the abuse took place. This Bill closes that loophole. We amended the Bill to make sure it only applied to pets like dogs and cats, which removed opposition from the Farm... from the Farm Bureau. I know of no opponents. I urge 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? Cassidy, Flowers,

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Sosnowski. Mr. Clerk, 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. House Bill 607, Mr. Yingling. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 607, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Yingling."

Yingling: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Illinois has over 7 thousand units of local government, which has led to redundancies and inefficiencies which cost property taxpayers more every year. HB607 addresses this issue by empowering local officials to consolidate their township highway commissions with voter approval. HB607 specifically does a couple things: Number 1) it clarifies existing... existing statute that a township highway commission shall automatically consolidate if it has four centerline... centerline miles of road or less. It also clarifies... Excuse me. The main component of the Bill expands existing... existing State Law that currently applies only to Cook County to every county in the state. The law puts in place a mechanism for voters to consolidate the operations of their township highway commission. So, this is how it works: Number 1) the township board of trustees can place a question on the ballot as to whether the township highway commission should be consolidated into the township board of trustees. Number 2) a majority of voters must vote in favor of the question. Number 3) if approved by the highway... if approved, the highway commission shall be consolidated upon the completion of the highway commissioner's term in office or

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

within 90 days after the election, whichever is later. And then finally, the township board of trustees then becomes responsible for all responsibilities, duties, obligations and tax levies formerly held by the highway commission. I'm happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "This Bill's on the Order of Short Debate. Mr. Riley, do you speak in opposition? He's your seatmate."

Riley: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Riley: "Representative, in terms of incorporating all of the duties of the township of the road district, does the township also get that levy?"

Yingling: "The answer is yes."

Riley: "What's really the difference between what we're doing right now and the fact that the township supervisor is the... the de facto treasurer of the road district? What would you really be gaining?"

Yingling: "So, that would be based on a township by township basis. One of the things that we have to look at, at a statewide level, is as we start to look at ways to consolidate government we have to recognize that Illinois is very geographically diverse, so what might be good for one area of the state could actually be detrimental for another area of the state. So, by giving local control to each township to make a decision that's right for them, that would help alleviate any unintended consequences to other units of... to other areas of the state. So, depending on what a specific situation is for a specific township, they could potentially gain... and I would argue depending... they could gain a large

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

efficiencies with the township board of trustees and the supervisor then having control over the highway levies."

Riley: "Can you just give me an example of those efficiencies."

Yingling: "Sure. So, right now, under... under existing law, the township board of trustees does not have direct control over the tax levies. So, I will give you an example in my township. So, right now, in my township there's about 11 miles of road. There's no mechanism to consolidate that right now for the residents in my township. Right now, our highway tax levies are \$2 million. So, the people that I represent are being taxed \$2 million each year to maintain 11 miles of road. So, by consolidating the functions of the highway commission into the... into the functions of the township board, it provides for efficiency and it also provides for that township board then to enter into intergovernmental agreements with other neighboring townships, with potentially other governmental bodies or private contractors."

Riley: "But you see, couldn't the township... couldn't the existing road commissioner do those same kind of things?"

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

Riley: "Can you do those same kinds of things now in terms of entering into intergovernmental agreements?"

Yingling: "It... it could, yeah."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Yingling, you may close if you wish."

Yingling: "Thank you. Our... our constituents are demanding that we take action to streamline government, eliminate inefficiencies and alleviate the ever-growing property tax burden that... that they have to bear. This is a commonsense measure that has already been working within Cook County. As

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

we focus on government consolidation across the state, it is important to acknowledge that Illinois is very geographically diverse. A one size fits all model could be detrimental to certain areas of the state and therefore, we must focus on providing the tools to local government. This Bill provides local control for our constituents so they can make whatever decision is right for them. I would strongly encourage an 'aye' vote. And I would appreciate your support. Thank you." aker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed

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, Members. Sauer, Sims, Sommer, Turner, Unes, Wheeler. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 75 voting 'yes', 35... 34 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 123, Mr. DeLuca. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 123, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. DeLuca."

DeLuca: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, House Bill 123 creates the Indigenous Peoples Day in the State of Illinois on the last Monday in September of each year. This will not be a day off. There is no cost to the state. I'd like to thank Representative Rita Mayfield for her assistance on this. Thank you very much, Rita. And I ask for your 'yes' vote."

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

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Members, Members, Members. Please record yourselves. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declass... declared passed. The Chair recognizes Mr. Harris. The Chair doesn't recognize Mr. Harris. Mr. Hoffman, 2525. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2525, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. The Bill is read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

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

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2525, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Earlier today we had the Bill that would provide for a not-for-profit workers' compensation insurance program that would allow individuals in... businesses to reduce their premiums. On House Bill 2525, this is the workers' compensation reform Bill that we had passed in the last General Assembly. This Bill, together with the previous Bill, I believe will go a long way in reducing the cost of workers' compensation to employers in Illinois. What does this Bill do? As you may remember, what this Bill would do is provide for a rate in premium review. For the first time in Illinois, we would join most other states in providing for review of workers' compensation insurance rates to make sure that they are adequate and not overly... overly being charged. It provides

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

for safety and return to work incentives to employers. It would provide these incentives to help employers have safety and return to work programs. In addition, it would... it would take the issue of causation and it would, for the first time, do it statutorily put into Illinois law the issue of causation reflecting recent Supreme Court decisions. It ... it would also codify the issue of traveling employees and court decisions in that regard. And it would provide employer relief in that it would provide relief if there is an employee who was injured by cumulative trauma and would allow employers to seek contributions or reimbursements for prior... from a prior employer. Finally, the last provision of the Bill would provide for a Workers' Compensation Premium Rates Task Force will be made up of business and labor representatives. And this is a result of the hearings that we had last year, the subject matters hearings we had as well as the Committee of the Whole. I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andersson. This is... Bill is on Standard Debate, Ladies and Gentlemen. Mr... Mr. Andersson."

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

Andersson: "So, taking it a bit in reverse order, let's talk about what you're codifying as existing case law. Looks like the causation standard is being codified for what current case law reflects. Is that correct?"

Hoffman: "Yes."

Andersson: "So, we're doing nothing on that. Got it. When we talk about..."

Hoffman: "Well, I wouldn't say that."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Andersson: "Really?"

Hoffman: "I wouldn't say that. So, for the first time, Illinois law is going to specifically define causation so that it's statutorily in the law, in the Illinois Revised Statutes as opposed to relying on one court de... from one court decision to the next. There would be a clear, bright standard that will ensure that pe... the employers and employees know what the law with regard to causation is."

Andersson: "So, with respect, that does nothing. To the ... "

Hoffman: "Again, I would disagree."

Andersson: "I... I respect your disagreement. We're just going to have to disagree on that. It doesn't make the changes that need to make workers' comp more competitive, but let's talk about this rate review process. So, you're familiar with the... I know you're very familiar with the workers' comp process. You familiar with the wo... with the concept of lost... lost costs, insurance rates and premiums?"

Hoffman: "Yes."

Andersson: "You want to explain them to me?"

Hoffman: "Well, why don't you explain your concern?"

Andersson: "Well, I'd like to know if you understand them is my concern."

Hoffman: "Well, here's what I can tell you."

Andersson: "Yes."

Hoffman: "Okay. I'm not an insurance expert, maybe you are. I'm not."

Andersson: "Go ahead."

Hoffman: "And... but what I can tell you is Illinois... Illinois is surrounded by states that all have prior rate approval. Every

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

time that we... we talk about the issue or hold this conversation, we talk about competitiveness for our employers and competitiveness in a workers' compensation system. These other states have prior rate review. Okay? What we are saying here is..."

Andersson: "You're not answering my question, Sir. Let me answer it for you. There are elements that come into play when you figure out a rate, okay? And your Bill concerns rates, correct? Trying to set rates. Is that correct? Yes?"

Hoffman: "I apologize. I was talking to legal counsel."

Andersson: "That's okay. Your... your proposed Bill would establish rates, setting rates, yes?"

Hoffman: "Yes..."

Andersson: "Yes."

Hoffman: "...not premiums."

Andersson: "Okay. So, the deal is there are three things that go into rate making: lost costs, which are established and documented from the years passed on the different categories of work. So, an example, an attorney's lost rate might be .80 because we sit behind desks, but someone else in a more dangerous profession would have a... a substantially different one. Insurance rates are recommendations. They recommendations based on averaging. And the third premiums, the things we actually pay, the premium rates. This Bill tries to set premium rates. And the reason for that, the argument is because our rates didn't go down as much as the recommendation of the NCCI, which I think was 30 percent. But that conflates the two issues, Ladies and Gentlemen. What it does is it confuses the recommended rate and the premium.

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Premium is determined from the recommended rate. So, we're there; we're using it. But what we do is you then take into account the factors of the specific business. Their lost ratio, the type of work they do, do they have a safety plan. All of those things affect how much their actual rate is going to be. And by the way, so does competition. Competition for that business affects those rates and brings them down. We have a very competitive market. This would reverse that. And it's interesting. I looked for a study about these... these rate control processes and I was able to find one from 1998. And I asked some friends in the industry, could you get me an updated one? And they said, no, we can't because no state has moved in this direction ever in that time period. States are moving the exact opper... opposite way to a competitive market. We're going the exact opposite way based on the false assumption that this is all about profits. Ladies and Gentlemen, the profits for the workers' comp industry in Illinois over the last five years has averaged 2.78 percent per year. That's their profit. That's it. That is not excessive profit. There is not a problem here that needs to be fixed. This system is working. The profits are very low. The average, if you go beyond Illinois, is about 7 percent. This is the wrong direction. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wheeler for up to five minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Wheeler, K.: "Thank you. Representative Hoffman, we're looking at a couple things here that have been covered. I want to make sure I understand them, the way your Bill intends. Looking at

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

premium review for the first time, right? We're actually going to have the pre-file."

Hoffman: "Yeah. This... so, maybe what... what I can... what I can do is I can attempt to... maybe I haven't done a good job of laying out the way the Bill... the intent of the Bill and what it would actually do with regard to rate review. First of all, there would be rate reviews. So, the previous speaker was correct. There would be rate reviews. Then you do take a lost ratio into account and you then have a premium for an individual employer. See, under this Bill, a employer could... could contest that his premium is excessive as well. So, there'll be prior rate review, prior rate approval and then, there will be in place the ability of an employer to object to their premium."

Wheeler, K.: "Okay. But in your... your conjecture is that this is going to lower premiums?"

Hoffman: "Yes. Yes. The objective is... is that in 2000... and I hate to sound like a broken record 'cause we've talked about this so long... but just to lay it out. 2011 we passed a significant workers' compensation reform package through the Illinois General Assembly. NCCI, which is the rating organization for insurance companies, has indicated there should be a 30... 30... over 30 percent cost reduction in the system... there has been a 30 percent cost reduction system... in the system since that time. What I'm told by employers in my area, and I think employers throughout the state, they have not seen a reduction in their premiums."

Wheeler, K.: "I understand that. Then I agree that we haven't seen that reduction. There may be other factors in place

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

beside the actual rate itself because the premium is not just the linear relationship with whatever the rate is expected... it's going to be. There are more components to it. There's overhead; there's process... somethings that you actually want to have in place. We don't have a lot of time here, so I'll move on to... to just recover the... the idea that... that there are 332 companies that offer workers' compensation reform or workers' compensation insurance right now in this state, correct?"

- Hoffman: "It's my understanding that there are 300 and some... I don't know if it's 32 or 33... 332 companies that are licensed to write in the state. I don't know if they're actually writing in the state."
- Wheeler, K.: "But they could if they chose to so. The reason I bring that up is because one of the things that came up in committee was that the compens... or the you... the savings weren't being passed along to the actual end users, the companies that purchase the workers' compensation insurance; therefore, the insurance companies must be holding back some of these savings. That was part of the discussion we had in committee. Is that..."
- Hoffman: "Well, what I can tell you is what the previous speaker indicated. He used some data that was prior to the 2011 reform with regard to the profits of insurance companies. In 2011, the profits of the… of insurance companies truly were down. And I believe the profits were something like .3 percent, very low. Now, if you look at profits of some insurance companies that do workers' compensation insurance in Illinois, they're upwards of 15 percent."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Wheeler, K.: "But... Okay. I mean, I'm going to real quick, Jay, 'cause I'm running low on time. The insurance companies, you know, I talked to said that their rates are about what Steve said, 2.78 percent profit. So, we're losing money back then before the reforms were put into place. Now, they're making some back. So, over a period of time you're going to average some better than another. My point is this. If you really believe that there is effectively collusion between 330 different companies about pricing in the market, really, we ought to go to the Attorney General of the United States and say this is an anti-trust problem 'cause that's what it would be. It's impossible to get that many companies to agree on something. Let me go to the Bill. My previous colleague on the... or the previous speaker on my side of the aisle talked about causation and codifying it. While I appreciate the Sponsor's intention to actually put it in statute, it's not going to change anything 'cause it's just codifying what we already have. This cannot be characterized as reform that will help business costs. It will not. It absolutely will not. We compare ourselves to other states that surround us. Their costs are lower, period, because their system costs less to run and less to the employer. Not all the systems are perfect. I don't want to be each one of those systems, but we can be more competitive with real workers' comp reform. I wish this... what this was; it is not. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

Ives: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. So, it's interesting because it seems like the Sponsor would like to do something on behalf of business and yet, the opponents that are listed

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

are nearly all businesses. Maybe we should listen to them. And in this respect, why don't we listen to somebody who knows a lot about business and that's Doug Oberhelman, who for many years ran Caterpillar. And I'm reading from an op-ed they did in the State Journal-Register and he basically talked about Caterpillar's deep roots in Illinois. Over the years, they've employed tens of thousands of Illinoisans including 22 thousand work... that are working and raising their families here. He goes on to say that export demand played a huge role in their decision in the latter part of 2011 to announce investments totaling 840 million in support of two Illinois factories. He said sometimes exports drive those decisions, other times it may be logistics. More often in Illinois, the issue's an outlying blow though keep us from investing in our home state. And he goes on to say despite the fact that we've announced plans for dozens of new factories in the last few years and that our workforce in the United States has increased by more than 14,500 people in the last 10 years, we haven't opened a new factory in Illinois in decades. And then he go... he's going on. He says about 10 months ago I wrote a letter to our political leaders expressing my hope that the state would undertake fundamental reforms so Illinois could compete for jobs and long-term business investment that drives growth. Today, he says, we haven't seen much change. Illinois's not done what's necessary to balance its budget, major credit agencies have downgraded the state's bond rating. And Illinois will still be among the most expensive states for workers' compensation insurance, he writes. In fact, he goes on to say, our own comparison of workers' comp

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

costs showed Illinois was far more costly than Indiana, which is consistent with a study by the State of Oregon that shows that we're also more expensive than Iowa and Kansas. He says in... the state dramatically needs to lower work comp crap... costs. He concludes by saying business leaders are making decisions today on where to invest in the future. Illinois must act now with a bipartisan sense of urgency to position itself for future job creation that is being discussed in boardrooms all across the country. He wrote this letter, not last year when he was still the CEO, oh no, he wrote this letter more than five years ago in 2012. That's when he wrote this letter. And these problems still persist today and in fact, they have deepened. So, when we talk about workers' compensation costs, I think the people we need to really be talking to and listening to is the business community that is paying for these. We need, more than anything in the State of Illinois, jobs. We are not going to pull out of this debt file that we're in, the financial pi... you know, debt file until we have more jobs and more taxpayers paying taxes. So, why can't we, just for once, for once listen to our business community and vote for something on their behalf. I'd also like to note in the list of opponents include a number of government entities. We've had people down to testify on workers' compensation and they include government entities. They also include not-for-profits who are also being battered by our worker compensation system here in the State of Illinois. I'm just asking you, please, talk and listen to the people that have to deal with this system all the time. Let's bring jobs back to Illinois. Let's not add anoth... something

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

additional where job... job creators decide to choose a different state over our state. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Three Members have spoken in opposition. Mr. Hoffman to close."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Hoffman: House. I just want to... just tell to... tell this to my friends on the other side of the aisle. This is truly, I believe, an honest, good faith attempt to try and reduce the amount of money that's coming out of employer's pockets here in Illinois and making sure that they are being treated fairly. People who commit fraud who are in... who say they're injured and are ... who aren't, should not receive compensation. Insurers who commit fraud should not be in business. Employers who fraudulently don't have workers' compensation insurance and say they do should not be doing business in Illinois. What should happen here and this is a good faith attempt to have a multifaceted approach to go at prior rate review to make sure that the premiums are reduced to employers. To the previous speaker's comment, in 2010, prior to our reforms on workers' compensation, for every dollar that was spent on a premium and sent to an insurance company about 75 per... about 78 cents was sent back in claims... and paid in claims. Now, since the reform, the most recent Department of Insurance information indicates for every dollar spent around 50 cents is sent out in claims. So, to say that insurance companies aren't receiving as much and sending out less is simply wrong. Now, are they making a profit? I don't know. I can't tell because I can't see into their books. Are they paying the CEOs big bonuses? I don't know. Are they paying adjusters

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

more money? I'm not sure. All I know is this. They are keeping more money than they have brought in, in a long, long time and it's all as a result of the hard work we did. So, if you look at the numbers, it's hard to say this isn't a reasonable approach. To look at other states, it's hard to say this isn't reasonable approach. I understand. You talk causation, you talk about traveling employees; you talk 'til your blue in the face about whether you believe that the size of awards for workers' compensation is reasonable. But the bottom line is this, if a person in Illinois is hurt at work and they're honestly hurt at work, we shouldn't have some red herrings so they and their family suffer. That's it. And if an employer is... can't pay the premium and they should be able to make sure that that premium is a result of a reduced amount that should be in place as a result of our taxes here in 2011. That's why I believe this is an honest, fair approach and will reduce premiums for employers all throughout Illinois while making sure that the legitimate injured workers are taken care of in a fair manner. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Andrade, Harris. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 66 voting 'yes' and 50 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3095, Mr. Stewart. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3095, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Stewart."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

- Stewart: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 3095 amends the State Police Act. It changes the educational requirements to be able to apply to the State Police. I know of no opponents. And I'd certainly ask for your 'yes' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Guzzardi, Phillips. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. There are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3502, Representative Conroy. Representative Conroy. Please read the Bill. That's 3502, Representative Conroy. Let's get the right person giving the signals."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3502, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Conroy."
- Conroy: "Thank you, Speaker. This Bill creates an Advisory Council on Early Identification and Treatment of Mental Health Conditions. This Advisory Council within the Department of Public Health is... with the purpose of developing recommendations and an action plan to address the barriers to early and regular screenings and identification of mental health conditions in children, adolescents and young adults in Illinois."
- 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? Flowers,

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Greenwood, Hernandez, Williams. Greenwood. Please take the record. There are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 418, Mr. Wehrli. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 418, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wehrli."

- Wehrli: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill amends the Downstate Police Article of the Illinois Pension Code. After January 1 of 2019, it would prohibit an annuitant from becoming a police chief and collecting a second pension in the IMRF SLEP program. It... but instead would allow them to participate in a defined contribution program. This Bill, as amended, I worked diligently with the FOP and the Illinois State Association of Chiefs of Police. FOP is now neutral on this Bill and the Chiefs of Police... this is actually their language. I'm more than happy to answer any question and would be thankful for your support."
- 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? Drury, Hammond, Unes. Please take the record. There are 108 voting 'yes', 4 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3157, Representative Harper. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3157, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Speaker Lang: "Representative Harper."

Harper: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to bring before the House, House Bill 3157 which would track food deserts in the State of Illinois. I encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Do you complete your... your comments? Thank you. 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? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Second Reading, House Bill 690, Representative Ammons. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 690, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. The Bill is read for a second time on a previous day. Amendment #2 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #3 is offered by Representative Ammons."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ammons."

Ammons: "Thank you. I ask the committee... I mean, I'm sorry... I ask the full Body here to approve this House Amend... I mean, Floor Amendment that would provide for security and safety for workers as well as collect aggregate data in the State of Illinois for temporary workers."

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. Please read the Bill."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 690, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Ammons."
- Ammons: "Thank you. House Bill 690 is entitled the Responsible Job Creations Act. This Bill is the first Amendment to it since about 10 years ago. The Bill is designed to protect about 840 thousand workers in the State of Illinois. And I am happy to answer any questions. This Bill moved as an agreed Bill. And I appreciate an 'aye' vote for this 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? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves, Members. Brady, Breen, McDermed, Riley, Spain. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 78 voting 'yes', 37 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Second Reading, House Bill 313, Representative Feigenholtz. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 313, a Bill fact... a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. The Bill is read for a second time on a previous day. Amendment #2 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #3 is offered by Representative Feigenholtz."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Feigenholtz on the Amendment."
- Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment is agreed by all the key stakeholders. Twenty-five nursing organizations met over this two-year period and changed definitions that reflect the body of the Act in the Nurses Practice Act. I'm happy to answer any questions."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

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

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

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

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 313, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Feigenholtz. Did you already explain the Bill?"

Feigenholtz: "I did."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Arroyo, Spain. 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. House Bill 3168, Representative Stratton. Please read the Bill. Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. House Bill 2474, Mr. Demmer. Is Mr. Demmer on the floor? Out of the record. House Bill 2373, Representative Lilly. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2373, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Lilly."

Lilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the General Assembly. As you know, people with crime and criminal backgrounds are often routine denied opportunities for quality jobs, safe housing and education. House Bill 2373 will help Illinois families owl... overcome the barriers of

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

criminal background and achieve successful, financial wealth. There's no opposition to this Bill. We have many advocates who worked along with law enforcement to make sure that we believe that the sealing process continues to work. SB2373 expands the number of criminal offenses that can be sealed under Illinois law."

Speaker Lang: "This Bill's on the Order of Short Debate. Mr. Durkin is recognized for two minutes."

"Thank you. A little bit earlier I spoke to a Bill that was... represented by Representative Nekritz and this is the Bill that I referenced which I believe is a way for us to begin working again in a cooperative manner. I appreciate what Representative Lilly has done. She's been to my office a number of times. This is the continuation of the Bill that I supported about a year ago. But I just want people to know that Republicans... we're willing to work with you on things that concern you and your constituents. And again, I will just say that you please respect the same type of request that we'd be making with you over the next three and a half weeks. But I think you've done a very good job of explaining the Bill to me about helping women get second chances at life and be able to move on from trouble... from their troubled past. So, I'm going to encourage Members to support it. And thank you for your advo... advocacy on behalf of this."

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? Yingling. Please take the record. There are 80 voting 'yes', 34 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2802, Representative Mah. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2802, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Mah."

Mah: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the General Assembly. This Bill... this is a Bill that requires covered employers, businesses with more than 25 full-time employees, to offer their employees the opportunity to set aside their own money in a pre-taxed basis in order to purchase transit passes. This would be through an already existing federal program set up for transit benefits savings that are pre-taxed. Employees can only access this program if it is offered by the employer. This Bill applies only within the RTA service area. And it offers exemptions for businesses within zip codes not covered by public transit. I'm happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "This Bill is on the Order of Standard Debate. Mr. Andersson is recognized."

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

Andersson: "Thank you. So, Representative Mah, my understanding...
we had a conversation about this previously... is that this is
not a mandate on the employees. They don't have to contribute
if they don't want to. Is that correct?"

Mah: "That is correct. It's permissive for the employees. The employees do not have to participate if they do not wish."

Andersson: "And no employer money is required to be input into this. They have to set up the system, but they don't have to... they don't have to contribute if they don't want to either."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Mah: "That is correct. In fact, there are savings that employers can accrue as well because the FICA contribution would be less because it's a pre-taxed plan."

Andersson: "So, the only expense really that the employer would incur is the initial set up of the enrollment system. Is that correct?"

Mah: "That's correct. And the cost is minimal. Our research has shown that it... the cost for administration for each employee is 25 cents per month per employee which adds up to about \$3 per year."

Andersson: "And the... and this only applies in certain geographic areas. Is that correct?"

Mah: "Correct. The..."

Andersson: "Which is where?"

Mah: "The RTA service area with exemptions for employers within that area in zip codes not served by public transit."

Andersson: "And then, I think you indicated there was a threshold for the number of employees for this to apply to?"

Mah: "Yes, that's correct. So, employers with 25 or more full-time employees."

Andersson: "Thank you for the answers to the questions."

Mah: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ives: "So, Representative Mah, we saw this in committee. And there were actually quite a few questions. And one of the questions were, if... while this may not be a requirement for an employee to participate, it is a requirement for an employer to set it

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

up, if he has the requisite number of employees. Is that right?"

Mah: "That is correct."

Ives: "Yeah."

Mah: "But the... the Bill requires that the employee... the employer, rather, offer the program. If there are no employees that choose to participate, the cost is..."

Ives: "Yeah, okay."

Mah: "...minimal."

Ives: "So, that's a good point. So, even if there's one employee, then he has to set it up, correct?"

Mah: "Yes."

Ives: "Okay. There is this one employ..."

Mah: "But this... this program is similar to the health benefits savings plan..."

Ives: "Yes."

Mah: "...an employer... the employer offers any kind of benefits, this is something that is already offered through their..."

Ives: "Okay. Do... do..."

Mah: "...HR department and the cost is minimal."

Ives: "We're on... we're on Standard Debate. If you leave it just short answers, it'd be great for me. If... if this employer has 25 employees and only 5 of them live in RTA system, he still has to set this up. Is that correct?"

Mah: "Yes."

Ives: "Okay. If this employer has 25 employees and only 1 of them is located in the RTA system, he still has to set up this plan if that one individual wants it, correct?"

Mah: "That's correct."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Ives: "And so, there would be no... there would be no savings really for him by having a large number of employees participate; regardless, the plan set up costs are going to be spread out over that one individual employee if that one individual decides to set it up, correct?"

Mah: "So, the employer will actually save money from having to contribute less in FICA contributions. For an employer... an employee that makes \$50 thousand a year, the employ... the employer would contribute about \$120 less in FICA. So, in fact, it does represent savings for the employer as well as the employee."

Ives: "Well, we don't know that for a fact though. In fact, to the Bill. We don't know that it's going to save any employer any money at all. And in fact, if you look at the opponent list, once again, it's businesses opposed to this including the Illinois Chamber of Commerce. So, they don't like this Bill. They don't think it's going to save money. And it's very loosely defined. In fact, you could have part-time employees qualify as being an employee 'cause there's no restriction on that. And so, you could be setting up a program... forced to set up a program for literally one employer... employee when the majority of your employees aren't even located in the RTA region. This is just another mandate on business. If they want to set it up, they can avail themselves to setting this up. There's no necessary reason that we have to mandate this on any employer in the RTA region. Again, I really urge this Body to pay attention to what business is telling us and business is opposed to this Bill. They don't think it saves them money. If ... if the people

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

want to use the transit this way, they already can. We don't need a mandate again, once more, something on employers. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Olsen."

Olsen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I think this federal program is a laudable program. It's an outstanding program, if an employer chooses to offer the program. The program allows employees to purchase a parking or a transit pass that's pre-taxed. And I think this is really a great program; however, I am concerned about this Bill requiring employers, even small employers and even employers with very few employees in the jurisdiction, to be required to participate in this program. Let me be clear. There is cost to administer the program. I worked pri... previously at an employer that did offer this program. It was an outstanding program. I did choose to avail myself of this program. There was a cost to the employer. The employer had to hire a third-party administrator to oversee the program. And ultimately, there is some cost whether they choose to hire a third-party administrator, choose to handle it internally or some other way. This is a cost to business. And I can't support this especially in our current climate. I'd like to yield the rest of my time to Representative Wheeler."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wheeler for 3 minutes and 48 seconds."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Wheeler, K.: "Representative, we talked about this in committee.

I want to just put some things on the record for everybody.

The... one of the things we talked about was the location issue.

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

You know that I live on the edge of the RTA district. So, I want to make sure it's clear the way it stands. Is it the employer or the employee… Excuse me. Is it the employer or the employee's address that determines whether or not this person requires the offering?"

Mah: "If the employer is located within an area, a zip code, that is not served by public transit, then they are exempt. And in answer to an earlier point about the cost of setup, a third-party administrator is not necessary given that the RTA offers administration of this program at the cost of 25 cents per employee per month. So, it is a minimal cost..."

Wheeler, K.: "I... I... Okay, I understand that. I'm short... short on time here. So, I would like to get a couple more things in with this, okay? Thank you for bringing that up. The... So, the location has to do with the employer not the employee. So, an employer could have... in DeKalb County was not RTA, just 'cause we have somebody lives in Aurora or east of there, they don't get involved in the program, correct..."

Mah: "Correct."

Wheeler, K.: "...based on the Amendment? Thank you."

Mah: "If the employer's located outside of that area, yes."

Wheeler, K.: "Okay. And then, we've got a fiscal impact here in our analysis that shows a pretty substantial amount of money.

Do you have that in your analysis as well?"

Mah: "No. I... I think that the fiscal analysis that's provided is well out of line with our estimates because it is based on an estimate of an increase in ridership three times the current ridership, which is unrealistic. If the... if this policy increases transit ridership, a better estimate would be about

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

10 percent. And that would bring down the fiscal impact well below what was listed in the report."

Wheeler, K.: "Okay. But our impact shows an income of 128 to 183 million dollars annually. Even 10 percent of that would be up to \$20 million, which is a substantial amount. So, please keep that in mind, people, when you vote on this Bill. The last thing I want to bring up, in fact, is government covered by this Bill or not?"

Mah: "Yes, it is."

Wheeler, K.: "Are you sure about that?"

Mah: "That... that was... well, that was something that was discussed in committee. And I brought a number of Amendments to address the concerns that were brought up by committee. One of the concerns was whether government was included or not. I believe that we might have to add additional language to affirmatively include government and we can do that in the Senate version. But that's a... a minor change that we can make in the Senate version."

Wheeler, K.: "Rep... Representative, did you look at... I'm running out of time here... Floor Amendment 2 seems to remove that. So, I don't believe that the way the Bill is drafted in Floor Amendment 2 that this actually does cover government employees any more. So, I wish we would address that as well. And finally, I just want to bring up the fact that if the gover... if an employer does not have a tax deferral program, so I understand they have to provide the transit pass, which is another element of small business. I'm going to go to the Bill 'cause I'm short on time. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is just another thing we're saying to business, you have to do

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

this. This is a mandate, another mandate, mandate, mandate. When are we going to stop and look at how the businesses actually function in this state? While I applaud the Sponsor's intent, and the... I think the program's actually a great idea. This is a mandate. We should vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "So, three people on the Republican side have spoken, but I'm not sure if they were all really in opposition. So, I'm going to indulge Mr. Batinick."

Batinick: "I'll go straight to the Bill, Mr. Speaker. Thank you. According to our fiscal analysis, and I think before we pass Bills like this, we should not be guessing. This program will cost as much money as it would take to fully fund Chicago State University, Eastern Illinois University, Governors State University, North... Northeastern Illinois State University and Western Illinois University combined. So, that's the decision. You vote for this program that equates to the funding for all those universities I just listed. Vote 'no'. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Mah to close."

Mah: "Well, first I'd like to dispute the claims that the fiscal impact is in the amount that's listed on the report. That's based on an estimate that would triple or quadruple the ridership of CTA, Metra and Pace. And our estimates instead are closer to the 10 percent increase. Now, this... while the opponents argue that this is a mandate and that we shouldn't... we shouldn't have a mandate, what I propose is that this is good public policy. It has minimal fiscal impact. And in this day and age when we have so many serious concerns about climate change and the environment and the human impact on

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

the environment, this is something that we can do as ... as public servants to have a positive impact on the environment using our ability to... to shape public policy. This is an environmental and green piece of legislation. It allows employees to save their own money. It supports mass transit. It increases ridership on public transit. And it is at a minimal cost to employers. The cost is perhaps offset by the increased ridership and used above the public transit infrastructure. So, I... I urge that we all support this Bill and promote environmental policies and positive behavior supporting our public pol... public mass infrastructure. Thank you very much."

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Sims. Please take the record. There are 62 voting 'yes', 54 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Rules Report."
- Clerk Bolin: "Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on April 27, 2017: recommends be adopted Floor Amendment #4 to House Bill 3001; and recommends be adopted Senate Joint Resolution 28."
- Speaker Lang: "House Bill 2474, Mr. Demmer. Please read the Bill."

  Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2474, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Demmer."

Demmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2474 is a clarification on a law we passed in 2013. It cleans up some

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

- audit findings from the Department of Human Services. I know of no opposition. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Please take the record. There are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Second Reading, House Bill 3720, Representative Harper. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3720, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill for a third time."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3720, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Harper."
- Harper: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3720 would simply change the way we calculate TIF surpluses to allow that surplus to be used for special education and wraparound services in Chicago Public Schools."
- Speaker Lang: "This Bill is on Short Debate. Chair recognizes Mr. Andersson for two minutes."
- Andersson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."
- Andersson: "I... Oh, Mr. Speaker, I'd move to move this to Standard Debate."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Speaker Lang: "I see plenty of hands. The Bill will be moved to the Order of Standard Debate. Please proceed."

Andersson: "Thank you, Sir. So, Representative, this is going to require the mandatory distribution of the City of Chicago's TIF District funds each year. Is that correct?"

Harper: "Can you repeat that, please, for me, please?"

Andersson: "Yes. This is going to require for the City of Chicago for them to distribute from their TIF funds surplus balances each and every year. Is that correct?"

Harper: "Yes."

Andersson: "So, you understand how the TIF system currently works, I assume?"

Harper: "Yes, kind of. It's... it's very, very complicated."

Andersson: "It is indeed."

Harper: "Most folks don't understand how it works."

Andersson: "Right. It... it..."

Harper: "But I think I have a little bit of an understanding..."

Andersson: "All right."

Harper: "...as it relates to this Bill."

Andersson: "All right. So, are you aware that currently there is a methodology for distributing surplus funds by every TIF in the state including the City of Chicago? Are you aware of that?"

Harper: "Yes."

Andersson: "Okay. So, what's wrong with that system? They have the ability to do it right now. They don't need this legislation."

Harper: "Sure. Let me explain. Well, currently, TIF excludes anticipated redevelopment projects costs from the TIF surplus

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

calculations. And so, as a result, some municipalities have chosen to accumulate excess TIF funds for anticipated redevelopment projects costs rather than distributing such funds to the taxing district."

Andersson: "Right. So, that would be the idea of a TIF. There are... there are really two different types of TIFs. There is your borrowing TIF and your pay-as-you-go TIF. Borrowing TIFs are where you borrow money in the anticipation that a project's going to develop and then you pay back off of the revenues. The other type is you accumulate money until you have enough in the fund to do the project that you want to do. Under your Bill, you would mandate the refunding of that every year so they could never build up the funds necessary to do a project. Isn't that correct?"

Harper: "Well, sure. Let me explain to you the intent of this Bill. The intent of this Bill is to put money into our Chicago Public School system. As you know, or you may not know, we have experienced a lot of cuts this year. And the way that we currently calculate our TIF surplus makes it look like we don't actually have one when we do. And what it would do... what this Bill do specifically was that it would require municipalities to not exclude anticipated redevelopment project costs from the surplus calculation, which we know would increase the annual TIF surplus distribution."

Andersson: "So, I'm not going to have a lot of time. So, another point I think that's important to note... I guess I'll speak to the Bill, Ladies and Gentlemen... is that when we talk about TIFs, the concept of a TIF is the 'but for' test which means but for the TIF, but for the redevelopment there would be no

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

new taxes. There would be no new revenues that would go to the school. That's the whole point of a TIF. And so, if ... what you do is you remove the surplus every year, you have removed the ability to use the TIF. This will effectively kill off the very development that the TIF would seek to create that will eventually benefit those very schools. This is me... the system already exists to do refunds of surpluses if it's deemed appropriate. But you've got to let the municipalities figure that out 'cause they're the ones negotiating the development. They're the ones who are determining how they're going to use that money. Now, I understand that maybe people are skeptical about TIFs so they don't believe that they're... they're run well. I have experienced just the opposite. They've made development happen. They do good things. And while I'm sympathetic to putting money back into the schools, this is money in the long-term that will net the schools more. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris for up to five minutes."

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, Representative, just to be sure, this would make any excess funds in the TIFs and direct them to the Chicago Public School system, correct?"

Harper: "Yes, it would."

Harris, D.: "And... and I understand what you're doing. And Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, let me tell you, I'm the first one to stand here and say that the City of Chicago has played games with its TIFs and how they move the money around and how they go from one to another and the like is... is perhaps questionable but... and the fact that there are I think 160 TIFs in the City of Chicago, virtually the entire... districts

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

that aren't at all blighted are in a TIF. But the point is this. The ... the use of the TIF moneys are beneficial for projects within... within the municipal boundaries. In this case, within Chicago. So, if you're taking all of that excess money out of the TIF ... respective TIFs and giving it just to the city... the Chicago Public Schools, in effect you are limiting development... the development ideas that the TIFs were created for in areas where they really were needed. So, it's an extremely limiting factor and what happens if maybe a development is scheduled maybe two years down the road which they may need the money and you're taking all of tho... the excess funds out of that ... excuse me ... out of that TIF in one year? No question that the Chicago Public School system needs dollars. I understand that and would want to try to be as helpful as we possibly can, but to take all of those excess funds in all of those TIFs in the City of Chicago is an inappropriate approach because it limits development in the areas that really do need development, where these TIFs are located. So, I ask you to look very closely. I want to be sympathetic to what the Representative wants to do with getting money into the city... the city public schools, but at same time she's harming potential neighborhood the development simply to help the Chicago Public Schools. And I think that's an inappropriate approach and I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sosnowski."

Sosnowski: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Sosnowski: "Obviously, TIF Districts collect funds from many different taxing districts. Wouldn't a more fair approach be to refund the individual taxing districts that have contributed to the TIF fund, if there's an excess?"

Harper: "I'm sorry. Can you repeat the question, please?"

Sosnowski: "Sure. Many..."

Harper: "I can't hear."

Sosnowski: "...taxing districts contribute to a TIF District.

Wouldn't it be more fair to rebate all those different taxing districts rather than just pick one district to refund that money to, if there's an excess?"

Harper: "You know, I'm not sure. But I really want to clarify what this Bill does not do. I also want to say that I am from an area... I'm from a neighborhood called Englewood, right, and we have TIFs there. So, I understand that TIFs are used to bring economic development in blighted area. I am not trying to do anything to hurt development in my area and to take away from our TIF. What this Bill does simply is just changes the definition of the anticipated redevelopment project costs. And the most importantly..."

Sosnowski: "Mr. Speaker, can I talk to the Bill?"

Speaker Lang: "Go on. You're inter..."

Sosnowski: "In re... in regards to this Bill, to my point that I asked, which it did..."

Speaker Lang: "Seems to me you just interrupted the Lady while she was answering your question."

Sosnowski: "That was not an answer to my question. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. I want to address the fact that we... TIF Districts around the state have multiple taxing districts that put money

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

into a TIF District. It doesn't make a whole lot of sense for us at the state level to pick one taxing district to receive all excess funds when, in fact, all those other taxing districts have contributed. I believe that they would have a right, maybe even a legal right, to sue on behalf of that and ask for those excess funds back, if we're going to start picking to refund some of those dollars back. I think it's inherently fair because those dollars go into a TIF District for a particular reason and then we've decided that we're just going to go ahead and give it to one taxing body. At this point, I'd like to give the remaining balance of my time to Representative Wehrli. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wehrli for 2:50."

Wehrli: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Several of my colleagues on this side of the aisle have articulated very good reasons why they should be... why you should be opposed to this Bill, but I'm going to take a different tact and try to articulate why you should be in favor of this Bill. While I understand TIFs in general, and they do serve a noble purpose when applied correctly. When I stand in Grant Park... which by the way is a great name for a park... and look inward to the city's skyline, it's a beautiful, majestic skyline, all of that real estate, the most expensive real estate in the entire State of Illinois is covered by a TIF District. And then I turn and look at the funding of Chicago Public Schools and those with special needs and I'm forced to make a decision on which I'm going to put a higher priority on. I'm going to put the higher priority on those with special needs in funding an education that they so richly deserve. So, as I said there

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

are many reasons to oppose this Bill; there is one very good reason to support this Bill. I urge its support."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Flowers, do you rise in support of the Bill?"

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I do."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you. First of all, Representative, thank you very much for bringing this legislation forward. And I want to ask would your district be considered, in regards to the definition of a TIF District, would your district qualify for that?"

Harper: "Many areas in my district qualify..."

Flowers: "Okay."

Harper: "...for the TIF District. I do have many TIFs in my district.

I live in one."

Flowers: "So, tax increment financing is a special funding tool used by the City of Chicago to promote the public and private investment across the city. Is your district in the city?"

Harper: "Yes."

Flowers: "Okay. Now, according to... under State Law, areas proposed for the TIF desig... designation must possess a numerous blight factor: the age, the Code violations, excessive vacancies, overcrowding of facilities, lack of ventilation like sanitary facilities, excessive waste, a dilapidated area. Is this what you're trying to address with some of the schools that's in your district?"

Harper: "Yes, Representative."

Flowers: "According to the previous speakers, there have been some inappropriate use of the TIF funds and the

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

inappropriateness is that it has not been going to the areas of the city which is really needed. And Englewood and west Englewood and other areas on the south and west side of the City of Chicago is one of the areas where the state definition of the use of the TIF funds would be appropriate. I would urge an 'aye' vote. And once again, Representative Harper, thank you very much for bringing this Bill forward, thinking about the children of the City of Chicago. Thank you."

- Speaker Lang: "Ladies and Gentlemen, we've had three people speak in response and two people speak in favor. Representative Harper to close."
- Harper: "Thank you. I just want to close by saying that thousands of students across Chicago... they come to school with significant needs including the need for a trauma informed service social services. This Bill creates a revenue stream for that... supervise those services. In addition to that, this provides increased transparency in the TIF program which is what we need which is what people who actually live in the TIF need more transparency on where our TIF dollars are going so that they're not going downtown to fund Grant Park. I encourage an 'aye' vote."
- 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Conyears-Ervin, Jesiel. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 75 voting 'yes', 35... excuse me... 39 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 261, Representative Mussman. Please read the Bill."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 261, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Mussman."

Mussman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. What this Bill serves to do is actually allow school districts a little more flexibility with how they use their transportation dollars regarding homeless students. Right now, we know that if a student is homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act they have to be transported from wherever it is they end up night to night which can be a huge expense. This gives the school district some flexibility if they can for a lesser cost use that money to assist that family with bills or finding another location within the district to be housed. Again, the highlights of the Bill are it has to cost less money and it has to be approved by both the family and the school district. I'm happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Olsen. The Bill is on Short Debate. Mr. Olsen for two minutes."

Olsen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. I want to commend the Sponsor for working with the department and working with the stakeholders to come to an agreed Bill. This Bill is about saving money. This is a Bill about saving money for taxpayers and providing better service to students in our districts. I am so pleased that we're bringing this forward. I urge your support."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. There are 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3004, Mr. Riley. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3004, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Riley."

Riley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 3004 essentially extends the RTA's short-term borrowing ability to 2020. We passed a Bill just like this a couple of years ago and it's going to sunset in 2018. This essentially gave the RTA an opportunity to increase their Working Cash Notes threshold of 100 million to 400 million dollars. So, we're just extending that two more years. I'll answer any questions you may have."

Speaker Lang: "This Bill is on the Order of Short Debate.

Representative Ives for two minutes."

Ives: "I'd like to move it to Standard Debate."

Speaker Lang: "I see plenty of hands. You are recognized under Standard Debate, Representative."

Ives: "Okay. Mr. Riley, essentially what your Bill does is it says that in the event of a default that state funds can be intercepted and sent to the bondholders or bankers to pay off that... those notes. Is that correct?"

Riley: "That's not what it says."

Ives: "That is in the Bill."

Riley: "It can be sent... it can be identified by the Treasurer.

The Comptroller can recoup the moneys that the Treasurer has invested... that the Treasurer has invested in the name of the people of the State of Illinois and they can get those moneys

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

back in the rare case of the default, not the bondholders or anyone else."

Ives: "That's actually not true because in fact what it says here it says that if the Treasurer has invested it all then, in any of those bonds, it does not limit just the Treasury from receiving the state intercept for funds..."

Riley: "Where..."

Ives: "...in fact, you even admitted in committee that there... that
 wasn't maybe the intent, but it doesn't matter. That's how
 the rule is written."

Riley: "Representative Ives, ple... you know, we can have this debate. Please don't tell me what I said. First of all, I'm holding the language right here and nowhere in there does it say anything about bondholders. It says the Treasurer..."

Ives: "In the ca..."

Riley: "...may after giving notice to the authority, certify for the Controller the amount of the default at Working Cash Notes. In accordance with any applicable rules of the Controller, the Controller must deduct and remit to the Treasury the certified amount or a portion of those amounts and it lists out the proportions. So, it's... that's what this... what the language actually says. It's all it says and I did not intimate anything else when we had this debate in... in committee."

Ives: "Okay. Okay. Well, we actually... I actually got some information from... as you know and I said it before, we got information from other folks who do say that the intercept technically makes the bonds a much better investment. No financial expert would criticize the Treasurer for making a

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

bad investment if he... if he had the intercept. But I wonder if the present and future Treasurer or Comptroller would really choose paying off the local bonds or letting a payment be made should they choose funding Chicago cops or Wall Street or et cetera. Possibly the Treasurer should direct the Comptroller, the Comptroller should not just refuse under the direction despite the statute. So, essentially, regardless if the Treasurer's intercepting money that is meant to go for other services, instead of paying off a default, why is that a reasonable thing to do? We shouldn't allow that, as a matter of fact."

Riley: "That's not what the Bill is doing."

Ives: "It's exactly what it's doing. It's saying in the case of
 default..."

Riley: "Well, that is not what it's doing. That is not... Well... well, first of all... first of all, this is language... this kind of language about what are you going to do just in case there's a default, bond houses like this kind of language, number 1, but number 2, the chances... and statistically have something called a P value. The chances of the RTA or the CTA defaulting are, as we say, way at the tail for the distribution to the point where it's not going to happen. So, you're working on a false premise, Representative Ives."

Ives: "Actually, we're not working. If you're... you say that there's no way it's going to happen, why do you have language attached to a Bill that actually we were pretty much okay with, why do you have language attached to a Bill that deals with a default if you're not worried about a default?"

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Riley: "Because, as I say, that's standard language that's used all the time. If you floated a Bill, bond houses like to see that. And you can have that in there even though, as I already have said, a default has a... a very rare chance of happening. But that doesn't..."

Ives: "Okay."

Riley: "...preclude you from putting language in."

Ives: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. This is actually one of a series of three Bills and one in the Senate where we've actually seen information... or we've actually seen language attached to Bills that essentially says in the case of a default that certain entities: banks, bondholders, can intercept that ... that money and... and the state money that is meant to go to those entities for other services and pay off the bankers and the bondholders instead. And in this case, why should we... why would we even let... if you felt like an entity was going to go default, why would you even allow your State Treasurer to invest into that entity, that lower governmental entity, if you felt like they were going to go into default. All this language is, is about in the place of a default. If you think that somebody has a problem with a default, the Treasurer should not be on the hook of it; state taxpayer should not be on the hook of it. And certainly, if we've said that state money needs to be allocated for certain resources, certain services and now, instead they're paying off the bankers and bondholders, which is what this would allow, that is a completely wrong in this state. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Breen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just to the Bill. The debate that you've heard is not necessarily actually directed at this Bill, but at a series of Bills and concepts that have been raised to this General Assembly. And the concept is this. Are we going to put the poor, our pensioners, our social service providers and others first or are we going to put bondholders first? Now, that's the general principle. And I know each ... each Bill has its own little... little twist to it and there's nothing wrong with, you know, that these Bills might have passed unnoticed in years... years previous. But the reason that you're starting to see more debate and discussion about this is the fact that... and to this particular Bill... if the RTA or whoever it is that defaults, the Treasurer doesn't actually have to certify the default. And if they do, the money for that default comes from somewhere. It comes from things that should have been, you know, we were looking at to direct to other purposes like the poor, like our social services, like IR... like paying our pensions. And so, for that reason, that's why you're seeing folks saying, you know, we need to step back and stop some of these back and forth arrangements that are going forward in this ... in this sort of a Bill. Way too much is going on here too. Once... once the default happens what happens to the state's credit rating? What happens to the local entities credit rating? A lot of questions are raised and no... and answers are not really forthcoming. Not to this particular Sponsor, but generally to these concepts, these Bills. I don't know if I have any colleagues that want time yielded to them, if they do not, then..."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Speaker Lang: "There are no lights on, Sir."

Breen: "Thank you. ...then I will conclude. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Riley to close."

Riley: "Thank you very much. But again, if you've read the language of the Bill, you see absolutely nothing... Now, it's really funny. We care about the poor. We've had Bills about the poor. Don't all of a sudden start caring about the poor when we've had all kinds of opportunities to make sure they service them. This Bill is pretty clear. It is to give a very important entity, the RTA, which you've done before, the ability to implement Working Cash Notes in a line of credit for their operation. The RTA's worth is about \$158 billion. So, \$158 billion, the chance of that entity going bankrupt is virtually nil, first of all. Second of all, the RTA has a AA bond rating. All we're trying to do is to help a very important entity that services 62 percent of this state. And they do it very well. Vote 'aye'."

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? Conyears-Ervin, Jones. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 60 voting 'yes', 56 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 795, Mr. Halpin. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 795, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Halpin."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Halpin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 795 is a Bill that will require the state, when purchasing vehicles, to purchase vehicles that have a VIN number of either 1, 2, 4, or 5, meaning that they were manufactured primarily in the United States or Canada. I believe it's important. In a... in the spirit of several Bills that we've had here in the past couple days, that we encourage Illinois and American-made products. I believe the state has a duty to, as a buyer of vehicles, to prefer vehicles that are made in the United States and Canada under the... the labor standards and the environmental standards that we all operate under here in the United States. I believe we need to put our... again, our taxpayer money where our mouth is and support American and in this case, Canadian businesses."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andersson."

Andersson: "Thank you. I move to move this to Standard Debate."

Speaker Lang: "The Bill is already on Standard Debate, Sir."

Andersson: "Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Andersson: "So, my understanding here is based on VIN numbers we determine whether or not the vehicle's manufactured in the United States and that's the test?"

Halpin: "That is correct, Representative."

Andersson: "Okay. Now, I know that there's a lot of... a lot of vehicles that appear to either be American or Canadian or from other countries that are manufactured here. Is that addressed? Like I know in Lafayette, Indiana, there's a Subaru plant."

Halpin: "Sure."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

- Andersson: "Would that Subaru qualify?"
- Halpin: "Yes, Representative. So, the… the standard is based on the VIN number. The VIN number is determined under federal standards as to determine where that car is manufactured. It does not to need necessarily an American company, but it needs to be made here in the United States or Canada."
- Andersson: "And oh, I know that when I shop for cars nowadays the sticker gives a lot of detailed information about where parts of the vehicle are made, where the vehicle is assembled. How does that factor into this? Is it assembly only, if that matters?"
- Halpin: "It... it's country of origin or where it's assembled, which is the determinating factor in creating a VIN number."
- Andersson: "Well, wait a minute. Those... I don't quite understand the distinction. Assembly I understand. Country of origin.

  Tell me what that means."
- Halpin: "The country of origin designation is where the, under the federal standard, is the car is considered to be made.

  And that's why the VIN number... the first number of the VIN number indicates the... the country of origin."
- Andersson: "All right. But again, I... if being made is being assembled, your second in... your second criteria and I understand. But how do we define country of origin? Is it where the corporate headquarters is? What is... what does that mean?"
- Halpin: "I believe that's a... that's a federal standard. Let me..."
  Andersson: "Can you explain what the federal standard is so I can
  understand?"

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Halpin: "So, the federal is standard... is a way to determine the country of origin. I don't know all of the particular details that go into making that determination; however, I do know that it is represented by the VIN number."

Andersson: "Honestly, I mean, thank you, but that doesn't answer the question even closely. I... I want to understand if we have an American car, let's say a Ford, that's manufactured in Mexico, are we now prohibited from that?"

Halpin: "Could you repeat that, Representative?"

Andersson: "Yes. You really haven't answered my question and maybe that's not possible. But I guess I'll just try by example."

Halpin: "Sure."

Andersson: "So, we've got a... we've got a Ford Motor Company vehicle, but it's manufactured or assembled in Mexico. Is that now excluded?"

Halpin: "Yeah... No. Country... country of origin is determined whether... a country of origin is the company that either completely manufactures the car or assembles the car. So, in your example, because it was assembled in Mexico, the country of origin is Mexico and will be designated as a... with a VIN number of 3, is my understanding."

Andersson: "So, in that example..."

Halpin: "It would be excluded."

Andersson: "That would be excluded."

Halpin: "Correct."

Andersson: "With my remaining time, I'll speak to the Bill. This is yet another one of these Bills that we've... that we've had so many of today and yesterday, I suppose, where we are limiting our own ability to buy affordable equipment to

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

operate our state. And it appears we may be limiting it in the sense of some of our own traditionally held vehicles, our American-made vehicles, at least under my definition, maybe not under this definition. Once again, folks, this is the wrong way to go. We need to find ways to save money for our state. This doesn't do it. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hays."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Hays: "Have you, Representative, checked with the good Lady from Hyde Park to see if she's going to put this Bill on Postponed Consideration... a Motion to Reconsider, like all of these other buy American Bills? I mean, that is the telltale sign that this isn't about passing legislation. This is gotcha nonsense. It's going to be put on a Motion to Reconsider and it's going nowhere."

Halpin: "I have not. And I should say, Representative, that I believe in this Bill. I hope it will go over to the Senate.

I intend to try to pass it in the Senate. And I think it's good policy. So..."

Hays: "So, you're telling then... you're telling this Body, right now, that this Bill will not be... there will not be a Motion to Reconsider placed on this Bill?"

Halpin: "Representative, I can't control what anybody else in this chamber does. But it's my intent to pass this Bill, send it to the Senate, put it on the Governor's desk where I hope he will sign it in support of Illinois and American workers."

Hays: "I think you and I both know better than that. What would you say if the country of Australia said that they are not

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

going to buy from John Deere any longer? What would your position be on that?"

Halpin: "I don't think that's relevant to this... to this Bill."

Hays: "It's directly relevant."

Halpin: "It's not... I believe every..."

Hays: "It's directly relevant."

Halpin: "I believe every country has the ability..."

Hays: "John Deere, I'm sure..."

Halpin: "...as a purchaser..."

Hays: "...wants to hear your answer."

Halpin: "Mr. Representative, I'm answering your question. I believe every country and every state in this union as a purchaser, as a buyer, has the ability to determine where they want to purchase their products from. If Australia decides that they want to make that choice, they can make that choice. I can tell you John Deere makes the best farm implements in the world and I believe that they will continue to sell those products. I can't control the... what Australia wants to do. If there's an Australian farm implement company that wants to compete with John Deere, they should have at it. But I'm more concerned about the residents here in Illinois and the United States. They're the people we're trying to protect with this Bill. I urge your support."

Hays: "Well, I... I appreciate that your position is more Trumpian than Trump's, but I suggest to you that the largest employer in your district is going to be a little disappointed with that answer. And I think everybody in this chamber knows that this Bill's going nowhere and it's... and it's gotcha nonsense

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

for the third or fourth time today. And I think we should be above this."

Speaker Lang: "Representative McDermed."

McDermed: "Perhaps I couldn't hear the debate, but I'm a little bit confused. The board calls it the North American-made vehicle. When I look at my analysis, it shows that only VIN numbers with United States or Canada VIN numbers are permitted. Last I heard, Mexico was part of North America, so which is it? Can you..."

Halpin: "It is..."

McDermed: "...explain it loud enough for me to hear? I think you might have said it..."

Halpin: "Yes."

McDermed: "...before, but I couldn't hear it."

Halpin: "It is... it is United States and Canada. Mexico is excluded."

McDermed: "But why are we calling it the North American-made vehicles, when it's not? So, we only mean..."

Halpin: "Sure."

McDermed: "...like English-speaking North America vehicles, huh?"

Halpin: "If we... if we had a term to describe United States and Canada, I would certainly use that. I believe North Americanmade is the best fit given what the goal that we're trying to accomplish."

McDermed: "I'm not sure that Mexico wants to hear this. This doesn't feel like a friendly Bill to me."

Halpin: "Repre... Representative... Representative, if it earned your support, I'm happy to change the titles of the vehicles to United States and Canada."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

McDermed: "It still wouldn't earn my support because..."

Halpin: "I... I..."

McDermed: "...it's not fair to..."

Halpin: "...I had a feeling that was the case, right?"

McDermed: "...our excellent neighbor Mexico."

Halpin: "I had a feeling that was the case."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Butler."

Butler: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Butler: "Representative, what kind of car do you drive?"

Halpin: "I drive a Ford Edge, 2013."

Butler: "Mmm. Ford Edge is a good car. I used to drive a Ford Edge. I've also thought about driving a Ford Fusion, which is an excellent car. Under your Bill, would the State of Illinois be able to purchase a Ford Fusion?"

Halpin: "I believe the Ford Fusion has a country of origin of Mexico, so the answer would be no. And I would also add that there is a comparable Ford C-MAX, which is made in the United States and a... at a fairly comparable price given the scope of the... of the Bill."

Butler: "Why would you... why would you exclude an American company such as Ford which, by the way, during the auto bailout they did not take money during the auto bailout and continue to perform admirably as an American company. Why would exclude one of their vehicles?"

Halpin: "I'm sorry. Could you repeat that for me?"

Butler: "Why would you exclude a vehicle that is made by a tremendous American company such as Ford Motor Company?"

Halpin: "I'm not excluding Ford Motor Company. Ford..."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Butler: "No. You're excluding the Ford Fusion which I would assume we probably have..."

Halpin: "If I could answer your question, Representative?"

Butler: "...we probably have a lot of state vehicles that are Ford Fusions. And in fact, I would assume there's probably some Members of this Body that drive Ford Fusions, which a certain Representative raising his hand over there drives a Ford Fusion. I don't think he'll be able to buy that car anymore."

Halpin: "To answer your question, Representative. This is not against any particular company. It's not against any... any particular Member of the Body that is purchasing a car. This is to emphasize that as a state we want to purchase cars that are built in here in the state... sorry... in the United States and Canada."

Butler: "Well, I just wish the State of Illinois..."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Butler..."

Butler: "...the State of Illinois..."

Speaker Lang: "...the Sponsor removes the Bill from the record."

Butler: "Thank you."

Halpin: "Thank you, Rep..."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you."

Halpin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "House Bill 3049, Mr. Fortner. Mr. Fortner. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3049, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Fortner."

Fortner: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 3049 limits an unintended aspect of this Bill's hotel-motel

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

tax. The current law provides that residents of more than 30 days are exempt from that tax by... by their presence there. It has been interpreted that companies can rent for 30 days as if they were that way and that includes the use of multiple guests over the 30 days. One community in my district, when someone realized this interpretation actually saw a 40 percent decrease in that by using this interpretation. This does not eliminate this interpretation. It still provides that companies can use this. It simply says they have to extend out to 90 days before they can do so. I would be happy to answer any questions."

'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 104 voting 'yes', 8 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3407, Mr. Sosnowski. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3407, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sosnowski."

Sosnowski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill will unwind a practice that was passed by the General Assembly many years ago that allowed for auction rate securities and interest rate tax slots. Not many school districts, not many local governments took advantage of this, but in particular, Chicago Public School system got caught in this type of borrowing scheme in which rates were not fixed, fluctuated,

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

and they ended up losing hundreds of millions of dollars in excessive interest fees that they would not have paid if they had a traditional fixed rate type of loan. There's been many articles and press on this in multiple Chicago media and around the state and the nation. This would simply unwind that practice so that our local governments and school districts focus on fixed rate interest borrowing. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Sims. Please take the record. There are 114 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2987, Mr. Slaughter. Please read the Bill. Mr. Slaughter, you have a Floor Amendment. Please place the Bill back on the Order of Second Reading and Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2987, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. This Bill was read a second time a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Slaughter, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Slaughter."

Slaughter: "Thank you... thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Amendment does two changes. It clarifies the definition of the youth that are in the custody of the Department of Juvenile Justice. The other thing that it did was remove a reporting requirement."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

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. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2987, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Slaughter."

Slaughter: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. As we push forward as a state, nothing is more critical than assisting and supporting our most vulnerable residents. HB2987 creates an opportunity for our State Government to help our youth and young adults that have either been courted wrong, homeless, or part of our foster care system. This Bill is requiring that when a state agency has an opening for an internship or student worker position that those agencies solicit applications from the three agencies that manage and oversee those three at-risk populations. Those agencies are: the Department of Juvenile Justice, which oversees our court-involved and formerly incarcerated youth; DHS, which oversees our homeless youth and population; and then lastly, DCFS, which oversees our foster care population. For many years... many, many years both sides of the aisle have urged the private sector to give our vulnerable at-risk populations a chance and an opportunity to get their lives on track. HB2987 is asking our State Government to look internally and be that example. We shouldn't ask businesses to do anything that we aren't willing to do ourselves as a government. Let me be clear. This Bill is not creating a

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

hiring preference. We are not asking agencies to hire these individuals. We are simply asking them to make the important applications. This to solicit Bill is administratively burdensome. When the Bill was first introduced, there was a reporting requirement that some agencies had concern with. The reporting requirement was removed with House Amendment #2. This Bill is not asking for any agency to generate a report, a report back to a commission or a task force or the General Assembly or the Governor. A fiscal note was filed on this Bill. There is no significant impact. Let's show these vulnerable populations that we care about them and we believe in them. I urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Lang: "This Bill's on the Order of Short Debate. Chair recognizes Mr. Andersson for two minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Andersson: "So, Representative, so I heard you say that this does not create a preference."

Slaughter: "That's correct."

Andersson: "So, what does it do exactly? If it's not creating a preference, what... what are we doing here to encourage these at-risk youth to get into these job positions?"

Slaughter: "What we're doing here is we're encouraging them by making them aware of applications for internships and student worker... and student worker positions."

Andersson: "And how are we doing that? How do we make them aware?"

Slaughter: "By soliciting their... their application."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Andersson: "So, how do we identify them? I want to understand the admini..."

Slaughter: "How do we identify them?"

Andersson: "Yeah. I want to understand the administrative side of this for the agencies. What do they have to do to go through to identify who to send the application to, I guess?"

Slaughter: "Sure. I mean, if it's the Department of Juvenile Jus..."

Andersson: "I'm sorry?"

Slaughter: "All right. All right. I didn't know if you were paying attention. If it's the Department of Juvenile Justice, for example, that Af... the Aftercare Division will identify all those youths that are formerly incarcerated."

Andersson: "Okay."

Slaughter: "So, if they're on the caseloads of the Aftercare workers. Let's go to DHS."

Andersson: "Please."

Slaughter: "If we're looking at the homeless population, we're looking at caseworkers that worked with our service provider that worked with the homeless population."

Andersson: "Okay. And are they... every time that there's a job opening are they going to be required to mail something to each of these individuals?"

Slaughter: "Sure. And it could be an e-mail."

Andersson: "Okay."

Slaughter: "It could be a phone call."

Andersson: "Okay."

Slaughter: "Or..."

Andersson: "Does your... does your..."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Slaughter: "...it could be a written letter that could be mailed.

Sure."

Andersson: "I'm going to run out of time. So, I've got to be quick. So, does... does it... does your Bill specify which method of contact is required?"

Slaughter: "No, no. It doesn't. It doesn't."

Andersson: "But every time there's a new opening they have to contact all of them, right? How do..."

Slaughter: "Those three agencies, yes."

Andersson: "Yeah."

Slaughter: "Yes."

Andersson: "So, how many... how many people are we talking about contacting? Talking about..."

Slaughter: "Not many. The HR department for each of those three agencies probably wouldn't..."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andersson, I'll let you just finish, please?"

Andersson: "Thank you. I'm trying to understand the number of youth that we need to contact. That's my question. How many?"

Slaughter: "Well, I mean, I don't know their... the exact number of how many."

Andersson: "Are we talking... are we talking thousands, tens of thousands, what are we talking?"

Slaughter: "However many may apply. I believe with DJJ we're not talking about a thous... thousands, maybe in regards to DCFS.

But what we're doing is contacting the agencies. And then, the agencies will make those youth aware of the opportunity."

Andersson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Slaughter to close."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

- Slaughter: "Ladies and Gentlemen, let's please understand how critical it is to help these vulnerable at-risk population. Getting an internship or student worker position can and often is the catalyst to begin the one... one's career. Instead of looking to others, let's create... creatively utilize our own resources, initiative and opportunity to address these atrisk populations. Thank you. I urge a 'yes' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Gordon-Booth, Sente. Please take the record. On this question, there are 67 voting 'yes', 47 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 688, Mr. Zalewski. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 688, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. This Bill was read a second time a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Zalewski, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski on the Amendment."
- Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to adopt the Floor Amendment #1. It limits the ability to a certain time period of time. It makes other technical changes."
- 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. Please read the Bill."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 688, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this House Bill." Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is an ability for a downstate service firefighter to enter the Chicago Fire Pension Fund. It al... it includes provisions that limits the window to a six-month window. And they can only transfer up to 10 years. In addition, the agreement we made with the city fund was that if the person wanted to transfer into service, the cost would be the service time in the downstate fund along with the tabulated portion of the unfunded liability from the downstate fund over to the Chicago fund. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andersson."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Andersson: "So, my understanding from the analysis is that this will allow firefighters to count unvested downstate fire service credit in the already underfunded Chicago fire system. So, we're going to lead to a further unfunded liability situation. Do you agree with that statement?"

Zalewski: "I com... Steve, that's completely wrong."

Andersson: "Okay."

Zalewski: "The unfunded liability portion of the Chicago Fire Fund will be accounted for when the person applies. They will have to be a calculation based on the... by the actuaries for the unfunded piece. That will be accounted for in the employer contribution when it's transferred over to the Chicago Fund."

Andersson: "Do we know the fiscal impact of this?"

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Zalewski: "It's limited. It's very narrow. With it..."

Andersson: "Excuse me. I couldn't hear that."

Zalewski: "It's very narrow; it's limited."

Andersson: "It's very..."

Zalewski: "It's... it's minimal."

Andersson: "It's minimal. And this is only... to be honest with you, did we debate this before? I feel like I'm in déjà vu?"

Zalewski: "Well, it's been a long day, Steve, but no, we haven't debated it."

Andersson: "We haven't. Okay. I... I guess... I guess, it's me. So, this is not reciprocal? In other words, we're only talking about downstate to Chicago?"

Zalewski: "No, it's not reciprocal."

Andersson: "And out of curiosity, why not make it reciprocal? If it works one way..."

Zalewski: "Well, the reason we're doing it is because there's a...
the... being deemed firefighters would say there's a limited
amount of individuals, a small amount, that want to take
advantage of this."

Andersson: "Okay."

Zalewski: "So, there's no need... there's no influx of Chicago
 firefighters going to suburban departments; it's the other
 way around."

Andersson: "How many... do we have an idea of how many firefighters might be able to take advantage of this?"

Zalewski: "Few... fewer than 10."

Andersson: "Fewer than 10?"

Zalewski: "Yes."

Andersson: "Seriously?"

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Zalewski: "Yes."

Andersson: "Will it continue? In other words, will there be other opportunities for this or is it..."

Zalewski: "Well... so, that's why we did the window. We don't want
 it to be a steady stream."

Andersson: "Okay."

Zalewski: "If the... we limit the window and if it stays another five years, if there's another influx, I think that would be for this Body to consider. But for right now, we want to make this a very narrow targeted window."

Andersson: "Thank you for the answers to the questions."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. This is just bad policy. We're basically allowing service credits to go into the Chicago Fire Pensions Fund when that fund is well south of 30 percent funded. In fact, I'm pretty sure it's right around 23 percent funded. This... That fund's not well funded. And I actually wonder whether or not we're doing our... we're being really responsible for those who want to transfer into the fund, if we don't tell them exactly how poorly funded the fund is that they're moving into compared to the fund they're coming out of. Maybe we should have some transparency to this unless... and make sure that they're fully aware of some of the remarks that we know from Pension Committee. Like the remark that we heard from one of the administrators of the state fund who basically said that once you're 30... under 30 percent funded, it's unlikely that you can recover from that. Maybe we should talk about the Municipal and laborers' Fund which is sitting at 20 percent funded and there's been a number of

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

analysis done saying that literally that fund could be bellyup in four years. So, I don't know that we're doing the right thing to this guy for letting him transfer into the Chicago Fire Pension Fund to begin with. Not to mention, you can't ever guarantee me that you're going to get the calculation correct as to what exactly he should pay in for the benefits that he's going to receive on the backend. We've been really horrible at making actuarial analysis at, you predicting our investment returns and also some other things. The idea that we think we understand exactly what that benefit wor... is worth and how much he should pay in is ridiculous. The last thing I'd like to highlight about this Bill is that it really proves to us once more why we need a modernized system that allows employees to actually move in and about employment through different funds, different retirement programs in a flexible manner. That's why we need a system such as we already have in the SURS program that 20 thousand people have self-selected. It is a self-managed 403(b) style plan that allows them to own that plan from day one. They own their retirement account from day one. And really, that's how we need to move to because we keep doing these one-up Bills and Representative Andersson is actually not incorrect. We've heard of these types of Bills over and over again 'cause we keep doing a fix. This time... Well, you're going to see a Bill we haven't done already. A policeman wants to move in his own city from the police department to the fire department and now he wants to move from one pension fund to the next. So, at some point, I really hope that this Body awakens to the fact that folks like to move around in employment and that we

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

should give them a flexibility not tied to their retirement account, but the flexibility to move in and out of these systems in a free manner. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski to close."

Zalewski: "I would simply say that the previous speaker is right.

We do need a comprehensive solution. We had one in Senate
Bill 777 that would have greatly increased the health of these
funds. Otherwise, it's good public policy. I urge 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. Wallace. Please take the record. There are 82 voting 'yes', 33 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 270, Representative Wallace. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 270, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Wallace."

Wallace: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and the Members of this Body. As the third... as the daughter of a 35-year veteran of the San Diego Police Department, I'm happy to bring to you House Bill 270 which is a Bill that is to hold more assurances for the public trust, provide for police accountability. And it simply states that if there's an officer involved in a sexual assault, he will be investigated by a unit other than the one that he currently works for."

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

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

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 3168, Mr. Jones. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3168, a Bill for an Act concerning children. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Jones."

Jones: "...you... Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3168, as amended, merely amends the Juvenile Court Act and Abused and Neglected Children Reporting Act to extend protections to delinquent youth and provides a report to the guardian ad litem. This Bill is the work... I want to commend Representative Stratton and those on the board for bringing this issue to the front. And I'm happy to answer any questions, but I ask for your 'aye' vote."

'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. There are 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3822, Mr. Evans. Mr. Evans. Please read the Bill. Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. Senate Bill 14, Leader Currie. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 14, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. This Bill was read a second time a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

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

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 14, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this Senate Bill." Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."

"Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. Without state action, the Municipal and Laborers' Pension Funds in the City of Chicago will be bankrupt in the next 10 years. In order to protect the retirement benefits of these city workers, and in order to protect Chicago taxpayers, I hope you will support Senate Bill 14. This measure moves the growth pension funds from the current multiplier decision about how they are funded to an actuarially appropriate funding mechanism. It will triple the contributions of the taxpayers of the City of Chicago. And in fact, the City Council has already approved changes to sewer and water rates that means that that money will be available. And after 5 years, the system will be on a... an actuarially sound basis. It's important to protect the workers and it's important to protect the taxpayers. If we do nothing, both funds will be bankrupt within the next 10 years. I'd be happy to answer your questions. And I'd appreciate your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andersson."

Andersson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Is this Standard Debate?"

Speaker Lang: "The Bill is on Standard Debate, Sir."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Andersson: "Leader Currie, so, what is stopping the City of Chicago from currently paying the amounts that are required without legislative change?"

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

- Currie: "As you know, pensions are set by State Law. And State Law establishes a level of support from the city taxpayers that is not adequate to stave off bankruptcy in either of these funds."
- Andersson: "But if they... if they have a pledged fund, which I believe they do, it's a new fund water... I honestly don't remember where it's coming from... but there's a new... there's a new fund to flow to this. Why can't they take that money now and add to their minimum contributions?"
- Currie: "Well, sure. And we could also decide on our own that we're not going to fund anything for these workers, right? If what you're suggesting is accurate, then there's no reason to think that the pension requirements in state statute have any meaning whatsoever."

Andersson: "No. I... I..."

Currie: "In order to make it work, we have to change the statute.

In addition, there are some benefit changes in this measure that have been agreed to between the city and the workers."

Andersson: "So, I..."

- Currie: "But most important, these pensions are a function of creature of State Law and we, state lawmakers, have to change the law or these changes cannot happen."
- Andersson: "So... so, it's your position that they cannot contri...

  it's illegal for them to contribute more to a pension fund
  than what the statute sets as an amount?"
- Currie: "It would do two things. It would make this an actuarially based funding mechanism and it would, in fact, triple the contribution of the citizens of Chicago will make to these funds over the next 5 years."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

- Andersson: "With respect, that didn't answer my question. My question is, right now, in the absence of this Bill, is there anything that legally prohibits the City of Chicago from contributing more than is required under the statute?"
- Currie: "It... it certainly wouldn't fit under the structure of the current state statute. Besides this, as I say, there are things that are happening in this Bill that couldn't happen without state... state authorization."
- Andersson: "I understand that there are other things."
- Currie: "And in addition, I'm not at all convinced that the city could decide to spend more just as I think they couldn't decide to spend less. These pension funds were created by State Law. And I think that the State Law will govern."
- Andersson: "Well, with respect, I disagree. I think that they..."
- Currie: "Well, if I... if I were a city taxpayer, I might bring a lawsuit, if the city and on its own hook decided to take more of my tax dollars to put into these funds."
- Andersson: "Well, I don't think there is any... any prohibition, any statutory prohibition on depositing more into a pension fund that's required. Another question about the... the ramp that's been established. It goes through 2022. What happens in 2023?"
- Currie: "At that point, I believe, we will have... if you look at the charts. It would seem that we would know how much we are spending and we believe that between the contributions of the workers and the tripled amount coming in from the city, that we should not have any further dislocations in the funding formula."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

- Andersson: "It appears from our analysis that the 2023 required amount will jump to 880 million, which is more than 220 million over 2022. Prior to that it was about \$90 million increments. How are they going to pay for that?"
- Currie: "Well, in fact, the way the ramp works is that there will be additional funds coming in from the city from the water and sewer tax already, as I say, approved by the City Council."
- Andersson: "Actually, our analysis shows that the city has not provided any information about how they would cover beyond that 90 million ramp, the additional 220 million. Here's my concern, speaking to the Bill. The... the difficulty here is I think that there are some good things about the Bill. There's some reforms; there's some clearly constitutional reforms that are beneficial. But we are heading towards another cliff. In 2023, they won't have the funds to do this. Guess what's going to happen? They're going to have to come back to us and ask again. Let's do this the right way. Let's make that ramp fully actuarialized... I can't say that word... and let's... let's make this the right way. Let's not just set ourselves up for 2023 where we're going to have to revisit it again. I urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Breen is recognized, five minutes."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Breen: "Okay. Representative, I was in committee with you on this...
this particular Bill. And one of the issues that we had that
we were discussing and that I know you guys were supposed to

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

leave and come back to us on, but I don't see any Amendment filed. It was on page 14. It appears that what the General Assembly is doing here is we are ordering a tax increase on the people of the City of Chicago. So, at line 6 it says, except as provided in subsection (f) of this Section, the City Council... the city shall levy a tax annually on all taxable property in the city at a rate that will produce a sum which, et cetera, will be sufficient for the requirements of this Article. And then on page... further down, it was what we had discussed, there... we're now adding numbers pages 17... on the top of page 17 that we're increasing this levy up to 266 million, 344 million, 421 million, 576 million. So, is that... do you have a better answer for us? I mean, it looks like we are actually ordering a tax increase on the people of the City of Chicago."

Currie: "You're actually describing current law. And the actuarial tables I have seen suggest that at the point of which we get to the end of the ramp and we are on an actuarially appropriate funding mechanism, that there should not need to be additional tax increases in the City of Chicago. As I say, the city under this Bill will triple its contribution and the City Council has already approved measures that will make that funding mechanism possible."

Breen: "And then, to the Bill. So, what you just heard is that the City of Chicago's contribution will triple. It will triple because we are enshrining in statute that the property taxes of the people of the City of Chicago will triple next year. And so, that is something that this General Assembly is doing. We are increasing those property taxes greatly. As you heard

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

from Representative Andersson, there's nothing stopping the City Council of Chicago from properly funding its pensions. There's no reason for us to add here. We've got, you know, there's some benefit changes and what have you to increase new hire contributions, which looks like just a quick fix to try to get some cash into the system fast so as to prop it up a little bit further. The ... the statistics we heard in committee were that it's only 20 to 30 percent funded, these pension funds. And this Bill doesn't get them ... these funds ... anywhere near where they need to be. And what it does is just imposes additional taxes on the people of the City of Chicago from that fear. It's essentially giving cover to the City Council of the City of Chicago to raise peoples' taxes. They can point at us in Springfield and say we did it, which is something that we shouldn't have to do. The people of the City of Chicago entrust their government Leaders to make these decisions and they should do it on their own and not asking us, who have our own constituencies, to raise their property taxes for them. I'd like to yield the balance of my time to whomever is next on the list. Is it Jeanne?"

Speaker Turner: "Representative Ives is next, but she can take her full time if she'd like."

Ives: "Yes, I'd appreciate full time, thank you. And I'll take
 the extra..."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Ives is recognized."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Ives: "Representative Currie, do you have with you... 'cause we asked for it three weeks ago when we heard this Bill... do you

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

have with you an actuarial analysis of how this fund will perform over the next 40 years?"

Currie: "I believe we've seen the actuarial tables. And my understanding from the city is that their actuaries and the actuaries for the labor and municipal funds agree that this language... this statute, this Senate Bill 14, will make the funds, both funds, whole and we will not be looking at bankruptcy within the next 10 years."

Ives: "Could you tell me the funded status for the municipal fund?"

Currie: "Thirty-two percent. So, we have a big problem here we need to solve it. In fact, what we're doing here..."

Ives: "Actually... Okay."

Currie: "...is helping the city solve its own problem."

Ives: "All right. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. First, two things that I would like to note. When this Bill came before us in committee: one, they could not even ansil... answer a simple questions on the funded status, which actually is 20 percent funded. And they could not answer... they could not give us any actuarial analysis on how this fund's going to perform. Additionally, they did not bring down the executive director to ask specific questions about the fund when he has been before our committee previously and we had new questions for him. I don't think that that's a good way for us to go about passing a Bill without little or no information. So, there's information that I gathered in September when they... the executive director was in front of us and that they... and when they had analysis done by Spiegel Consulting. And I'll be honest with you, I think this is important for everybody to

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

understand. In 2000... in 2000, both of these funds were fully funded... fully funded. They have now dropped dramatically in their funding and they're at the point of literally going belly-up. There will be no money left by the time we're done talking about this Bill. The biggest concern we have is that last year that... these two funds together collectively took in about \$99 million. They paid out \$999 million; that's a billion dollar differential. And when you... I've looked at a number over their analyses about them. This is essentially a Ponzi scheme that, even though they think in 8 and 10 years they won't have any funding, the truth is you're looking at 4 and 6 years before the funding runs out. At that point, analysis shows if you use their average investment rate of 5.5 percent over the last 15 years, which is all they've made, they're essentially only going to take in about \$500 million and they're going to be paying out in the year 2023 \$1.3 billion. One of the biggest concerns you should have is that literally the City of Chicago has no way to pay for this. They have no way to pay for this. And if anything, I hope this serves as a warning to the rest of the General Assembly that we need to move on pension reform immediately because we can't do this to people who are going to depend on this for their retirement because the money is not going to be there. I'm telling you right now I don't think that the City of Chicago will have the wherewithal in 5 years, 6 years, 10 years even to pay for these funds and here's why. When you only have a budget of about \$9 billion, how can you spend \$1 billion of your budget, one-ninth of your budget, only to pay out retirees when you have... when that is only two of the four

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

funds that you manage? There's no way. Additionally, you have the CPS. The CTU pension fund's in trouble. You have Cook County pension funds in trouble. You're layering on one problem after another to taxpayers. So, if you learn anything in this discussion, I want you to learn that we have to solve pensions right now because as this money pays out, \$1.3 billion just for these two funds, you are not going to have the services to provide for your minority youth, for your schools, for your infrastructure, for any other service. So, if you learn nothing from the debate today, please understand that pensions are the number one issue that Illinois has to solve before we get to fiscal sov... solvency. And Mr. Speaker, if this Bill should receive the requisite number of votes to pass, I ask for a vote verification."

Speaker Turner: "Members, a verification has been requested.

Representative Christian Mitchell, do you rise in support of the Bill? Representative Christian Mitchell is recognized."

Mitchell, C.: "So, I'll be very, very brief. I know that we're all very tired. There's been a lot of conversation about the policy of this Bill and I think everyone should just be honest. This is a policy that allows the City of Chicago to solve its own pension problem. It passed with bipartisan support earlier. It passed with bipartisan support earlier in the year and the only reason why anyone would be voting against this Bill, who voted for it on the other side of the aisle, is because the Governor's throwing a temper tantrum, as per usual, about his useless turnaround agenda and wants to leverage the kids in the City of Chicago and the taxpayers of the City of Chicago in order to gain political advantage.

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

This is a very, you know, relatively simple Bill. It does relatively simple things allowing the City of Chicago to solve its own problems. The only reason why anyone would ever be voting against this is because the Governor is throwing a tantrum, which I think is one, unacceptable and two, indicative of his governing style. So, with that, if you don't mind, I'd love, if the Sponsor's willing to yield, I'd love to be able to ask a couple of questions."

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Mitchell, C.: "Thank you. Representative Currie, just... just to sort of emphasize the points that I've just gone over, could you run us briefly back through exactly what it is that this Bill does allowing the city to police its own pension system."

"In fact, this represents, I think, the best of local Currie: government. It might ... reflects a ... an agreement between the city and the members of the municipal and labor funds to make changes that will make the systems solvent. None of these people want in their retirement years to discover that there is not money to pay their pensions. Chicago taxpayers don't want that to happen either. What this Bill will do is enable the City Council to increase water and sewer fees in order to be able to expand the pool that will fund the system. The whole system will move to an actuarially required... a contribution level, which will stave off bankruptcy. In addition, there are changes in the benefit structure, not for any Tier I employee, not for any Tier II employee, but for Tier III employees to help sustain the system. It's a straightforward proposition. Actuarially it is sound. Without passage of this Bill, the funds will go bankrupt."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

- Mitchell, C.: "And to be clear, right now, Leader Currie, the challenge was that right now the city can only make contributions based on property taxes. This Bill allows them to use funds, which I think they've already raised, to pay for these pensions. Is that correct?"
- Currie: "I think we're already paying for the improvements in this Bill as... as taxpayers in the City of Chicago. But until we pass this Bill, the money cannot be spent."
- Mitchell, C.: "And right now, if the city fails to make... and according to this Bill, if the city fails to make its required contribution, the fund can certify the payment to the Comptroller. So, there is some potential for penalties if the city doesn't live up to..."

Currie: "Right."

Mitchell, C.: "...what it's supposed to do. Is that correct?"

Currie: "And the... and the Comptroller intercept language is part of this proposal."

- Mitchell, C.: "Okay. So, it seems that this is a really good Bill that allows the city to just manage its own finances, to use its own local revenue to pay for its own public pensions. Is that correct?"
- Currie: "That is absolutely correct. And beyond that, it reflects an agreement between the workers and the managers that this is the right way to go."
- Mitchell, C.: "And am I correct in saying I believe the Roll Call was 91 to 16. Am I correct in understanding that there were Republicans votes for this Bill..."

Currie: "Many."

Mitchell, C.: "...when it passed in December?"

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Currie: "Many."

Mitchell, C.: "Okay. All right. Well, I... look, I appreciate the answers that we've been given so far, but I do want to continue sort of looking at various aspects of the Bill. So, I'm looking at my analysis and it says that there are some benefit changes here for Tier I and Tier II members. Am I reading that correctly and if so, sort of what are those changes?"

Currie: "Sure. There are no benefit changes..."

Mitchell, C.: "Yeah."

Currie: "...for Tier I members. For Tier II members there is the option of contributing more and taking an earlier retirement. For Tier III, that is hires... new hires... there will be... there will be changes in the contribution level. But they are not yet hired, so there's no... nothing... nothing that changes the benefit options for current employees of either of these funds."

Mitchell, C.: "Thank you... And... and so, Representative, if you could help us, I think that there's been a lot of talk to them about just that the raw finances of this and a lot of sort of bluster from the other side about we need real comprehensive pension reform, even though the Supreme Court sort of tied our hands. What happens to the City of Chicago if they're not able to sort of bring their pension costs under control?"

Currie: "What happens is bankruptcy. In 2025 and in 2027, the actuaries tell us that these funds will be broke."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Mitchell, C.: "And... and Representative, I... I tend to be a person who believes the City of Chicago is rather important for the economic growth..."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Durkin is recognized."

Durkin: "Thank you. To the Bill. Thank you for those comments. I ... I... they're very colorful as always. Bluster from this side of the aisle. You know, temper tantrums. Let me go back to something that I made very clear in January, when we got sworn in. It's real simple. We will work with you with your priorities as long as you work with us in our priorities. It's called a two-way street. The two-way street started, at least with something that I'm concerned about, and that's on our five state pension systems that are in a worse position than Chicago's. At the end of March, I introduced House Bill 4027, which is a combination of President Cullerton's consideration model, which hasn't completely been tested by the Supreme Court; it wasn't with Senate Bill 1. Also, in other adjustments what we believe that will produce at least \$2 billion in savings on an annual basis. That's our priority. What has happened to 4027 since I introduced it? Talking about temper tantrums? It sat in the Rules Committee. It has not moved an inch. So, when you talk about the fact that Republicans are all bluster and they're just playing in some type of sandbox and they're getting upset and I'd have to say that it's anything but the truth. But the fact is, as I said earlier today, we will work with you as long as you work with us. This... this has been a one-way street for such... at such a long time. But let's... let's be perfectly clear. It's just not Chicago's but it's the State of Illinois's systems

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

are the ones that are as important to us and that's important to me. Sure, I'm concerned about Chicago's systems, but I'm more concerned about Illinois... Illinois's systems, our five systems. And no one... no one on that side of the aisle seems to be concerned about it. So, you're... so, we've got time, extend the deadline on this Bill. Make it part of a broader, comprehensive solution to the global problems we have with our pension systems with our five systems and also with Chicago. You do that, you've got us onboard."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Willis is recognized."

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

Willis: "Leader, what will happen if we do not do something to help in the City of Chicago with their current pension situation?"

Currie: "In 2025 and in 2027, both funds will have gone bankrupt. The effect of that will be that the retirees will no longer be able to collect their benefit checks. That to me would be a disaster. The city has promised these people that they will get a pension benefit. And if we do not make these changes today, there will be no money in the fund to sustain the deserving retired workers."

Willis: "So, we could be in a very similar situation that a few years ago the City of Detroit was in where many of their pensioneers went from having a full vested pension to getting less than 10 cents on the dollar."

Currie: "You're exactly right."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Willis: "And that would just be tragic for these strong, hardworking, mostly middle class, people in our state and in the City of Chicago."

Currie: "Accurate, you are."

Willis: "One of the other questions I have for you. You mentioned a Tier III employee. Can you please explain that to me? I am not familiar with that... what that is."

Currie: "These would be people who are not yet hired but could be hired after the effective date of the Bill. And the change here is that they will contribute more to the pension fund in order to help. Again, we're trying to make some parity. The taxpayers are contributing more. Tier III employers... employees would pay more into the system as well in... in exchange for an earlier retirement. And an option would be available under this Bill for the Tier II employees, that is anybody who was hired after January 1, 2011, until the effective date of the Bill. And those individuals would have the opportunity to pay more in order to take an earlier retirement."

Willis: "And we know that oftentimes by employees taking early retirement were able to save money because we're able to hire new employees to take those spots at a lower rate..."

Currie: "Exactly."

Willis: "...as we set in the new Article 7."

Currie: "This doesn't require anybody to do it, which is why we think this is totally constitutional, but it does give the Tier II employees that option."

Willis: "Which oftentimes we know from... historically, it's often a good option and many employees do take it because it allows

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

them to enjoy their retirement while they may have their health still in their... their best interest and stuff like that. One of the other questions, I know when I took office almost five years ago I was part of the group that was encouraged not to go into the GARS pension fund. And at the time, it was because we were very concerned about the pension and we were going to do some pension reform, which we did and I kept to that. But I also now, in retrospect, I look back at that and I realize that it actually had a reverse effect because by a number of my colleagues and myself included not going and contributing to GARS, we actually perpetuated the problem making it worse because the way our pension systems are set up is by new employees paying in, we're actually paying for the pension benefit of those that are retiring, correct?"

Currie: "Correct."

Willis: "And so, from five years ago where we were at about 30 percent, we are now down to 19 percent in GARS because of probably bad advice not to go into there at that time, but that's neither here or there. I think of... To the Bill. I think this shows that we are... the City of Chicago realizes that they are in a dilemma. They have to work through it. They have done this by increasing their property taxes, but they need our help and our assistance to be able to pay for their pensions to give stability to their employees. Without those employees available and being paid, we're having some issues. So, we're working on this to the best of our ability. And I would certainly urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative... Leader Currie to close."

40th Legislative Day

- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. This is a very important solution to a very important problem. We've many other problems to solve, but if we don't solve this one, we are leaving good solid workers in the lurch and hurting the citizens of Chicago. I urge your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 14 pass?'
  All in favor... Excuse me. Members, a verification has been requested by Representative Ives. All Members should be at their seats to vote their switch. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 14 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. With 63 voting 'yes', 45 voting 'no' and 2 voting 'present'... Representative Ives, would you like to persist with your... Mr. Clerk, please call the votes in the affirmative."
- Clerk Hollman: "A poll of those voting in the affirmative.

  Representative Ammons; Representative Andrade;

  Representative Arroyo; Representative Beiser; Representative

  Burke, D.; Representative Burke, K..."
- Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, please discontinue the verification. With 63 voting 'yes', 45 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present', Senate Bill 14, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2559, Representative Nekritz. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2559, a Bill for an Act concerning civil procedure. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Nekritz."

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is an initiative of the Illinois State Police. There have been instances where convicted criminals have sought to change their name in order to avoid some of the consequences from that and mainly the experience with the criminal was able to get a FOID card in violation of Illinois law. So, we have set up some standards here where when you go to change your name, if there is a criminal conviction in your background, notice has to be given to the state's attorney and... and the State Police have an opportunity to participate in that process as well."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2559 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 2559, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Stratton, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Stratton: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Representative."

Stratton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just like all of the colleagues in the... all of my colleagues in the House to congratulate Representative Justin Slaughter who will be leaving tomorrow to get ready to get married... tonight."

Speaker Turner: "Congratulations, Representative. Representative Ford, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Ford: "A point of personal privilege."

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Sir."

40th Legislative Day

- Ford: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would like to not rain on the parade or Justin Slaughter, I want to congratulate him also. But we also have a new Member on the Democrat side that's taking photos... I think he's around here somewhere... John Berry. John Berry, will we all give him a big round of applause. He's been doing a great job. Thank you, John."
- Speaker Turner: "Thank you. The Clerk... Mr. Clerk, Committee Reports."
- Clerk Hollman: "The following committees will be meeting immediately following Session. Fire & Emergency Services is in Room 115; Economic Opportunity in Room 122; Counties & Townships in C-1; Elementary & Secondary Education: School Curriculum & Policies in D-1; Consumer Protection in 413."
- Speaker Turner: "And now, allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, Leader Currie moves that the House adjourn until Friday, April 28 at 9:30 a.m.; Friday, April 28, 9:30 a.m. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the House is adjourned."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Second Reading of House Bills. House Bill 2376, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. House Bill 3897, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 3905, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of these House Bills. Second Reading of House Bills. House Bill 1429, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 1430, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 1431, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 1432, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 1433, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 1433, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 1434, a Bill for an Act

40th Legislative Day

concerning	public	aid.	House	Bill	143	85,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	public	aid.	House	Bill	143	86,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	public	aid.	House	Bill	143	87,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	public	aid.	House	Bill	143	88,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	safety	. Но	ıse Bi	11 1	439,	a	В	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	safety	. Hou	ıse Bi	11 1	440,	а	В	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	safety	. Hou	ıse Bi	11 1	441,	а	В	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	safety	. Hou	ıse Bi	11 1	442,	а	В	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	safety	. Hou	ıse Bi	11 1	443,	а	В	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	health	. Hou	ıse Bi	11 1	444,	а	В	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	liquor	. Ног	ıse Bi	11 1	445,	а	В	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	health	. Hou	ıse Bi	11 1	446,	а	В	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	health	. Hou	ıse Bi	11 1	447,	а	В	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	health	. Hou	ıse Bi	11 1	448,	а	В	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	health	. Hou	ıse Bi	11 1	449,	а	В	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	health	. Ног	ıse Bi	11 1	450,	а	В	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	health	. Ног	ıse Bi	11 1	451,	а	В	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	health	. Hou	ıse Bi	11 1	452,	а	В	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	health	. Ног	ıse Bi	11 1	453,	а	В	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	health	. Hou	ıse Bi	11 1	455,	а	В	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	safety	. Hou	ıse Bi	11 1	456,	а	В	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	safety	. Ног	ıse Bi	11 1	457,	а	В	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	safety	. Hou	ıse Bi	11 1	458,	а	В	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	safety	. Hou	ıse Bi	11 1	459,	а	В	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	safety	. Hou	ıse Bi	11 1	460,	а	В	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	safety	. Hou	ıse Bi	11 1	461,	а	В	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	safety	. Ног	ıse Bi	11 1	462,	а	В	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	safety	. Ног	ıse Bi	11 1	463,	а	В	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	safety	. Hou	ıse Bi	11 1	464,	а	В	Bill	for	an	Act

40th Legislative Day

concerning	criminal	law.	House	Bill	1465,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	criminal	law.	House	Bill	1466,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	criminal	law.	House	Bill	1467,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	criminal	law.	House	Bill	1468,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	criminal	law.	House	Bill	1469,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	criminal	law.	House	Bill	1470,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	criminal	law.	House	Bill	1471,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	criminal	law.	House	Bill	1472,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	criminal	law.	House	Bill	1473,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	criminal	law.	House	Bill	1474,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	criminal	law.	House	Bill	1475,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	criminal	law.	House	Bill	1476,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	criminal	law.	House	Bill	1477,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	criminal	law.	House	Bill	1478,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	criminal	law.	House	Bill	1479,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	criminal	law.	House	Bill	1480,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	correction	ons.	House	Bill	1481,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	criminal	law.	House	Bill	1482,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	criminal	law.	House	Bill	1483,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	criminal	law.	House	Bill	1484,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	criminal	law.	House	Bill	1485,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	criminal	law.	House	Bill	1486,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	criminal	law.	House	Bill	1487,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	criminal	law.	House	Bill	1488,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	criminal	law.	House	Bill	1489,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	criminal	law.	House	Bill	1490,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	correction	ons.	House	Bill	1491,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	criminal	law.	House	Bill	1492,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	criminal	law.	House	Bill	1493,	a	Bill	for	an	Act

40th Legislative Day

concerning	criminal	law.	House	Bill	1494,	аВ	ill f	or a	n Act
concerning	criminal	law.	House	Bill	1495,	аВ	ill f	or a	n Act
concerning	criminal	law.	House	Bill	1496,	аВ	ill f	or a	n Act
concerning	criminal	law.	House	Bill	1497,	аВ	ill f	or a	n Act
concerning	criminal	law.	House	Bill	1498,	аВ	ill f	or a	n Act
concerning	criminal	law.	House	Bill	1499,	аВ	ill f	or a	n Act
concerning	criminal	law.	House	Bill	1500,	аВ	ill f	or a	n Act
concerning	criminal	law.	House	Bill	1501,	аВ	ill f	or a	n Act
concerning	criminal	law.	House	Bill	1502,	аВ	ill f	or a	n Act
concerning	criminal	law.	House	Bill	1503,	аВ	ill f	or a	n Act
concerning	criminal	law.	House	Bill	1504,	аВ	ill f	or a	n Act
concerning	transport	ation	. Hous	e Bil	1 1505	, a E	Bill :	for a	ın Act
concerning	transport	ation	. Hous	e Bil	1 1506	, a E	Bill :	for a	ın Act
concerning	courts.	House	e Bill	L 150	17 <b>,</b> a	Bil	l fo	r ar	n Act
concerning	courts.	House	e Bill	L 150	18, a	Bil	l fo	r ar	n Act
concerning	courts.	House	e Bill	L 150	19, a	Bil	l fo	r ar	n Act
concerning	courts.	House	e Bill	L 151	.0, a	Bil	l fo	r ar	n Act
concerning	courts.	House	e Bill	L 151	1, a	Bil	l fo	r ar	n Act
concerning	courts.	House	e Bill	L 151	.2, a	Bil	l fo	r ar	n Act
concerning	courts.	House	e Bill	L 151	.3, a	Bil	l fo	r ar	n Act
concerning	courts.	House	e Bill	L 151	4, a	Bil	l fo	r ar	n Act
concerning	courts.	House	e Bill	L 151	.5, a	Bil	l fo	r ar	n Act
concerning	courts.	House	e Bill	L 151	.6, a	Bil	l fo	r ar	n Act
concerning	courts.	House	e Bill	L 151	.7, a	Bil	l fo	r ar	n Act
concerning	courts.	House	e Bill	L 151	.8, a	Bil	l fo	r ar	n Act
concerning	courts.	House	e Bill	L 151	.9, a	Bil	l fo	r ar	n Act
concerning	courts.	House	e Bill	L 152	10, a	Bil	l fo	r ar	n Act
concerning	courts.	House	e Bill	L 152	1, a	Bil	l fo	r ar	n Act
concerning	alternat	ive di	spute	reso	lution	. Но	use E	Bill	1522,

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

a Bill for an Act concerning notices. House Bill 1523, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1524, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1525, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1526, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1527, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1528, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1529, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1530, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1531, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1532, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1533, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1534, a Bill for an Act concerning notices. House Bill 1535, a Bill for an Act concerning alternative dispute resolution. House Bill 1536, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 1537, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 1538, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 1539, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 1540, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 1541, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 1543, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 1544, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 1545, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 1546, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 1547, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 1548, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 1549, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 1550, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 1551, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 1552, a Bill for an Act

40th Legislative Day

concerning	civil	law.	House	Bill	1553,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	civil	law.	House	Bill	1554,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	civil	law.	House	Bill	1555,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	civil	law.	House	Bill	1556,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	civil	law.	House	Bill	1557,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	civil	law.	House	Bill	1558,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	civil	law.	House	Bill	1559,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	civil	law.	House	Bill	1561,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	busine	ess.	House	Bill	1562,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	busine	ess.	House	Bill	1563,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	busine	ess.	House	Bill	1564,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	busine	ess.	House	Bill	1565,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	busine	ess.	House	Bill	1566,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	busine	ess.	House	Bill	1567,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	busine	ess.	House	Bill	1568,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	busine	ess.	House	Bill	1569,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	busine	ess.	House	Bill	1570,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	busine	ess.	House	Bill	1571,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	busine	ess.	House	Bill	1572,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	busine	ess.	House	Bill	1573,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	busine	ess.	House	Bill	1574,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	busine	ess.	House	Bill	1575,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	civil	law.	House	Bill	1576,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	civil	law.	House	Bill	1577,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	civil	law.	House	Bill	1578,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	civil	law.	House	Bill	1579,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	civil	law.	House	Bill	1580,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	civil	law.	House	Bill	1581,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	civil	law.	House	Bill	1582,	a	Bill	for	an	Act

40th Legislative Day

concerning	human rights	s. House	e Bil	1 1583	, a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	human rights	s. House	e Bil	1 1584	, a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	human rights	s. House	e Bil	1 1585	, a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	human rights	s. House	e Bil	1 1586	, a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	human rights	s. House	e Bil	1 1587	, a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	business. H	House B	ill	1588,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	business. H	House B	ill	1589,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	business. H	House B	ill	1590,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	business. H	House B	ill	1591,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	business. H	House B	ill	1592,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	employment.	House	Bill	1593,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	employment.	House	Bill	1594,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	employment.	House	Bill	1595,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	employment.	House	Bill	1596,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	employment.	House	Bill	1597,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	employment.	House	Bill	1598,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	employment.	House	Bill	1599,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	employment.	House	Bill	1600,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	employment.	House	Bill	1601,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	employment.	House	Bill	1602,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	employment.	House	Bill	1603,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	employment.	House	Bill	1604,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	employment.	House	Bill	1605,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	employment.	House	Bill	1606,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	employment.	House	Bill	1607,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	employment.	House	Bill	1608,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	employment.	House	Bill	1609,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	employment.	House	Bill	1610,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	employment.	House	Bill	1611,	а	Bill	for	an	Act

40th Legislative Day

concerning	employment.	Hous	se Bi	11 16	512,	a I	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	employment.	Hous	se Bi	11 16	513,	a I	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	employment.	Hous	se Bi	11 16	514,	a I	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	employment.	Hous	se Bi	11 16	515,	a I	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	employment.	Hous	se Bi	11 16	516,	a I	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	employment.	Hous	se Bi	11 16	517,	a I	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	conservation	. Но	use B	sill 1	1619,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	transportation	on. H	House	Bill	1620	, a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	transportation	on. H	House	Bill	1621	, a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	transportation	on. H	House	Bill	1622	, a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	transportatio	on. H	House	Bill	1623	, a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	transportation	on. H	House	Bill	1624	, a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	transportation	on. H	House	Bill	1625	, a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	transportation	on. H	House	Bill	1626	, a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	transportatio	on. H	House	Bill	1627	, a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	transportatio	on. H	House	Bill	1628	, a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	transportatio	on. H	House	Bill	1629	, a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	transportatio	on. H	House	Bill	1630	, a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	transportatio	on. H	House	Bill	1631	, a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	transportatio	on. H	House	Bill	1632	, a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	transportation	on. H	House	Bill	1633	, a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	transportatio	on. H	House	Bill	1634	, a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	transportatio	on. H	House	Bill	1635	, a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	transportation	on. H	House	Bill	1636	, a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	transportation	on. H	House	Bill	1637	, a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	transportation	on. H	House	Bill	1638	, a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	transportatio	on. H	House	Bill	1639	, a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	transportatio	on. H	House	Bill	1640	, a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	transportatio	on. H	House	Bill	1641	, a	Bill	for	an	Act

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

concerning transportation. House Bill 1642, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1643, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1644, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1645, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1646, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1647, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1648, a Bill for an Act concerning conservation. House Bill 1649, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1650, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1651, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1652, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1653, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1654, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1655, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1656, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 1657, a Bill for Act concerning safety. House Bill 1658, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 1659, a Bill for Act concerning safety. House Bill 1660, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 1661, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 1662, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 1663, a Bill for Act an concerning safety. House Bill 1664, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 1665, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 1666, a Bill for an Act concerning agriculture. House Bill 1667, a Bill for an Act concerning agriculture. House Bill 1668, a Bill for an Act concerning agriculture. House Bill 1669, a Bill for an Act concerning agriculture. House Bill 1670, a Bill for an Act

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

concerning agriculture. House Bill 1671, a Bill for an Act concerning animals. House Bill 1672, a Bill for an Act concerning animals. House Bill 1673, a Bill for an Act concerning fish. House Bill 1674, a Bill for an Act concerning fish. House Bill 1675, a Bill for an Act concerning wildlife. House Bill 1676, a Bill for an Act concerning wildlife. House Bill 1678, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1679, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1680, a Bill for an Act concerning business. House Bill 1681, a Bill for an Act concerning business. House Bill 1682, a Bill for an Act concerning business. House Bill 1683, a Bill for an Act concerning business. House Bill 1684, a Bill for an Act concerning business. House Bill 1686, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 1687, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 1688, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 1689, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 1690, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 1691, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 1692, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 1693, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 1694, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 1695, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 1696, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 1697, a Bill for an Act concerning housing. House Bill 1698, a Bill for concerning housing. House Bill 1699, a Bill for an Act concerning urban problems. House Bill 1700, a Bill for an Act concerning urban problems. House Bill 1701, a Bill for an Act concerning aging. House Bill 1702, a Bill for an Act

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

concerning aging. House Bill 1703, a Bill for Act an for concerning aging. House Bill 1704, a Bill Act concerning aging. House Bill 1705, a Bill for an Act concerning aging. House Bill 1706, a Bill for Act concerning children. House Bill 1707, a Bill for an Act concerning children. House Bill 1708, a Bill for an Act concerning military service. House Bill 1709, a Bill for an Act concerning military service. House Bill 1710, a Bill for an Act concerning health. House Bill 1711, a Bill for an Act concerning health. House Bill 1712, a Bill for an Act concerning health. House Bill 1713, a Bill for Act concerning health. House Bill 1714, a Bill for Act an concerning health. House Bill 1715, a Bill for concerning transportation. House Bill 1716, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1717, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1718, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1719, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1720, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1721, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1722, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1723, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1724, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1725, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1726, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1727, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1728, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1729, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1730, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1731, a Bill for an Act

40th Legislative Day

concerning	crimin	al	lav	v.	Hous	se	Bil	1	1732,	. 6	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	crimin	al	lav	v.	Hous	se	Bil	1	1733,	. 6	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	crimin	al	lav	V .	Hous	se	Bil	1	1734,	. 6	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	crimin	al	lav	V .	Hous	se	Bil	1	1735,	. 6	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	crimin	al	lav	V .	Hous	se	Bil	1	1736,	· 6	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	crimin	al	lav	V .	Hous	se	Bil	1	1737,	. 6	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	crimin	al	lav	v .	Hous	se	Bil	1	1738,	. 6	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	crimin	al	lav	v .	Hous	se	Bil	1	1739,	. 6	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	crimin	al	lav	V .	Hous	se	Bil	1	1740,	. 6	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	crimin	al	lav	v .	Hous	se	Bil	1	1741,	. 6	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	crimin	al	lav	v .	Hous	se	Bil	1	1742,	. 6	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	civil	la	.W.	Н	ouse	В	ill	1	743,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	civil	la	.W.	Н	ouse	В	ill	1	744,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	civil	la	. W .	Н	ouse	В	ill	1	745,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	civil	la	. W .	Н	ouse	В	ill	1	746,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	civil	la	.W.	Н	ouse	В	ill	1	747,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	civil	la	. W .	Н	ouse	В	ill	1	748,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	civil	la	. W .	Н	ouse	В	ill	1	749,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	civil	la	. W .	Н	ouse	В	ill	1	750,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	civil	la	. W .	Н	ouse	В	ill	1	751,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	civil	la	. W .	Н	ouse	В	ill	1	752,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	civil	la	. W .	Н	ouse	В	ill	1	753,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	civil	la	. W .	Н	ouse	В	ill	1	754 <b>,</b>	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	civil	la	. W .	Н	ouse	В	ill	1	755 <b>,</b>	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	civil	la	. W .	Н	ouse	В	ill	1	756,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	civil	la	. W .	Н	ouse	В	ill	1	757,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	civil	la	. W .	Н	ouse	В	ill	1	758 <b>,</b>	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	civil	la	. W .	Н	ouse	В	ill	1	759,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	civil	la	. W .	Н	ouse	В	ill	1	760,	а	Bill	for	an	Act

concerning civil law. House Bill 1761, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 1762, a Bill for an Act

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

concerning civil law. House Bill 1763, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Second Reading of these House Bills. They will be held on the Order of Second Reading." Clerk Bolin: "Second Reading of House Bills. House Bill 2141, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2142, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2143, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2144, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2145, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2146, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2147, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2148, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2149, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2150, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2151, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2152, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2153, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2154, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2155, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2156, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2157, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2158, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2159, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2160, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2161, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2162, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2163, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2164, a

40th Legislative Day

Bill	for	an	Act	making	appropriations.	House	Bill	2165,	a
Bill	for	an	Act	making	appropriations.	House	Bill	2166,	а
Bill	for	an	Act	making	appropriations.	House	Bill	2167,	a
Bill	for	an	Act	making	appropriations.	House	Bill	2168,	a
Bill	for	an	Act	making	appropriations.	House	Bill	2169,	a
Bill	for	an	Act	making	appropriations.	House	Bill	2170,	a
Bill	for	an	Act	making	appropriations.	House	Bill	2171,	а
Bill	for	an	Act	making	appropriations.	House	Bill	2172,	а
Bill	for	an	Act	making	appropriations.	House	Bill	2173,	a
Bill	for	an	Act	making	appropriations.	House	Bill	2174,	a
Bill	for	an	Act	making	appropriations.	House	Bill	2175,	a
Bill	for	an	Act	making	appropriations.	House	Bill	2176,	a
Bill	for	an	Act	making	appropriations.	House	Bill	2177,	a
Bill	for	an	Act	making	appropriations.	House	Bill	2178,	a
Bill	for	an	Act	making	appropriations.	House	Bill	2179,	a
Bill	for	an	Act	making	appropriations.	House	Bill	2180,	a
Bill	for	an	Act	making	appropriations.	House	Bill	2181,	a
Bill	for	an	Act	making	appropriations.	House	Bill	2182,	a
Bill	for	an	Act	making	appropriations.	House	Bill	2183,	a
Bill	for	an	Act	making	appropriations.	House	Bill	2184,	a
Bill	for	an	Act	making	appropriations.	House	Bill	2185,	a
Bill	for	an	Act	making	appropriations.	House	Bill	2186,	a
Bill	for	an	Act	making	appropriations.	House	Bill	2187,	a
Bill	for	an	Act	making	appropriations.	House	Bill	2188,	a
Bill	for	an	Act	making	appropriations.	House	Bill	2189,	a
Bill	for	an	Act	making	appropriations.	House	Bill	2190,	a
Bill	for	an	Act	making	appropriations.	House	Bill	2191,	a
Bill	for	an	Act	making	appropriations.	House	Bill	2192,	a
Bill	for	an	Act	making	appropriations.	House	Bill	2193,	a

40th Legislative Day

Bill	for	an	Act	making	appropria	ations.	House	Bill	2194,	a
Bill	for	an	Act	making	appropria	ations.	House	Bill	2195,	a
Bill	for	an	Act	making	appropria	ations.	House	Bill	2196,	a
Bill	for	an	Act	making	appropria	ations.	House	Bill	2197,	a
Bill	for	an	Act	making	appropria	ations.	House	Bill	2198,	a
Bill	for	an	Act	making	appropria	ations.	House	Bill	2199,	a
Bill	for	an	Act	making	appropria	ations.	House	Bill	2200,	, a
Bill	for	an	Act	making	appropria	ations.	House	Bill	2201,	a
Bill	for	an	Act	making	appropria	ations.	House	Bill	2202,	a
Bill	for	an	Act	making	appropri	ations.	House	Bill	2203,	a
Bill	for	an	Act	making	appropri	ations.	House	Bill	2204,	a
Bill	for	an	Act	making	appropri	ations.	House	Bill	2205,	a
Bill	for	an	Act	making	appropri	ations.	House	Bill	2206,	a
Bill	for	an	Act	concern	ing safet	y. Hous	e Bill	2207,	аВ	ill
for a	n Ac	t co	ncer	ning and	imals. Hou	ıse Bill	2208,	a Bil	l for	an
Act o	conce	erni	ng a	gricultu	re. House	e Bill	2209 <b>,</b> a	a Bill	for	an
Act c	conce	rni	ng ed	lucation	. House B	ill 221	0, a Bi	.ll fo	r an .	Act
conce	ernin	g e	duca	tion. H	ouse Bill	2211,	a Bil	l for	an .	Act
conce	ernin	g e	duca	tion. H	ouse Bill	2212,	a Bil	l for	an .	Act
conce	ernin	g e	duca	tion. H	ouse Bill	2213,	a Bil	l for	an .	Act
conce	ernin	g g	over	nment. I	House Bil	1 2214,	a Bil	l for	an .	Act
conce	ernin	g m	ilita	ary serv	ice. Hous	se Bill	2215,	a Bil	l for	an
Act c	once	rniı	ng pu	blic aid	d. House B	3ill 221	.6, a B	ill fo	r an .	Act
conce	ernin	g p	ubli	c aid.	House Bil	.1 2217,	a Bil	l for	an .	Act
conce	ernin	g 1	reven	ue. Hou	se Bill	2218,	a Bill	for	an .	Act
conce	ernin	g h	nousi	ng. Hou	se Bill	2219,	a Bill	for	an .	Act
conce	ernin	g a	aging	. House	e Bill 2	2220, a	Bill	for	an .	Act
conce	ernin	g c	hild	ren. Ho	use Bill	2221,	a Bili	l for	an .	Act
conce	ernin	g l	ocal	governm	ent. Hous	se Bill	2222,	a Bil	l for	an

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Act concerning local government. House Bill 2223, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 2224, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 2225, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. House Bill 2226, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 2227, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 2228, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 2229, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 2230, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 2231, a Bill for an Act concerning business. House Bill 2232, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 2233, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 2234, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 2235, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 2236, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 2237, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. House Bill 2238, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 2239, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. House Bill 2240, a Bill for an Act concerning conservation. House Bill 2241, a Bill for an Act concerning wildlife. House Bill 2242, a Bill for an Act concerning fish. House Bill 2243, a Bill for an Act concerning agriculture. House Bill 2244, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 2245, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 2246, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. House Bill 2247, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 2248, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 2249, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 2250, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 2251, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. House Bill 2252,

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 2253, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 2254, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 2255, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 2256, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 2257, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 2258, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 2259, a Bill for an Act concerning military service. House Bill 2260, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 2261, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 2262, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 2263, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 2264, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 2265, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 2266, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 2267, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 2268, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 2269, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 2270, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 2271, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 2272, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 2273, a Bill for an Act concerning military service. House Bill 2274, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 2275, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. House Bill 2276, a Bill for an Act concerning wildlife. House Bill 2277, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 2278, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. House Bill 2279, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. House Bill 2280, a Bill for an Act

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 2281, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 2282, a Bill for an Act concerning corrections. House Bill 2283, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 2284, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 2285, a Bill for an Act concerning warehouses. House Bill 2287, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 2288, a Bill for an Act concerning notices. House Bill 2289, a Bill for an Act concerning alternative dispute resolution. House Bill 2290, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. House Bill 2291, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 2293, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 2294, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 2295, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 2296, a Bill for an Act concerning human rights. House Bill 2297, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 2298, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 2299, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 2300, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 2301, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 2302, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 2303, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 2304, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 2305, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 2306, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 2307, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. House Bill 2308, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 2309, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. House Bill 2310, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. House Bill 2311, a Bill for an Act

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

concerning State government. House Bill 2312, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 2313, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 2314, a Bill for an Act concerning health. House Bill 2315, a Bill for an concerning civil law. House Bill 2316, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 2317, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 2318, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 2320, a Bill for an Act concerning health. House Bill 2321, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 2322, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 2323, a Bill for concerning safety. House Bill 2324, a Bill for an concerning regulation. House Bill 2325, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 2326, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 2327, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 2328, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 2329, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 2330, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 2331, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 2332, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. House Bill 2333, a Bill for an Act concerning business. House Bill 2334, a Bill for an Act concerning health. House Bill 2335, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 2336, a Bill for an Act concerning business. House Bill 2337, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 2338, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 2339, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 2341, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 2343, a Bill for

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

an Act concerning finance. House Bill 2344, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 2345, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 2346, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 2347, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Second Reading of these House Bills."

Clerk Hollman: "Introduction and First Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 421, offered by Representative Moylan, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 682, offered by Representative Welch, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 734, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 776, offered by Representative Ford, a Bill for an Act offered concerning civil law. Senate Bill 882, Representative Thapedi, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Senate Bill 887, offered by Representative Zalewski, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 896, offered by Representative Parkhurst, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Senate Bill 948, offered by Representative Thapedi, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Senate Bill 949, offered by Representative Thapedi, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Senate Bill 982, offered by Representative Andrade, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. Senate Bill 1238, offered by Representative Jimenez, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 1326, offered by Representative Hammond, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 1343, offered by Representative Sims, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 1372, offered by Representative Walsh, a

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Bill for an Act concerning safety. Senate Bill 1420, offered by Representative Breen, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 1466, offered by Representative Sosnowski, a Bill for an Act concerning wildlife. Senate Bill 1469, offered by Representative Andersson, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Senate Bill 1573, offered Representative Gabel, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Senate Bill 1581, offered by Representative Sims, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 1584, offered by Representative Reis, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Senate Bill 1586, offered by Representative Kifowit, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 1598, offered by Representative Mayfield, a Bill for an Act offered concerning revenue. Senate Bill 1663, Representative Ammons, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 1668, offered by Representative Demmer, a Bill for an Act concerning property. Senate Bill 1670, offered by Representative Guzzardi, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 1671, offered by Representative Swanson, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 1676, offered by Representative Welch, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 1693, offered by Representative Kifowit, a Bill for concerning health. Senate Bill 1694, offered bу Representative Zalewski, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Senate Bill 1702, offered by Representative Mayfield, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 1705, offered by Representative Wallace, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Senate Bill 1730, offered by Representative Turner, a

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Senate Bill 1737, offered by Representative Zalewski, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 1739, offered Representative Ford, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 1746, offered by Representative Hays, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 1756, offered by Representative Parkhurst, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Senate Bill 1757, offered by Representative McAuliffe, a Bill for an Act concerning the Department of Bill 1758, Affairs. Senate offered Representative Greenwood, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. First Reading of these Senate Bills. Committee Reports. Representative Crespo, Chairperson from Committee on Elementary & Secondary Education: Curriculum & Policies reports the following committee action taken on April 27, 2017: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House Joint Resolution 22. Representative Walsh, Chairperson from the Committee on Counties & Townships reports the following committee action taken on April 27, 2017: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 2756. Representative Willis, Chairperson from the Committee on Fire & Emergency Services reports the following committee action taken on April 27, 2017: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill Representative Hernandez, Chairperson from the Committee on Consumer Protection reports the following committee action taken on April 27, 2017: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 1560, Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 1560, Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 2510, and Floor

40th Legislative Day

4/27/2017

Amendment #2 to House Bill 2958. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."