58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Speaker Lang: "The House will be in order. We shall be led in prayer today by Reverend Steve Worsham, who is with Bethel Bible Church in Evergreen Park. Reverend Worsham is the guest of Representative Kelly Burke. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off cell phones and rise for the invocation and Pledge of Allegiance. Reverend Worsham."

Reverend Worsham: "Let's pray. Father, I'd like to begin my prayer this morning with a confession and that's a confession that You've commanded us to pray for those in authority over us and it's something I've not done as well as I should. It's easier to take potshots at others and think that we know better, but Lord, these are folks that serve You and serve the people and so, I pledge to pray more. Lord, You have said that to have a pure religion is to help those in need, to help widows and orphans and to keep oneself spotless from sin and sometimes because of my selfishness I go for 0 for 3 on that one too. So, Lord, help me to pray for these people who serve, help me to pray for their families, pray that You would be with them today as they decide on important decisions for the good of the people. I pray that they would have a compassionate heart, a heart of righteousness and justice. And Lord, I pray that You'd be with them and their families and just guide them. You've said in Your word that if any of us lacks wisdom, You'll give it generously. And so, I pray that we would look to You for wisdom today. And we pray these things in Your name, Amen."

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

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

- Cavaletto et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Lang: "Roll Call for Attendance. Leader Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. I have no excused Democrats to report today."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Demmer."
- Demmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please let the record note that all Republicans are present today."
- Speaker Lang: "Hard to believe. Mr. Clerk... Hernandez, Martwick.

 Please take the record, Mr. Clerk. We have 117 Members present

 and we do have a quorum. The Chair recognizes the Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2017: recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 262, Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 707, Floor Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 1843, Floor Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 2034, Floor Amendment 2 to House Bill 2859; approved for consideration, referred to Second Reading is House Bill 1438, House Bill 2457, House Bill 2859; approved for consideration, referred to Third Reading is House Bill 684 and House Bill 2376. Representative Andrade, Chairperson from the Committee on Cybersecurity, Data Analytics, & IT reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2017: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 444. Representative Crespo, Chairperson from the Committee on Elementary & Secondary Education: School Curriculum & Policies reports the following committee action

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

taken on May 30, 2017: recommends be adopted is a Motion to House Bill Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to Representative Beiser, Chairperson from the Committee on Environment reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2017: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 1417; do amended Short Debate is Senate Representative Thapedi, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary - Civil reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2017: recommends be adopted is a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2702, Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2713, Senate Amendment 2 to House 2713, Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill Representative Scherer, Chairperson from the Committee on Business Incentives for Local Communities reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2017: recommends be adopted is a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2820. Representative Mussman, Chairperson from the Committee on Special Needs Services reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2017: recommends be adopted is a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2641. Representative Daniel Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on Executive reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2017: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 1518; do pass as amended Short Debate is Senate Bill 3, Senate 1839, Senate Bill 1904. Representative Riley, Chairperson from the Committee on State Government Administration reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2017: recommends be adopted is Motions to Concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 3050... 3005, and Motions

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

to Concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 4011. Representative Kelly Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-Higher Education reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2017: recommends be adopted is a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 3691. Representative Evans, Chairperson from the Committee on Transportation: Regulation, Roads & Bridges reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2017: recommends be adopted is a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2363, House Joint Resolution 62. Representative Walsh, Chairperson from the Committee on Counties & Townships reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2017: recommends be adopted is a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3536. Representative Chapa LaVia, Chairperson from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2017: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 266. Representative Mayfield, Chairperson from the Committee Elementary & Secondary Education: Licensing, on Administration & Oversight reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2017: do pass as amended Short Debate is Senate Bill 1483. Representative Chapa LaVia, Chairperson from the Committee on Energy reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2017: recommends be adopted is a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3656. Representative Lilly, Chairperson from the Committee on Insurance: Property & Casualty reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2017: recommends be adopted is a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Bill 1954. Representative Davis, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-Elementary & Secondary Education reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2017: do pass as amended Standard Debate is Senate Bill 446. Representative Crespo, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-General Services reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2017: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 321."

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

Clerk Hollman: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 446, offered by Representative Meier. House Resolution 447, offered by Representative Lang. House Resolution 448, offered Representative Lilly. House Resolution 449, offered by Representative Unes. House Resolution 450, offered by Representative Riley. House Resolution 451, offered by Representative Hernandez. House Resolution 452, offered by Representative Ives. House Resolution 453, offered by Representative Ives (sic-Nekritz). House Resolution 454, offered by Representative Crespo. House Resolution 455, offered by Representative Gabel. House Resolution 456, offered by Speaker Madigan. House Resolution 457, offered by Representative Daniel Burke. House Resolution 458, offered by Representative Williams. House Resolution 459, offered by Representative Fine. House Resolution 460, offered by Representative Thapedi. House Resolution 461, offered by Representative Soto. House Resolution 462, offered Representative Soto. And House Resolution 463, offered by Representative Meier."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

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. Chair recognizes Representative Jimenez."

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

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Jimenez: "Good morning, Members. I'd like to introduce to you to my Page for a day. Hanna, if you could stand up? Hanna Abrahamson just graduated from Springfield Lutheran. She's heading to Methodist University in North Carolina where she'll study criminal justice and she'll play tennis there. Please welcome her to the chamber."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome. We're happy to have you with us today.

Representative Ives is recognized."

Ives: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise for a point of personal
 privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Ives: "Do... We just adopted House Resolution 452. This Resolution is... celebrates the 100th anniversary of the First Infantry Division and the First Division Museum at Cantigny. The First Infantry Division was organized on June 8, 1917 for duty on the Western Front in World War I. It is the first permanent division in the regular Army and has seen action in all American Wars since 1917 except for the Korean War. The division is also known as 'the Big Red One' and the 'Fighting First'. The division motto: no mission too difficult. No sacrifice too great. Duty first. Embodies the bravery of this unit since its inception. The First Division won the first American victory in World War I at the Battle of Cantigny in

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

France where their command showed innovation in being the first to significantly use modern combined arms operations in the U.S. Army. In World War II, the First Division, keeping in line with their name, was the first division sent to Europe arriving in Great Britain in July 1942. They fought in Africa and the amphibious landing in Sicily, they led the assault on Omaha Beach on D-Day, June 6, 1944. They pushed past the hedgerows and across France into German territory where they breached the Siegfried Line and attacked the City of Aachen taking control of the first German city to fail to allied armies. They held the northern shoulder during the Battle of the Bulge and eventually liberated a... a Nazi labor camp at Falkenau. In Vietnam, the Big Red One was again first to fight beginning in 1965. It protected the Highway 13 corridor to Cambodia against enemy infiltration. The division was engaged in operations in the Iron Triangle and fought back in the 1968 Tet Offensive. From Desert Storm to the war on terror including Operation Iragi Freedom and Operation Enduring First Division continues to distinguish Freedom, the themselves in service to our country. The First Division Museum is a legacy left by Colonel Robert McCormick, Jr., who served as an artillery officer in the First Battalion Fifth Artillery Regiment of the First Division and participated in the Battle of Cantigny. He named his country estate in Wheaton after that battle and began and supported the First Division Museum located at Cantigny. This summer the museum will complete a \$7 million renovation to include the more current military actions the division has participated in, especially in regards to those in the 21st century. This Friday, Cantigny

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

will host its celebration of the 100th anniversary of the First Division and on August 26, the renovated museum will be open to the public. Cantigny is truly an important and historic site and a treasure to our state. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Page 6 of the Calendar, Senate Bills-Third Reading, Senate Bill 1348, Representative Soto. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1348, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Soto. Out of the record. Members, we still have a lot of Bills on the Calendar. We need you to be ready when your Bills are called, no offense, Representative Soto. But we need you... 'cause you didn't know when we... where we were starting. Need to be ready. We may not get back to your Bills. So, if you need a file, get it. If you need a printout, do it. We're going to enforce all the timing today. Senate Bill 1376, Mr. Evans. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1376, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Evans."

Evans: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and the great Members of this Assembly. Senate Bill 1376 amends the Department of Transportation Law of the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois by making three specific technical changes removing reference to the Federal Regional Rail Reorganization Act of 1973 and the Railroad Revitalization and Regulatory Reform Act of 1976 in one change. The second change is it changes reference from the Interstate Commerce Commission to the Federal Surface Transportation Board. The Interstate Commerce

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Commission is nonexistent. And lastly, removes reporting requirements that were previously mandated for the purposes of the Federal Regional Rail Reorganization Act of 1973 and the Railroad Revitalization Regulatory Act of 1976. I request your support for this technical change cleanup Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ammons, do you rise on this Bill?

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? Burke,
Feigenholtz, Mayfield. Please record yourselves, Members. 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. Representative Ammons is recognized."

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

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Ammons: "Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the single most critical issue facing community-based services for children and adults with disabilities in Illinois is the inability to recruit and retain frontline staff, direct support professionals. Families receiving services, caregivers, service providers, have all been ringing this alarm in communities across our state and in the halls of this building for far too long. It has been nine years since the state has increased rates to provide wage increases for caregivers. Inaction on this issue has meant dedicated caregivers continue to receive wages below the poverty line. DSP... DSPs are leaving this work, not because they want to,

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

but because they can't pay their bills or put food on their it is our loved ones with disabilities... tables. And developmental disabilities that are suffering the most. Last night, Dale Morrissey, the CEO of Developmental Services Center in my district and chairman of the board of directors of IARF... Mr. Speaker, if you would please bring order to the chamber. This statement is in relationship to people with disabilities and those who care for them. And I appreciate the General Assembly caring about this issue. Last night, Mr. Dale Morrissey, the CEO of Developmental Services Center in my district and chairman of the board of directors of IARF, sent me some disturbing information that they recently gathered from 25 service providers across the state. During the course of this budget impasse or I say budget crisis, 13 group homes have closed, meaning 69 individuals were forced to move from their homes to somewhere else. Twenty-two group homes were consolidated, meaning 90 individuals moved into larger settings with some people that they didn't even know. Again, Ladies and Gentlemen, the root cause of these situations none of us should ever want to read or hear about is the shortage of staff. The providers that were forced to make these decisions carry an average staff vacancy rate of 20 percent. If these providers had to take further action today to shift their service capacity to a hundred percent of their existing staffing levels so many lives would be upended. Fifty-four group home closures, 54 group home closures, 3 ICFDD closures which serve individuals with the highest needs. Ladies and Gentlemen, it's time... it's beyond time in Illinois that we cannot neglect children and people with

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

disabilities anymore. As we witnessed on this floor two days ago about the crisis in the Department of Children and Family Services, we also have a crisis with developmental services and the people that try to care for them. I implore all of you to cosponsor and support Senate Bill 955, the Community Disabil... Disability Living Wage Act which will provide a living wage for all of our caregivers to get off of food stamps and other aid and contribute more to our local economy. But most importantly, provide stability and support in the lives of people with developmental disabilities. And with that, please help me welcome the CEO and Chief Executive Officer of Developmental Services Center, Mr. Dale Morrissey, from Champaign, Illinois is in the gallery. Thank him for the work that he does and welcome him to our Capitol."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you. And welcome to the House chamber. Mr. Andersson is recognized."

Andersson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have inquiries of the parliamentarian."

Speaker Lang: "State your inquiries."

Andersson: "Thank you. Yesterday during debate, Representative Batinick moved the previous question pursuant to Rule 59. At that point, the Rule is very clear and states that until that question is decided all debate is precluded. Yesterday, once again, the Motion was completely... completely disregarded. There was no vote; there was no consideration of it. It was ignored. Then when I attempted to appeal that ruling pursuant to Rule 57, my appeal was equally ignored. These Rules are being flouted. I'd like to understand why and what the justification is. And I'd like it on the record, please."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andersson, the parliamentarian and I have discussed this for you. The answer to your inquiry is that Leader Currie was following accepted practice. She didn't rule against his Motion. She just simply suggested that there were a couple of additional speakers prepared to speak and let's move on. She didn't really make a ruling, so there was nothing to appeal. Representative Hammond is recognized."

Hammond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You just used the words 'accepted practice'. We have Rules that govern this chamber. The actions that took place yesterday and the actions that have taken place previously are not accepted practice, Mr. Speaker. And they are certainly not the way this chamber should be conducted."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hays."

Hays: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, I... I find that ruling interesting because the way that situation was handled is not how you personally would handle it ever. On countless occasions, the same Motion has been made. In each and every instance, you followed the Rules or if there was just one speaker left, you would ask the person who made the Motion are you okay if one more speaker speaks. So, it's not accepted practice. It's not the practice that you personally have ever employed and if you're going to make it up on the run, come up with something better than that nonsense."

Speaker Lang: "Senate Bill 1348, Representative Soto. I do want the Body to understand this is the last time we're going backwards on the Calendar. So, Members that are not on the floor that have Bills should get to the floor. Representative Soto. Please read the Bill."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1348, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Soto."

Soto: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This Amendment... I mean, I'm sorry, this Bill extends the sunset of the Medical Practice Act by two years. The Amendment retains all other aspects of the underlying Bill. Department of Financial and Professional Regulations boilerplate modern... modernization language. Senate Bill 1348 contains an immediate effective date. And I would ask for 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? For the remainder of the day, I'm only going to say this three times. Have all voted who wish? Willis. Please take the record. On this question, there are only 6... there are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1400, Representative Nekritz. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1400, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Nekritz."

Nekritz: "I am in my chair and ready to proceed, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Bless your heart."

Nekritz: "So, this legislation takes the provisions of the Health Care Worker Registry that are currently in four different statutes and puts them into... into one place in statute so that when... if and when we amend it, it will be much easier to

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

make sure that we're covering all the employees that the Health Care Worker Registry is supposed to cover. I mean, it also adds new provisions to the Act... this Act concerning the right to appeal administrative finding in the hearing process. It also gives the Department of Public Health authority to investigate and issue subpoenas and rule-making authority. I know of no opposition. And I'd ask for 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? Riley. Please take the record. There are 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1429, Mr. Davidsmeyer. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1429, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davidsmeyer."

Davidsmeyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1429 simply makes it... clarifies the new technology and remote starters for cars to say that if you start your car with a remote system, it is not illegal to leave it running outside while you're inside."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. There are 115 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Welter is recognized."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

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

Speaker Lang: "Proceed, Sir."

Welter: "Members of the General Assembly, I have with me today a Page for the day, Ellie Marcolini. Ellie is here, if you want to stand, Ellie. She just graduated the eighth grade and will be a freshman at Williamsville High School this fall. She plays volleyball, basketball and track. And this Sunday she leaves for Washington, D.C. Her mother is my... our assistant, Peter Breen and I. And I would like you to give her a warm Springfield welcome."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome. Happy to have you with us. Mr. Brady is recognized."

Brady: "Thank... thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Proceed, Sir."

Brady: "I, too, Ladies and Gentlemen, would like you to join me in welcoming to Springfield a couple Pages that I have today. First off, Mr. Jack Henry. Jack will be an incoming senior at Bloomington High School. He's with us today. And his classmate, Lauren Lutman, who'll be a senior at Bloomington High School are here today. And they're here with his mother, Tracy, who's in the gallery. And also, from Gridley, Illinois, Garrett Hedican, who will be an incoming sophomore, who is homeschooled. They are my Pages today. Please give them a Springfield welcome, as they're standing down in front of us here. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome. Happy to have you with us today. Senate Bill 1433, Mr. Fortner. Please read the Bill."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1433, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Fortner."

Fortner: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 1433 will provide that any person who voluntarily self-discloses noncompliance on an environmental infraction of which the agency had been unaware is entitled to a reduction in the portion of the penalty that is not based on the economic benefit of noncompliance. Happy to answer any questions."

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? Evans. Please take the record. There are 115 (sic-116) voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1434, Mr. Hoffman. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1434, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1434, as it has been amended, ensures that we have the Department of Revenue on board. It amends the definition of insured closing letter... or excuse me... the department of... the department on board, IDFPR on board. And it also ensures that the title companies as well as the equity companies are all in favor of this Bill. I know of no known opposition."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andersson."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

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

Speaker Lang: "The Sponsor yields."

Andersson: "So, this relates to rental purchase agreements. Is that correct?"

Hoffman: "I apologize. I... on my computer, I had the wrong Bill up. It's a different Bill of mine. I had..."

Andersson: "You want to... you want to give us another one?"

Speaker Lang: "You explained the wrong Bill, Sir?"

Hoffman: "Yeah, I did. And I will pass that later, when we get to it."

Speaker Lang: "All right. Well, now you'll have to explain it later."

Hoffman: "So, Mr. Andersson, when we get to that Bill, my explanation will stand, okay?"

Andersson: "That... that's fine."

Hoffman: "Yes."

Andersson: "But how about we go over this Bill?"

Speaker Lang: "Would you like to explain this Bill now, Sir?"

Hoffman: "Yes, I would like to talk about this Bill."

Andersson: "Looking forward to it."

Hoffman: "What... what this Bill does is it deals with rental purchase agreements. Currently, what happens in Illinois, when a rental purchase... when a rent-to-own dealer purchases a piece of property, they have to pay the tax. What this would do is it would extend the payment of tax during the... during the term of the rental purchase agreement. It will... it will result in a net gain to the state with more taxes being paid and it also spreads it out over time. The rental purchase agencies are in favor of this Bill. The Department of Revenue

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

had an Amendment that they wanted me to put on the Bill. That was put on the Bill. So, I now know of no known opposition. Other states do this this way."

Andersson: "So, do we currently levy that tax, and if I understood your description, we're spreading it over the term. Is that right?"

Hoffman: "Yes."

Andersson: "So, right now, if I were to buy a rent-to-own... a couch, I would pay the 6.25 immediately. And instead, now, I would pay it over the term?"

Hoffman: "What would happen is... is the rental dealer would pay the tax immediately."

Andersson: "Okay."

Hoffman: "So, let's say you bought... for the sake of simplicity, let's say you bought a couch for a thousand dollars. Okay?"

Andersson: "Right."

Hoffman: "You'd pay that 6.25 or \$62.50. You would pay that right away. But now, what would happen is the... the tax would be spread over the... over the course of the rental agreement; therefore, the 6.25 would be paid over the course of the rental agreement."

Andersson: "How does that... you had said it's going to increase revenues. I understand the spread. I don't see how that increases revenues?"

Hoffman: "Because what would happen is the... the couch would probably be marked up. Okay? And that marked up amount will be the... the amount that will have the tax paid on it. Okay?"

Andersson: "Thank you very much for the answers."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris, this Bill is on the Order of Short Debate. But if you're brief, I'll let you proceed."
- Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Chair... Mr. Speaker. I will be brief. And Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill came before the House Revenue Committee. It did come out on relatively a partisan vote. The Republicans did vote 'no' primarily because we did not understand the Bill and no one talked to us about the Bill. What the Sponsor has done here is indeed accurate in terms of his description. When a rent-to-own entity buys that piece of property, they put the sales tax or pay the sales tax immediately. Now, after the markup, that sales tax is spread out over the longer period of time. This is similar to what we did with leases a number of years ago with the automobile industry which benefited both the state as well as ... as well as individuals. And lastly, I would say this. Illinois is the only state in the union... the only state in the union that utilizes this method of taxation. This brings us into line with all the other 49 states, so I would and can encourage a 'yes' vote on the Bill."
- 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Hernandez. Please take the record. There are 98 voting 'yes', 18 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1439, Representative Williams. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1439, a Bill for an Act concerning children. Third... Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Speaker Lang: "Representative Williams."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is proposed by the National Runaway Safeline, supported by the Attorney General and the Foster Care Alumni of America, Illinois Chapter. And basically what this Bill would do would provide that law enforcement must provide someone who reports a missing child with some very basic information: number 1) the 24-hour tollfree telephone number for the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children and the National Runaway Safeline as well as a description of services provided to families of missing children. And the motivation is sometimes when a parent reports a child missing, there may be opportunities for them to connect with other organizations that provide resources and support and ultimately help them connect with their missing child. And we don't want them to not get the resources, and therefore, asking law enforcement to provide that to them. And I'm happy to answer any questions about this very simple Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andersson."

Andersson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll just speak to the Bill.

I just want to urge an 'aye' vote on this one. I think that this is exactly the sort of thing that we should be doing to combat the sort of missing children and exploited children.

And I'm certain this has relationships to human trafficking as well. It's... it's commonsense stuff. It's very... I think it will be very effective. I compliment the speaker for bringing... or the Sponsor for bringing it. And I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1459, Representative Kifowit. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1459, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Kifowit."
- Kifowit: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is to talk about the Notarization Task Force to look at best practices and verification standards to implement electronic notification."
- 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? Evans. Please take the record. There are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1462, Representative Kifowit. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1462, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Kifowit."
- Kifowit: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1462 establishes a learner... Entrepreneur Learner's Permit pilot program to encourage and assist first-time entrepreneurs in certain sectors by helping them with associated state fees and... and expenses."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andersson."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

- Andersson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I apologize. It was a little hard to hear. Could you give me a thumbnail on that again, Representative? What's this... what's the purpose of the Bill?"
- Kifowit: "The purpose is it establishes an Entrepreneurial Learner's Permit pilot program to encourage and assist first-time entrepreneurs in certain business sectors by helping them with state fees associated with starting up a business."

Andersson: "And is this subject to appropriation?"

Kifowit: "It is... it's a pilot program and what it does is it limits the total reimbursements given in a fiscal year to 500 thousand. And DCEO claimed that they... with the Amendment that this should not be a problem."

Andersson: "Yeah. Floor Amendment 2 was adopted, correct?" Kifowit: "Correct."

- Andersson: "All right. According to our analysis that does indicate it's subject to appropriation. So, it looks like the answer to that is yes. So, we're encouraging entrepreneurs, right?"
- Kifowit: "Correct. As we know that small businesses and entrepreneurials create at least 60 percent of the workforce, and therefore, this is a great aspect to create jobs and stimulate the small business economy."

Andersson: "Thank you very much for the answers to the questions." Kifowit: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Record yourselves, Members. Andrade. Please take the record. On this

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

question, there are 88 voting 'yes', 28 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1478, Mr. Reick. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1478, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reick."

Reick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1478 amends the Radiation Protection Act by abolishing the Radiologic Technologies Advisory Board. And if there's ever been a reason for abolition, that name is it. The purpose of the Board was to assist IEMA with formulation of policies and regs for agency programs and to provide technical assistance, but the only time IEMA ever hears from this Board is in an audit finding that they haven't met since 2010. So, they think they can do a job better doing with some other type of committee. And they want to get the auditors off their back. It went through the Senate unopposed without... unanimously and there are no opposition."

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? Thapedi. 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. Senate Bill 1486, Mr. Olsen. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1486, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Olsen."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

- Olsen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is an initiative of the State Board of Education to streamline the School Code to amend or repeal outdated or otherwise problematic provisions of the School Code. I ask for your support."
- '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. Hernandez. Please take the record. There are 116 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1489, Mr. Welch. Please read the Bill. Gentleman has an Amendment. Please put the Bill back on the Order of Second Reading and please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1489, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Welch."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Welch."
- Welch: "Mr. Speaker, I move to adopt Floor Amendment #1 which is purely a technical Amendment. It takes out one word."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment will say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1489, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Sorry to cut you off, Mr. Welch, but I assumed that was okay with you."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Welch: "I appreciate that, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Welch: "Mr. Speaker, I ask for approval of Senate Bill 8... 1489 which amends the Illinois Emergency Management Agency Act that will allow them to collect a reasonable fee for attendance at Agency-sponsored conferences, not trainings. I am not aware of any opposition to this Bill. The fee is going to be limited to \$50. It's merely intended to cover the cost of putting on the conference. And 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? Mitchell. Please take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1493, Mr. Slaughter. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1493, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Slaughter."

Slaughter: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 1493 amends the Property Tax Code to allow our forest preserve districts to abate all due or unpaid property taxes and liens for distressed properties that are acquired by the districts. This Bill will allow forest preserves to create more recreational and outdoor opportunities by being able to repurpose and improve distressed properties for public use. Currently counties, municipalities, schools, and parks can abate these taxes. Senate Bill 1493 is simply adding that

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

forest preserve districts can now also abate these taxes. I urge a... a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

Ives: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ives: "Okay. Real quickly, it also... in our analysis also there's existing liens. Could you identify what those liens might be?"

Slaughter: "What the lien?"

Ives: "Yes. It says abatement of unpaid..."

Slaughter: "What the liens might be?"

Ives: "...taxes and existing liens. Is it only the liens that are associated with the unpaid taxes or are there other liens for which they're not going to have to pay?"

Slaughter: "No. It's my understanding it's only liens associated with the unpaid taxes."

Ives: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "The Bill's on the Order of Short Debate. Mr.

Andersson, you can have the minute and 28 seconds

Representative Ives left over."

Andersson: "Thank you. I appreciate that. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Andersson: "Thank you. Just very quickly. So, the current law is this can be done for counties, municipalities, school districts. And the park districts are the only ones who don't have this benefit and you're adding them, correct?"

Slaughter: "Right. That's correct."

Andersson: "Thank you very much."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Tabares. Please take the record. There are 115 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1529, Mr. Spain. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1529, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Spain."
- Spain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 1529 is an initiative of the Illinois Horseman's Council. Simply confirms that horse keeping and horse boarding is an activity protected in the Farm Nuisance Act. 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? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1532, Representative Chapa LaVia. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1532, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Chapa LaVia."
- Chapa LaVia: "Hi there, Speaker. You look mighty fine today. So, what this Bill does it adds that the average daily attendance of students with the equalized education program or a 504 plan... shall be displayed on district report cards. Currently,

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

the percentage of students with disabilities are already displayed on school district report cards, but this will provide additional information on these students. It requires... it requires average daily attendance of school districts to be displayed on the school report card. I'll take any questions, ask for its passage."

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 take the record. There are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1577, Representative Moeller. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1577, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Moeller."

Moeller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 1577, as amended, is necessary to bring the Illinois False Claims Act in conformity with the recent changes made to the Federal False Claims Act. The stakeholders negotiated an Amendment to address the concerns of the business community. And I know of no opposition. The False Claims Act is designed to prevent and punish fraud, waste, and abuse committed against the government. The Bill is revenue positive in that it allows the state to continue to receive an extra 10 percent of the money recovered in Medicaid fraud cases. Without this Bill, those additional dollars, about \$1 million a year, would instead go to the Federal Government.

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

I'm happy to answer any questions and ask for a favorable 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? Manley. Please take the record. There are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1585, Representative Soto. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1585, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Soto."

Soto: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 1585 is a modernization and a 10-year extension of the Physician Assistant Practice Act for Illinois. The legislation has no opponents in the Health Care Licensing Committee hearing and... the committee hearing and passed by 16 to 0 votes. The Bill has 21 Republican and Democratic... Democrat cosponsors in the House. And I want to thank Reps McCombie and Frese for being the chief cosponsors. The Bill will allow physician assistants to increase patient access to medical care for Medicaid patients, rural Illinoisans, and the underserved areas. I ask for a favorable Roll Call. I'm sorry, '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. There are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

declared passed. Senate Bill 1591, Mr. Crespo. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1591, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Crespo."

Crespo: "Yeah. Thank you, Speaker. Senate Bill 1591 is a trailer Bill to Senate Bill 382 of the 99th General Assembly. During the drafting process of that Bill last year, the parcel line included in this Bill was accidentally left out. And Senate Bill 1591 just makes sure that it is included as originally intended."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves, Members. Mr. Crespo. Thank you. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1593, Representative Chapa LaVia."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1593, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Chapa LaVia."

Chapa LaVia: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 1593 would promote... permit churches that own parking lots in downtown areas to share their parking with the community without losing their tax-exempt status on the parking lot. I'll take any questions and ask for its passage."

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

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? 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. Senate Bill 1598, Representative Mayfield. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1598, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Mayfield."

Mayfield: "Thank you so much. This Bill, you've seen it here a couple times before in various iterations, we keep extending this Bill because it works. What this is, these are the PPV leases. It is a partnership that was formed by the U.S. Navy and the four city residential groups to provide for the leasing of the military properties. It works out really well. The City of North Chicago is definitely benefitting from this as well as the City of Highland Park. It is a good Bill. And I'd recommend an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ives: "This is... this... it's kind of a technical Bill. It's probably something that most people have not been paying attention to. It's interesting though that they are moving the... the rate from 7.75 percent to now 12 percent. And it seems like there is not actually... that this is going to go on and on. So, the higher rate the lower taxes that are collected on this property and that means that any of the EAV would be pushed off to other property owners. So, I just have a question as to why did they come up with the 12 percent rate and why is

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

it extended so far out? Because typically PPV leases depend on the amount of money that's coming in. And now, this is a huge corporation initiative. The home company is a huge conglomerate. They build tons of military housing all over and actually, this is going to really benefit them more than anybody else. And all that EAV is going to be pushed off on to other folks. So, why the rate increase? Why are you extending it so far out? And why should this not be something that's looked at typically as we look at other items on how much are they getting in income? This is a guaranteed income strain for them because the military, the Federal Government, is paying this. And I don't understand why we're making this adjustment for a huge conglomerate like this when property taxes are the number 1 issue for many people in the State of Illinois."

Mayfield: "Thank you for your question. In re... answer to your question, first off, the City of Highland Park will experience reduced taxes as a result of this Bill which is why they are in favor of it. Yes, they did change the rate, but you have to understand that military housing prior to us doing these leases, we were not receiving any property taxes, zero. So, when you say that the money was pushed... that these taxes are being pushed off on others, think about it this way, we're getting something where as before we were getting nothing. So, this is actually working out well. It works out for the cities that are also surrounding these properties because they're receiving the economic value from those families that are actually renting these properties. The cities have entered into an agreement with these... with the properties as

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

well so that they're now we're providing police service. So, that money is being paid to the cities for providing fire services. So, those moneys are being paid to the cities. We're actually making more money now than we ever have before for the municipalities that are surrounding these military homes. Military homes never pay taxes. We were receiving zero tax dollars. We are receiving some now. So, there's, you know, there's a philosophical to saying, oh, we're reducing taxes. Well, you're reducing based upon something that we never received taxes on before."

Ives: "Well, thank you for that clarification 'cause it's not at all clear in the both, the Bill or our analysis that they previously had been paying nothing. So, just to clarify, they've been paying nothing prior to this and they are now going to have to pay something even if it's not in... in generally accepted practices with these PPV leases. Is that correct, then?"

Mayfield: "That is correct. Military property has also been taxexempt."

Ives: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Ladies and Gentlemen, this Bill is on the Order of Short Debate, but Mr. Drury, can you be brief, Sir? Sir?"

Drury: "I'll try."

Speaker Lang: "Well, don't try, be brief or we're going to cut you off. Go ahead, Sir."

Drury: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Just so everybody knows. This Bill deals with two very important things that we talk about a lot. It deals with property taxes and education. What this Bill does is it reduces the property taxes for a

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

multimillion dollar corporation, and therefore, reduces the funding that's going to the local schools both in Highland Park and North Chicago, one of the worst funded school districts in the... in the state. So, if you vote for this Bill, just realize that what you're doing is you're giving property tax relief to a multimillion or possibly billion dollar corporation and you're also defunding local schools that severely need the money. This agreement has been in place for a long time. There was a deal made back, I think, in 2007 and there's been a continuous effort to reduce the taxes that this multibillion dollar corporation is paying. This is a very bad Bill for the community. It's a very bad Bill for our local schools. And I strongly urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Batinick. This Bill is still on the Order of Short Debate. Can you be brief?"

Batinick: "It'll be a... Yes."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Drury did very well. Can you be that brief?"

Batinick: "A brief question."

Speaker Lang: "Go."

Batinick: "I'm hearing conflicting information. I'm hearing that no property taxes were paid and now property taxes are being paid. When this was built in 2009, the deal, had property taxes been paid on the… on the PPV from 2009 'til now?"

Mayfield: "Yes. But it has been an agreed upon rate depending on which military base it was. Each one has a slightly different tax base. To the previous speaker, we talked about we're taking money from the school districts. That's absolutely not true. We're actually putting money into the school district; whereas, before we were not getting that real... real estate

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

tax relief for those school districts. So, he's in... totally incorrect."

Batinick: "All right. Well, then here's my question. They've been...
they've been paying taxes since 2009, so if we pass this Bill,
they're going to be paying less taxes?"

Mayfield: "They'll be paying upon the agreed upon rate. But please understand, that prior to 2009, we received nothing. So..."

Batinick: "Prior to 2009. How does this help things moving forward? I'm saying we're here... we're where we are now. This is..."

Mayfield: "I can explain that."

Batinick: "...property tax today is an important debate. If we could just take it off of Short Debate, I'll be as quick as I can."

Speaker Lang: "Well, I'll do that, but you weren't recognized for that purpose."

Batinick: "Oh, I'm..."

Speaker Lang: "That's the purpose of... but proceed."

Batinick: "I don't know how this helps us moving forward?"

Mayfield: "Okay. I'm going to explain how it helps moving forward. If we... let's say that this agreement is dissolved. We will receive zero. We will go back to receiving zero. That's how it helps us going forward. They... this corporation can pull out tomorrow and we will receive zero tax dollars, zero. At least now we're getting something which is why we're trying to maintain..."

Batinick: "To the..."

Mayfield: "...this business relationship."

Batinick: "To that speaker's point. To the Bill. I'm tired of this. We do carveouts for individual corporations that are

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

always holding the gun to our head 'cause we have one of the most horrible business climates in the nation. So, we have to do a carveout for them 'cause property taxes are absurd. Seven point seven five percent, that's actually a pretty high cap rate; 12 percent is a ridiculously high cap rate for valuation. For something that has a long-term lease from the Federal Government, you'd be looking at 5, 6 percent. They should be happy after 7.75. But once again, we're in a situation where we got to do special carveouts. Instead of doing something that makes the business climate wonderful for everybody, we're doing all these little things. We passed a Bill a few weeks ago, \$8 million of property tax incentives for a company that was going to bring 40 jobs to the state, 40 jobs. That's where we are. And we're not addressing the main issues. We're addressing all these one-off issues and explaining why we're good. We have to fix the main problem of the state's overall business climate. And we wouldn't have to do this, but people that are connected get what they want. The rank and file citizens pay a higher and higher and higher for everything. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Martwick."

Martwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Due to a conflict of interest,

I want the record to reflect that I'll be voting 'present'."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Mayfield to close."

Mayfield: "Thank you so much. I totally understand the prior speakers, you know, passion regarding the increase... a better business climate. We absolutely need a better business climate. I'm trying to keep a business in my district that is providing revenue to the district. This is money we have not

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

had before. It is money that we depend upon. The City of North Chicago is one of my struggling districts and this ... they actually have contracts with this particular company for their police and their fire services, so we're bringing money in. We're getting money into our school district that we did not have. I live in Lake County. Lake County has the highest tax rate, the absolute highest tax rate. I believe we're like number 8 in the country. So to say to cap it at 8 percent, maybe that might seem a lot if you're from southern Illinois, but if you live in Lake County, 8 percent you're still paying a heck of a lot of money. If you looked at my tax bill and compared it to others, you'd be wondering how I'm surviving. Our taxes are ridiculous. I'm urging a 'yes' vote. We really do need to continue to support businesses that are trying to be good corporate partners. They are trying to bring re... resources to our district and they are bringing money in. I want to be very clear. If we do not pass this Bill, we will receive zero dollars. That is not what we want to do. We want to make sure that we are continuing to generate revenue until we can get that business climate. I will vote 'yes' on a Bill that promotes businesses. I think it's time. Please vote 'yes'."

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? Members, record yourselves. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 67 voting 'yes', 45 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1657,

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Representative Willis. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1668, Mr. Demmer. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1668, a Bill for an Act concerning property. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Demmer."

Demmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This... Senate Bill 1668 is an initiative of DNR and IDOT. And it's the standard land conveyance Bill. I know of no opposition."

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? Currie. Please take the record. There are 114 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1681, Mr. Hoffman. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1681, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. A year ago we passed a Bill that said that contract carriers, as opposed to common carriers, would have to provide at least \$500 thousand per passenger in insurance. This just indicates that the railroad must... or that the contract carrier must show the railroad that they actually have this coverage. There's no known opposition."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wehrli."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Wehrli: "Jay, did you present the right Bill this time?"

Hoffman: "Yeah."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Wehrli: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the right Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Chapa LaVia. 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. Senate Bill 1692, Mr. Mitchell. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1692, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mitchell."

- Mitchell, C.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a trailer Bill to a Bill that we passed in 2015, setting return-to-play in return-to-learn protocols for students with concussions. This merely adds physician assistants and APNs to those who under the supervision of a physician can clear students to return-to-learn and return-to-play. I know of no opposition and ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Chapa LaVia, Rita, Scherer. Please take the record. There are 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Chair recognizes the Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Rules Report. Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2017: recommends be adopted Floor Amendment #1 to House Resolution 418; and recommends be

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

adopted Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2647."

Speaker Lang: "Senate Bill 1696, Representative Flowers. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1696, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. 1696 creates the Illinois Muslim-American Advisory Council which includes the creation of the Illinois Muslim-American Advisory Council as well as the Act. It provides details on the goals of the council, the appointment and number of members of the council, and the term limits. And the intent of this legislation is to urge the Governor to partner with faith-based communities to reduce violence and to encourage youth employment in Illinois. And I'll be more than 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: "Representative, this is not the first of this council.

This actually used to exist under Governor Quinn and it expired, correct?"

Flowers: "Yes, you're correct. It did expire."

Andersson: "So... so, we're not creating something out of whole cloth; we've already had experience with this?"

Flowers: "Absolutely."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Andersson: "Also, there is no… there's no compensation for the members, so they're not making any money off of this?"

Flowers: "Right."

Andersson: "Cor... Is that correct?"

Flowers: "That's correct."

Andersson: "Okay. And also, the Advisory Council has no actual power. It's... it doesn't dictate policy, it advises, correct?"

Flowers: "Ab... You're correct."

Andersson: "Thank you. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I know that there can be a lot of... a lot of feelings about issues like this. I want to rise in full support of this. In a day and age like this where there is so much fear, where there is so much animosity that is undeserved, the thing we need is communication. This Council does that. It creates and fosters communication. I strongly urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ives: "Are you aware of any other religious council that we have?

Is there any other religious council that we have 'cause that's what this is setting up?"

Flowers: "Well, there's quite a few other types of councils that we have."

Ives: "Oh... that the Governor would have to convene and that would actually take Members and Leadership to be part of? Is there any other religious American Advisory Council?"

Flowers: "Well, I'm sure there's other types of councils. There's a catholic..."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Ives: "There are other types of councils. There's an African-American one. There's a Latino one, I believe. Is..."

Flowers: "Religious Councils... So, are you saying government... in government?"

Ives: "I'm saying of this variety, the same thing that repre...
that has all these 21 members. Is there any other religious
American Advisory Council in the State of Illinois?"

Flowers: "I can't answer that."

Ives: "I would tell you that there's probably not another council..."

Flowers: "Also, you can't... can you answer it 'cause you're saying probably? So, you don't know the answer as well."

Ives: "I... I would... I would... I actually suspect that there is not a single other religious council... Advisory Council in the State of Illinois."

Flowers: "Representative..."

Ives: "And if that's the case... if that's the case, we shouldn't be doing this. There's no reason for this Bill. There's no reason for this council, and there's no reason to pinpoint one religious group for an Advisory Council that it consists of 21 members including all sorts of Leadership. We should not be approving this Bill. It is... has nothing to do... it's all about religious... religion reasons."

Flowers: "That's..."

Ives: "And it's not something Illinois should do."

Flowers: "First of all..."

Ives: "Please vote 'no'."

Flowers: "...first of all, Representative. It's... that's not true.

It's not all about religion. The purpose of this Resolution

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

and this council is to... I'm sorry, it's not a Resolution. The purpose of the Bill is to talk about violence and youth and talk about creating jobs. It's... it's a... it's a Bill, Representative, that I would think that you would want to have in regards to keeping down crime, helping people to become affiliated with the community which they may or may not be accustomed to. And this Advisory Committee will be talking to the Governor about what goes on in this community and vice-versa. It's really just like an exchange program, that's all."

Ives: "No, it's not."

Flowers: "And it's... it's a changing information."

Ives: "I..."

Flowers: "And it's educating a group of people that's not familiar with another group. So, what's so frightening about that?

There's no cost involved."

Ives: "The problem here is that you are actually using important time for a council that is only related to one religion. That is outrageous. That is outrageous. We don't need this council. There's no reason to pinpoint one religious group for this ability to influence or talk to or have all these membership... these Members on it and use up their... their valuable time for a religious group."

Flowers: "It's..."

Ives: "Now, I would argue that it's your side, really, that is far more interested in separating the church from the state."

Flowers: "Representative..."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Ives: "So, I... I'm done with my remarks, but I urge a 'no' vote on
 this. This is... it's outrageous that Illinois would create a
 Muslim-American Advisory Council."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Williams."

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

Flowers: "Yes."

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Williams: "Representative, isn't it true that the Federal Immigration Ban pertain to the countries that were majority Muslim?"

Flowers: "Yes."

Williams: "Were any other religious groups that were targeted in that ban?"

Flowers: "Yes."

Williams: "So, there were no one but Muslims that were banned from coming into the U.S., Muslim-based countries?"

Flowers: "Pardon me? I can't hear you."

Williams: "Well, I'll just go to the Bill. I think I'm just trying to make a point there. There's a reason that were creating an Advisory Council that pertains to a certain community. There's a reason. I think we all know what that reason is. I'm happy to stand in support of this Bill and do what we can to make sure that we remember that America is welcoming people of all religions."

Speaker Lang: "We've already had three people speak in favor of the Bill. Mr. Butler, are you supporting the Bill or do you rise in opposition? Please proceed, Mr. Butler."

Butler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. And I certainly respect the intent of the... of the Sponsor on this and I

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

actually supported this when we voted on it last year. And since then... since it... a lot of us had not done a lot of thought or research on the Bill before it came up last year, I've talked to several of my constituents and people who are concerned about this. And I... I do. I think it's a laudable goal. I think we need better relations. We need better Muslim ... relationships with Muslims in America, we do. We need to understand that better and I think... I think there's other avenues to pursue. My concern with... with this Bill is not the fact that I want better relationships with the Muslims in my community, but the fact that I think it conflicts with the Constitution, the Illinois Constitution. And to Representative from Wheaton, I think she makes a good point. We don't have other commissions that are religious-based. I ... I just want to point out to the Body. The Constitution that we swear... that we swear to uphold when we take that oath here in Illinois, the religious freedom, Section 3 in our Constitution under the Bill of Rights, the end of it says, nor shall any preference be given by law to any religious denomination or mode of worship. That's in our Constitution. And as I said, I res... I really do, I respect what you're trying to do here. I voted for it last time. But when I look at my job to defend the Constitution of this state, I cannot vote for this Bill because of that. I think it conflicts with the Constitution and I would hope everyone would agree with that. And hopefully, we can find other ways to create this relationship to have better relationships with Muslims. So, that's why I'm going to be a 'no' vote. And I would urge Members to vote against it."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reick, do you stand in opposition?"

Reick: "Reluctant opposition, Sir."

Speaker Lang: "Then you have the floor, Sir."

Reick: "There are Jews, Christians, Buddhists, Zoroastrians, and everybody else who are looking for jobs in this state. However, I would urge you to pull this Bill and make it... constitute it in an inclusive manner and make it an interfaith type of Bill rather than just one dealing with Muslims. My friend from Springfield here made some very good points regarding our constitutional obligation to not... not make one against the other. Would you be willing to do that?"

Flowers: "You know, Representative, I'm glad you asked the question. And I'm not willing to do it on this Bill, but I'm willing to work with you and let me tell you the reason why. There is not the racial profiling of those other groups you just enunciated. And so, as a result, that is what... that's the problem with this country. This is America. We should be open to everyone, all religions, but because we are not, because the President of the United States has singled out this particular group. And this... the only purpose of this is for education, education. It would... it would appear to me that you would want this type of interaction and communication and understanding so we can all get along. And so, I don't know about you, but I don't know much about the religious... I mean, the Muslim community despite the fact that I do have a large portion in my district. But the fact of the matter is we all need to know about each other and try to get along with each other just like those other ... those other groups you just enunciated."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Reick: "I believe that's why I'm saying that maybe this would be better as an interfaith type thing rather than not because..."

Flowers: "I agree."

Reick: "Uh, uh, uh, please."

Flowers: "I agree."

Reick: "Because the religions of this world are much like the politics in this nation. Everybody's at each other's throats and sitting down in an interfaith way will make... will make better bridges than having one religion seem to take precedence in terms of our constitutional obligation. We do have a limitation upon that and the Constitution I think is a hard limitation. To the Bill. I would say I would reluctantly vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "We've had sufficient Members under the Rules on both sides of the aisle. Representative Flowers to close."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And to the previous Members, I just want to bring to your attention that there is another commission. It's called the Holocaust and the Genocide Commission. So, there are other commissions that do exist, that's number 1. And I... number 2... number 2) there are Members that's going to be appointed and there's no reason why that other faith-based could not be a part of the appointment to help educate all of us and be... and be on this Advisory Board. And I would appreciate an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 67 voting 'yes', 44 voting 'no'. And this

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

- Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Leader Currie for a Motion."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. I move to suspend the posting requirements so that Senate Bill 453 can be heard in House Elementary: Curriculum Committee; that Senate Bill 552 can be heard in Judiciary-Criminal; and House Joint Resolution 63 in State Government Administration; Senate Joint Resolution 37 in House Transportation: Regulation. I'd appreciate your support."
- Speaker Lang: "You heard the Lady's Motion. Is there leave? Leave is granted. And the Lady's Motion is adopted. Leader Currie for a Motion."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. I move that we send Senate Bill... again, suspend the posting requirement so that we can hear Senate Bill 569 in Judiciary-Civil Committee and Senate Bill 779 in Personnel & Pensions Committee. I'd appreciate your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "You heard the Lady's Motion. Is there leave? There's no leave. Those in favor of the Motion will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. There are 65 voting 'yes', 51 voting 'no'. And the Lady's Motion prevails. Leader Currie on another Motion. No other Motion. Senate Bill 1720, Representative Hernandez. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1720, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Hernandez."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Hernandez: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 1720 deals with four points. It increases the penalties on companies that refuse to pay wage theft judgments. It also prohibits companies committing serious wage theft from receiving state contracts for at least five years. It also levels the playing field for responsible businesses and it injects more money into the economy and generate more tax revenue without increasing tax rates. I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andersson."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Andersson: "So, it appears we are increasing penalties on the Wage Payment and Collection Act. Is that correct?"

Hernandez: "That's correct."

Andersson: "So, again, I'm sorry. I could not quite hear what...
where... where are we and where are we going on those... on those
fines?"

Hernandez: "So, there is an increase of \$5 thousand and that becomes a Class A misdemeanor. Anything under 5 thousand will make it a Class 4... I'm sorry, it's backwards. Less than 5 thousand is a Class A misdemeanor; over 5 thousand is a Class 4 felony."

Andersson: "Is a Class 4 felony. Mr. Speaker, by the way, I would ask to move this to Standard Debate."

Speaker Lang: "That will be done."

Andersson: "Thank you. Beyond the… beyond the penalties, what else does the Bill do?"

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Hernandez: "It... it also will add that there would be no contracts given... and this is repeated. Let me say that again, repeated offenders or that will not be able to receive contracts from the state for at least five years."

Andersson: "Thank you for the answers to the questions."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ives: "So, it appears now that you're actually making this a Class 4 felony. So, it's now a felony, if you were to have a problem under this Act?"

Hernandez: "So, the... so, the Bill will make it... it increases...
yes, it does increase it. So, cur..."

Ives: "So, we're going to be putting business folks in jail that happen to violate one of our business Acts? That's what we're going to do? We're going to start jailing business owners?"

Hernandez: "Representative, we're talking about repeated. I mean, these are really serious, I mean, often. It still... it still falls on the chief procurement officer to make a decision, but we're going after the... the bad actors."

Ives: "But a first offense is still a Class A misdemeanit...
 demeanor. That's pretty serious. That's up to one year in
 jail."

Hernandez: "Well, this is serious. This is what we call wage theft where low-income people that are usually it... it aims them... are victims of this that are not being paid. So, what we're talking about egregious on how businesses are approaching this, there is a penalty. But when you have consistency, we have to make it more serious the penalty."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

- Ives: "I... I would argue that actually we already have procedures in place. We already have laws that ... that actually handle a lot this problem. And all you're doing is enhanced... you're doing enhanced penalties. So, your side of the aisle likes to talk about, you know, giving people reprieve, giving... not doing mandatory minimums, all of that idea which we all had a huge debate about that last... yesterday, as a matter of fact. And now, you're all... all you're about is enhancing penalties on business folks who are just trying to make a buck in the State of Illinois and who are trying to run their business. And we already have laws in place to handle this. I mean, nobody wants offenders to keep acting this way, but we have other ways to do this. We can pull their business license. We could do other things that... that fine them. But you're actually talking about jailing people to ... when they're dealing with complicated regulations that this state has imposed on them. That's what you're trying to do here. You're trying to shut down business in the State of Illinois."
- Hernandez: "No, I'm not, Representative. I'm just trying to go to the bad actors which theft does contribute to poverty. It lowers economic growth and it lowers tax revenues."
- Ives: "Okay. Could you just... let's just go back over maybe the last four years of data? How many times have you... has this actually had to be enforced? Has... where you've had repeat offenders that have not been found... that have been found by the Department of Labor and these other agencies to have been bad actors in this area? How many times has that happened?"
- Hernandez: "Representative, it has happened many times. I was part of trying to put that out... put in place an adjudicated

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

system because of such a backlog on claims... wage theft claims, to begin a process and place some penalties because it was just backlogged. And let me tell you this, wage theft is estimated to drain 800 million to 3 billion a year for the Illinois economy. This needs attention."

"Well, I would say that we already have attention on this. And actually, the testimony in committee was that the Department of Labor and the other agencies are already handling this and that there are very, very few bad actors out there. And essentially, that this is usually taken care of, that we already have our laws in place to take care of this. And you're just trying to send a message to your constituency, but the message you're really sending is to business... is to business in the State of Illinois because we are not open for business. We are hostile to business and if you step one foot out of the line and if you get accused of this, you're going to spend loads amount of money and time to just go through this... this process because you're enhancing the penalties on there where you're going to throw business owners in jail for making what could easily be just a mistake on paperwork. That's what it could be. I will tell you this is not a broad problem in the State of Illinois, that we already handle this and that we should reject this Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wheeler."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Wheeler, K.: "Representative, I... I'm just going to reiterate a couple things that the previous speakers have said, because there's a reason why the business community is united against

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

this Bill, even though, I think we all are in agreement that people should get paid to do the work. This... this isn't necessarily going to address the problem that you're bringing forward by virtue of the fact that we're just going to threaten business owners and employers that they could actually be charged with a felony for making a clerical error is something that, you know, this doesn't really have a protection for in the language."

- Hernandez: "So, Representative, this does not... it does not apply to those who make mistake... mistakes. It applies to those are willfully and repeatedly violating the... the law."
- Wheeler, K.: "I guess the way that I'm looking at the language here in our analysis says that it doesn't have to do with on the felony aspect of it for the Wage Payment and Collection Act. If the… if they are for amounts of \$5 thousand or more, there's not a clarification in here about a repeat offender. It just… it just says that it's a Class 4 felony now rather than a misdemeanor."
- Hernandez: "No. But it does. And that's why I don't understand why the business community is not at least neutral on this."
- Wheeler, K.: "Well, I guess that's my point I'm trying to make. Is that did you work in the business community to try and get neutral? And do you realize the fact that... that if an employer is going to put themselves on the line by employing someone, and going through all the aspects that we require them to with the federal and state regulatory processes that are in place now and we're adding to the penalties in case you make that mistake. Representative, have you ever tried to figure out a classification for employees as an employer? It's a...

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

- it's not an easy task for some of these things. We don't make it easy on them."
- Hernandez: "So, Representative, let me just explain that. The legislation will level the playing field for the responsible business people who are abiding by the law. So, it helps them. This is... it's important to that sector of the business who are doing things right."
- Wheeler, K.: "Well, I... then believe me, that's... that's the goal for every employer that I know. At the same time, there's no protection in place. From what I understand about your Bill, that would actually say, if you make a mistake... if the... if the computer software doesn't run correctly and something's not done properly, there's all kinds of ways that you can come to this. And the second part... my concern is and the concern of other employers is that you're inviting bad actors on the other side now to say, hey, you know what, we're going to... we're going to file a complaint against you and you're going to have to go against us and it's a terrible press for people. This is just making a problem that is bad, not addressing the problem you're trying to solve and making it worse for the employers. There's... there's no good side to this Bill that I see so far. So, with that, Mr. Speaker, if this Bill receives the requisite number of votes, I'd request a verification."
- Speaker Lang: "Your request is acknowledged. Representative Ammons is recognized."
- Ammons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I rise in support of this House... this Senate Bill because Senate Bill 1720 does what many on the right suggested is the important thing. We

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

do not have any sympathy for companies that steal wages from workers. We have no sympathy for companies that steal wages from workers. The same premise that applies to people who are everyday people committing crimes that we are okay with locking up for a very, very long time, this Bill goes a very small step toward bringing accountability in the wage theft problem. Now, let me tell you for those who are asking if this is a real problem, I will give you an analysis of a situation that actually happened in the City of Champaign where a contractor subcontracted with a minority contracting company, and then refused to pay over a hundred thousand dollars to that subcontractor. The subcontractor had to ultimately go to court to get back the due wages of the workers of which they were successful in court but no actual accountability came as a result of the wage theft outside of paying what was due. And in subsequent, people decided that it was okay to continue to give this company... continued city contracts even though they were found quilty of stealing wages from workers. And so, this Bill, although will not gain the support of the right who protects these kind of companies when they do this kind of thing, this Bill deserves an 'aye' vote on behalf of the workers and small minority firms who have been stiffed by larger companies from getting the wages that are due them. And so, I ask for an 'aye' vote on behalf of Senate Bill 1720."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Willis."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Willis: "Representative, is this Bill asking these businesses to do anything more than what is best business practices... for this law... for these small firms?"

Hernandez: "I'm sorry. Repeat that?"

Willis: "Okay. So, this Bill... I've heard from the other side of the room that it's going to put an undue burden on their businesses... on many of their small businesses if we go and incorporate this Bill. Is this Bill asking them to do anything other than what would be considered in most best business practices?"

Hernandez: "No."

Willis: "Okay. So, we're just asking them to follow the law, correct?"

Hernandez: "Correct."

Willis: "And we have put into the law prior protections for wage theft, correct?"

Hernandez: "Correct."

Willis: "But we haven't put anything in there to stop these companies from continuing to do it and still be hired by the State of Illinois. Is that not correct?"

Hernandez: "Representative, these are repeated bad actors who are willfully and denying that they are not doing such... such things. So, this is going towards those bad actors."

Willis: "Right. So, we're... what we're doing is we're actually saying, okay, you might say it's cheaper to pay the fine that we put in there, but you're still getting this huge, huge multimillion dollar contract from the State of Illinois. And what we're trying to do at this point is we're trying to make these businesses much more accountable. Is that not correct?"

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Hernandez: "Absolutely."

"Okay. To the Bill. I don't see why anybody under any Willis: circumstances would want the State of Illinois to hire and have a contract with a firm that is not following what we, as Legislators and the State of Illinois, said is the law. I cannot phantom why we would protect companies that are not doing it. I don't think there's a person on the right or the left side of this room that would say it is okay to not pay your bills and to basically have wage theft. I don't think there's a... there's not one colleague on that side that would say that it's okay not pay your bills. So, what we're doing here with this Bill is we're saying let's be accountable; let's hold you to that. You are continuing to do this. You're doing it wrong. We want to make sure that you follow the laws and if you don't follow the laws, we're not going to go and ... we're not going to give you another state contract. We're going to say let's get somebody that follows the laws that we put into place let them get the state contracts. Let them get the rewards for doing the right thing, following the laws the way you're supposed to do. That's what this Bill does. This Bill should not be causing any undue harm to businesses that are doing the right thing. If you're doing the right thing, you shouldn't have any worries about it. It's not going to affect you. You're doing the right thing. You will get that state contract or you will at least be able to bid for it. But if you're not doing the right thing, darn it, you should not be able to get any more contracts with us. You should be held accountable and that's what we're asking people to do here. We've gotten many, many laws already on the books that

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

will go and protect people. We have a minimum wage law. We have all of the... the Wage Payment Collection Act. We have the Workers Adjustment and Re... Retraining Notification Act. We have all of those. We made those laws for a reason. We made them to protect our workers. We made them to protect businesses that are doing the right thing. Why on earth would we want a business that is not doing the right thing be able to get an edge and to be able to get that service? That's what this is doing. It's saying let's level the playing field. Let's reward those businesses that deserve the rewards. Let those businesses get what they need to and if you can't, guess what, you can't come to the party. You're not allowed to go and bid on our state contracts. We want only businesses that follow the rules, do what they're supposed to, treat their workers fairly, treat their subcontractors fairly, and they are the ones that we're willing to then give our resources to not the rest of them. If you can't follow the laws that we as a robust Body put into place then you don't deserve to go and get those state contracts. I cannot possibly imagine why we would want to reward bad players and that's all this Bill does. It says if you're a bad player, you don't get to come to the game. You got to have somebody else that follows what we do get those rewards. I would strongly urge an 'aye' vote. I cannot see why anybody would state that this is a bad business vote; it's not. It's a good business vote. It lets ... "

Speaker Lang: "Representative, you cut... got cutoff in midsentence.

Do you wish to complete it?"

Willis: "I just want to finish that sentence. I want those that...
I said... as I stated, this is a good business Bill because it

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

allows those that are doing good business to continue to do the good business with the State of Illinois. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Manley."

Manley: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor's proud to yield."

Manley: "Representative Hernandez, do... are there any other states that do this?"

Hernandez: "Yes. New York."

Manley: "And how long... when did they enact this into law?"

Hernandez: "They started after seeing these bad actors in 2012."

Manley: "And so... did you say 2012?"

Hernandez: "Correct."

Manley: "Okay. I'm having a hard time hearing you even though we're like arm's length apart. So, since 2012 New York has had this in place. Can you tell me is there any data that supports that this was a good... was a... a good move on their part?"

Hernandez: "So, I can... sure, I can do that. So, since the start of 2012, the New York AG's Office has recovered nearly 27 million for more than 20 thousand workers victimized by wage theft and levied 2.5 million in penalties against employers."

Manley: "Okay. Repeat that. I want everybody to listen to this. So, since 2012, the State of New York, who is..."

Hernandez: "Has..."

Manley: "...has now has this on their books as law, has recovered what for workers and how many workers?"

Hernandez: "So, it has recovered nearly 27 million for more than 20 thousand workers victimized by wage theft and levied 2.5 million in penalties against employers."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Manley: "How many workers did this affect?"

Hernandez: "I have here 20 thousand workers."

Manley: "Okay. Twenty thousand people, that's not small. That's a lot of people. I want to thank you for bringing this Bill. I think the worker needs to be protected just as much as the businesses do. And... and I want you to repeat again. Is this... is this... could this affect a business that makes a mistake or has a... a glitch in their system or a changeover in their payroll department that would cause... is this an honest error? Is this... could this Bill... is this law going to affect business owners that..."

Hernandez: "No."

Manley: "...that make a mistake?"

Hernandez: "No."

Manley: "So, it's going to affect repeat..."

Hernandez: "Repeated willful, I mean, willful actors."

Manley: "So, it's people that have someone come to work for them; they do their work and then they don't pay them for a day's work?"

Hernandez: "That's correct."

Manley: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Hernandez to close."

Hernandez: "So, I just want to give you two examples of what has occurred in Illinois. Fast food giant Dominoes was caught using payroll software that underpaid workers. And a major road contract... contractor paid with our Illinois tax dollars shorted its workers by 1.5 million. It's happening. I ask for your 'aye' vote."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

- Speaker Lang: "Members, please be reminded that Mr. Wheeler has asked for a verification. Members will be in their chairs and vote their own switches. 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. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 67 voting 'yes', 48 voting 'no'. Mr. Wheeler, do you persist in your request? Gentleman withdraws his verification request. There being 67 'yes', 48 'no', this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Page 11 on the Calendar, Senate Bills-Second Reading, Senate Bill 81, Mr. Guzzardi. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 81, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. This Bill was read a second time a previous day.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments.

 A fiscal note, home rule note, state mandates note has been requested but not filed at this time."
- Speaker Lang: "The Chair recognizes Mr. Guzzardi."
- Guzzardi: "Mr. Speaker, I'd request that those notes should be ruled inapplicable."
- Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves that the note requests be held inapplicable. The Chair recognizes Mr. Wheeler."
- Wheeler, K.: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm... I'm finding it odd that my... my colleague is holding these notes inapplicable when the fiscal note that is requested has already been applied in other Bills with a... with a tab of more than \$300 million. That shocks me because I understand he's interested in a budget like I am and \$300 million impact affects what we

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

could do if we ever get to discuss a budget. And please... please keep in mind, Representative Guzzardi that that's just one small portion of what we're talking about. Therefore, I'll keep talking while you're waiting for your light to go on. I'm just teasing. So, I can't imagine how you can find these things inapplicable, Sir."

Guzzardi: "Thank you..."

Speaker Lang: "Go ahead, Mr. Guzzardi."

Guzzardi: "Just with respect to the Gentleman, but the almost identical language to this has been filed in the House for months and there was no notes placed on this. I think if the Gentleman was genuinely serious he might have filed those notes on House Bill 198 months ago."

Wheeler, K.: "I'm sorry, say it again, please?"

Guzzardi: "That's fine. We can vote."

Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman has moved that the note requests be held inapplicable. Do we have leave to take these on one Roll Call? Seeing no objection, the Gentleman moves that all note requests be held inapplicable. Those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion 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. Ammons, DeLuca, Thapedi. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. There are 61 voting 'yes', 52 voting 'no'. The Gentleman's Motion prevails. And all the note requests are held inapplicable. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "No further notes."

Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 81, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Guzzardi."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to first briefly discuss the current state of things in Illinois. There are 2.3 million people who work in this state who make less than \$15 an hour. That includes more than 40 percent of all workers, about half of African-American workers and female workers, and more than 60 percent of Latino workers. Illinoisans are being paid substandard wages and these aren't just teenagers working their first job. These are people who have been working for 20 and 30 years in their career. In the course of advocating for this issue, I've traveled all around the state. I've met with low-wage workers in Champaign and East St. Louis and Carbondale and right here in Springfield. I've talked to home care workers who have worked in their field for 30 who are doing some of the most difficult work in the state providing for our vulnerable seniors, our people with disabilities who are making 9.95 an hour. This is simply unacceptable. Senate Bill 81 proposes to raise the minimum wage in Illinois to \$15 an hour over the course of the next 5 years. I want to speak briefly to a couple of other provisions of the Bill. It contains a separate minimum wage for seasonal youth workers. This is a provision that we drafted in working with the Illinois Association of Park Districts on their concerns about this Bill. So, seasonal workers who are 18 year... below the age of 18 will end up at \$12 an hour then a slightly lower minimum wage. The Bill also contains a tax credit version for small businesses to help

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

offset some of the costs of raising their minimum wage over the course of the next several years. But really at its core this is a Bill about the dignity of work. Eight dollars and twenty-five cents an hour, if you're lucky enough to work full-time making the state's minimum wage right now of 8.25, that gets you to a little more than \$16 thousand a year. I think that we can all agree that that is a substandard wage that that is not an amount that you can take care of yourself on let alone provide for a family. And yes, many low-wage workers are in fact parents, grandparents, who are providing for children and grandchildren. Those folks deserve a decent living wage. I think this Bill is incredibly important to the constituents of every single Member of this chamber. And I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "The Chair will remove this from Short Debate and place it on unlimited debate. First speaker is Mr... is Representative Ives."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ives: "So, Representative Guzzardi, we've gone over this Bill probably every single year that I've been here there's been a minimum wage increase Bill. And I ask you once again, the City of Chicago has already passed a minimum wage Bill. Isn't that correct?"

Guzzardi: "It has, yes. I'm glad you bring this up."

Ives: "And we have not even seen the full implementation of that
 minimum wage Bill, correct?"

Guzzardi: "We haven't, but what's interesting is that just a couple of days ago the University of California released a

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

study of what's happened in the City of Chicago since they've started 'cause it's been on the ramp now to raise their minimum wage. And what they've said is that there have been no measurable negative effects on employment in the City of Chicago. In fact, all that's happened is that the people at the very bottom of the income bracket have gotten a little bit of extra money in their pocket. No measurable negative effects on employment and that's in line with statistics that we've seen from jurisdictions that have raised..."

Ives: "Okay. So..."

Guzzardi: "...the minimum wage across the country."

Ives: "Well, actually that is actually false information, fake news, from you right there. But first of all, let's talk about Chicago because they have not fully implemented the minimum wage. What are they at right now?"

Guzzardi: "That's a good question, I believe they're at \$9 an hour this year, and they're on the ramp up to 13."

Ives: "Okay. So, they're not too far from what the minimum wage is already at 8.25. But you know, what we've already seen in Seattle is that this did nothing for job creation, in fact, it cut jobs. Now, so when this gets fully implemented... and I asked you this in committee a number of times... I asked you why not we use, you know, Chicago... this huge economic engine for the State of Illinois... the one that can, you know, handle all of the... the minimum wage increases, why don't we use it as a test market? Why don't we see how it's implemented there and then why don't we check back in a couple years when it's fully implemented and see what has happened to wages and growth at that point? Wouldn't you agree that we couldn't use

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

this as just a... a pilot program since they've already implemented. Would you be willing to pull this Bill and let's see how Chicago works out?"

Guzzardi: "Thank you for the question. And a couple of things: 1) an argument that we've heard commonly from the business community about the Chicago minimum wage is what they want to see uniformity, statewide uniformity. So, that's where we're moving to with this Bill. And the second point I'd like to make, and I made this point in committee, so I hope you don't mind me repeating it, is that, again, in advocating for this Bill I've been to a lot of places outside of Chicago and I will tell you that the people who are making \$8.25 in Peoria, in Danville, in Champaign, in East St. Louis, they can't wait. These people cannot sit around and wait. We have enough information. We've raised the minimum wage in this state before. We know that raising the minimum wage doesn't hurt employment. All it does is put more money in peoples' pockets. They can't sit around and wait any longer for us to finally act on behalf of the people of this state."

Ives: "Okay. You know what, I appreciate your comments and..."
Guzzardi: "So, do one or two people."

Ives: "All right. Decorum, please, in the chamber while we're discussing an important issue to businesses and also employees. I think it's kind of interesting that this is... this really does tell you all you need to know about the minimum wage and it's a cartoon... I know you can't see it... but it says, good news, the minimum wage is now \$15; the bad news is I have to cut your hours. And it's an employer speaking to his employees and in fact, that's exactly what happened. And

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

while you decide... while you sit here and tell us that your ... that the entire state is interested in the \$15 minimum wage, I can tell you that there are a number of people that have opted out of that or have decided to move their business just across the city lines because they can't afford a \$15 minimum wage. Now, do you think that every individual should start off receiving a \$15 minimum wage if they're over the 18 hours? We're talking about they... they haven't... there's no tra... they haven't been trained yet. It's hour one, day one. Do you think that that's the right thing to do when you can't even figure out as an employer whether or not the person can... is trainable, whether or not they can show up on time or do you think that that employer should be investing that type of a resource into an individual? Does your... does your Bill actually require... allow for a training wage, an initial sixmonth training wage to see if the person is capable of handling the job?"

Guzzardi: "Representative, the premise of this Bill is that everyone who works deserves a wage that they can live on. That's the basic premise of the minimum wage as an idea. And I guess..."

Ives: "Okay. That's..."

Guzzardi: "...I wonder... I wonder..."

Ives: "Well, thank you for that, but the truth is, is that the minimum wage is maybe... is actually a wage for younger workers, first-time employees and people that are picking..."

Guzzardi: "That's just..."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Ives: "...up part-time work. It is not intended for... for people that are... are to live on necessarily. That is not the intention of the minimum wage..."

Guzzardi: "Representative, whether it's the intention or not..."

Ives: "...and I'll tell you what this side of the aisle..."

Guzzardi: "Sorry, please finish."

Ives: "...this side of the aisle is very much interested in lifting
 people out of poverty."

Guzzardi: "I appreciate that."

Ives: "We are very much interested in that. We believe that you could..."

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

Ives: "I thought this was unlimited debate?"

Speaker Lang: "Unlimited means unlimited numbers of people, not unlimited comments. You had five minutes. Your five minutes have expired, Representative. My friends in the gallery, the Members will do the applause and make the wisecracks. We'll just keep some decorum. Representative, please bring your remarks to a close."

Ives: "Okay. This is a... to the Bill. This is a misguided Bill. You can look at data from San Francisco, from Seattle, and from other places where they have already imposed a minimum wage and you will find that employees' hours have been cut, the jobs... and restaurants have closed over this. And that the employees are losing their jobs and cutting hours. This is not a solution at all. This is not what... something that we should mandate on businesses. And it is... and my colleagues will cover the other parts of this. But his Bill has huge problems. His tax credit is unworkable. And we need to vote

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

this down. This is bad... this is a bad idea for people who need a start in life and need to actually get that first job where they can learn those skills to move on up the ladder."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Batinick."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Batinick: "Representative, I was talking to an owner of a McDonald's in my district. And he was looking at this Bill and he was basically saying that if this Bill were implemented they were just going to, you know, modernize everything and use more robots and automatic things like that. What do... what do you say to all those people who are going to lose their jobs because of that?"

Guzzardi: "I think that's... I'm glad you brought that point up, too, to this one has often been brought up often in the course of this debate. I think that the notion that businesses... this idea that... that businesses are going automate if we increase the minimum wage. I think the idea that businesses aren't going to automate if we don't increase the minimum wage is sort of baffling to me. I think throughout the whole... the course of human civilization, the entire human history has been replacing manual labor with tools, right? That's what we do as humans. And every opportunity businesses have to replace labor with automation, they're going to do it regardless of whether this Bill passes or fails."

Batinick: "Well, I guess the trouble is why haven't they done it already because there's other states, other parts of the world, the stuff exists? Let me explain to you, who hasn't run a business and hasn't made business decisions, how this

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

works. You look at the cost of the machine and you look at the cost of labor and you do a little analysis. And I wish we could have white boards here so I could show you how one would work. We'd say, okay, the machine costs this much. This is how much I'm going to pay in interest; this is my overall cost. Or I can pay x amount of dollars in labor for it."

Guzzardi: "Right."

Batinick: "It's a math decision. And let me tell you, places like McDonald's and Amazon, like you see on TV, are going to be able to have the high-tech stuff. They're just going to replace people, no big deal. You know who isn't; the Little Mikey's Hot Dog Stand, the Little Joe's Market. What... what do you say to the little fulfillment people that sell stuff on the Internet and they've got some that are working out of their garage or they're working out of some... some small warehouse in southern Illinois or central Illinois? You know what they're going to do? Just walk across the border. Do you think Cairo, Illinois, can afford... is going to have any economic growth on a \$15 an hour minimum wage? You have absolutely no idea what businesses do. And they are fleeing the state. And all we do in this chamber for the last two and a half years that I've been here is dump on businesses. Business is just another word for job creator. We will lose jobs because of ... because of this. This isn't a situation where we're Silicon Valley and everybody's dying to come here. We have a net out-migration right now. To the Bill. Absolutely misguided Bill. There's simple mathematic equations on this stuff. Businesses make those decisions based on that simple math. We will lose jobs because of this. Thank you."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wheeler."

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

Speaker Lang: "The Sponsor yields."

Wheeler, K.: "Representative, we've talked very briefly during the notes Section of this... this is about the inapplicability and how your side voted to hold those notes inapplicable. Those fiscal notes have a purpose, not an inconvenience, as what they were in this case. They actually matter. I would like to see our state get a budget at some point in time. We are mandating before we even get to the real discussions, apparently, that we're just going to raise the cost of what it... of what it... we do in this state right now, right?"

Guzzardi: "Representative, oh go ahead."

Wheeler, K.: "So, I'm... I'm just going to finish, real quick..."

Guzzardi: "Yeah."

Wheeler, K.: "...then you can respond. I looked at Senate Bill 955 which raises for some of our providers to a \$15 wage. I wanted to understand what the impact was to the rest of the state, \$330 million, that's just one segment of what State Government does, okay? There's more. On top of that, we can take into account the fact that we're going to have an inflationary impact when we do this because other workers are going to day, hey, I was making 50 percent more than minimum wage before. Now, I'm making just minimum wage. I want 50 percent more than minimum wage. I want to go to 22 from 15. There's no analysis that you're responding to. There's nothing in this note of the fiscal aspect that... that shows that we can afford this. How do we do it?"

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

- Guzzardi: "Well, Representative, first of all, to the question of the notes, as I said in the brief exchange that I don't think you heard, House Bill 198 was filed quite a long time ago, months ago, which contained essentially the same language here. I think if you were genuinely curious about the fiscal impact of raising the minimum wage and not simply using this as a delaying tactic, you might have filed the notes on that Bill 'cause we would have plenty of time to get the… get the notes taken care of then."
- Wheeler, K.: "Notes... notes can't be applied to you on Second Reading, so I had to do what I could do."
- Guzzardi: "No, the Bill was on Third Reading in fact, so."
- Wheeler, K.: "My friend, I learned that you saw it two days ago.

 That's why I learned that process."
- Guzzardi: "That Bill was on Third Reading for a month any...
 anyhow."
- Wheeler, K.: "So, I apologize for that part of it. But still..."
- Guzzardi: "It is... it is not presently, but for quite a long time that Bill was on the Order of Third Reading in this chamber."
- Wheeler, K.: "There's a lot of notes around there, I mean. What was the result of those notes by the way? I mean, do you even research it at all? Well, I mean, you're bringing this Bill, you know I'm gonna ask these questions."
- Guzzardi: "Right. No I..."
- Wheeler, K.: "I know you have an answer."
- Guzzardi: "And it... let me speak to the question of the rates that we pay our... the provider rates... the question of raising the provider rates in the state, which is the Bill that you

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

mentioned a minute ago. We are having an enormous crisis in our nursing homes in... you know about this, right?

Wheeler, K.: "I agree with you on those things."

Guzzardi: "The turnover is..."

Wheeler, K.: "How do we pay for these things is my... my question.

And this part... this... because it is... the reason why I bring it up, Will..."

Guzzardi: "So, Representative... Yeah."

Wheeler, K.: "...it rights to the business community as well."

Guzzardi: "Yeah."

Wheeler, K.: "Okay. We are mandating raising a wage to an artificial number that was selected by government. Now, let's talk about the market, okay? The results of the studies that I've found and if I've needed one, 93 thousand jobs would be lost, okay, if this takes affect. I don't want to see 93 thousand fold."

Guzzardi: "Nor do I, Representative."

Wheeler, K.: "But that's what the impact of this job is."

Guzzardi: "According to..."

Wheeler, K.: "This Bill."

Guzzardi: "Yeah."

Wheeler, K.: "And I'll tell you another reason why. I have a flag manufacturer near my district, okay? They have low-skilled workers, okay? And they've given them jobs and they're... and they... and they... that's how it works. They have to compete with companies that are all across the country. Okay? If we raise the minimum wage, we're going to price them out of the market. They are going to do what Representative Batinick just suggested. They're going to have to automate 'cause

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

there's not going to be any way to compete. We're pricing people on purpose out of their markets. That's not fair to them. There's other ways we can accomplish raising wages. This Bill is going to have a negative impact that you and I aren't taking into account..."

Guzzardi: "Let me ask you, Representative Wheeler. Is it the proposition of your side that we don't need a minimum wage at all? Why do we have a minimum wage? If the market could set the wages fairly, why don't we just take the minimum wage away completely?"

Wheeler, K.: "Okay. Hey, I worked minimum wage when I was 16. Okay?"

Guzzardi: "Yeah, but can you answer that question for me?"

Wheeler, K.: "Hold on a second."

Guzzardi: "What do you think the minimum wage ought to be?"

Wheeler, K.: "Minimum wage when I was 16 was \$3.35... \$3.35 an hour. That was the minimum wage. If you extrapolate based on inflation, it's like \$7.60 an hour right now."

Guzzardi: "But why... why do we even have that?"

Wheeler, K.: "We're not very far off of it."

Guzzardi: "If the market could set the wages that would be the most fair to business, why do we have a minimum wage at all, Representative?"

Wheeler, K.: "Well, there's... there's a floor to protect certain people. People understand there's a concept here, philosophically. But you're saying, Will..."

Guzzardi: "So, no, no. But if you agree that the..."

Wheeler, K.: "...that we can just raise it unilaterally. Illinois can raise their minimum wage."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Guzzardi: "Yeah."

Wheeler, K.: "It'll have no impact on the people of Illinois that are at the bottom trying to and to get on the ramp to get a job for their first time. We're pricing them right out of it. That's what you're doing. I can move a couple things over here 'cause I'm running out of time, Will. The... the regulation's that we're putting in place, this tax credit system you've got set up in this Bill. I... I'm... my colleagues is going to address it more specifically. Do you think that's a workable system just on its face?"

Guzzardi: "I do."

Wheeler, K.: "Okay. We'll get to that in a minute. Will, you're making it so that businesses in Illinois are going to look at what their options are here and other places and we're going to say... just a moment ago we vilified business owners by saying we're going to put you in jail if you... if you have a wage theft issue."

Speaker Lang: "Your time has expired. Please complete your remarks, Sir."

Wheeler, K.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will. I will yield until I got... I'll wait until I'm yielded more time. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Fortner."

Fortner: "Thank you, Speaker. I'd like to speak to the Bill. And I'd like to focus our attention on maybe the broader history of the minimum wage. And I'm going to be using U.S. I know Illinois has often had a higher rate than that but there's some nice charts. I'm... going to refer to one provided by CNNMoney. They have a chart they put together back in 2015 that tracks minimum wage. And one of the things we've talked

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

about is making sure the minimum wage is what it needs to be to support families. Well, the Consumer Price Index, the rate increase is designed to help us keep track of that. So, we can look at that as to say, what might the minimum wage have been if it really kept pace with inflation? And what you'll see is it bounced up and down over the years since 1938 when the Federal Government first put it into place. The heyday of the minimum wage was arguably in the 1960s and 1970s. It reached its highest level historically adjusted for inflation. It makes sense. That was during the War on Poverty, a lot of programs that were first put into place to really try to address and make the minimum wage perform in a way that was supportive beyond where it originally was back in 1938. So, let's look at those numbers. If I take those two decades the 1960s and 1970s and I look at the median value and I adjust that for inflation, bring it up to 2017, what you find is that median adjusted for inflation is \$9.57. That's based on the minimum wage during the two decades of its heyday. So, well, maybe ... maybe some of those were averaging it down too much. Well, let's look at the highest federal minimum wage adjusted for inflation; that was 1968. Yeah, the minimum wage was only 1.60, but in today's dollars that's \$11.02, \$11... that's the highest adjusted for inflation minimum wage in American history, \$11.02. Now, you might say, well, maybe that's out of line with our suggestions. In the State of the Union Address in 2013, President Obama proposed a \$9 minimum wage. Now, that's 2013. Let's adjust that for inflation. In today's dollars that's \$9.45. It's just very consistent with that range which was the median over the

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

heyday of the minimum wage. I think that was probably a very reasonable place to look. The following year, in the 2014 State of the Union Address, the President came back and proposed a rate of \$10.10. It was a pretty big jump from \$9, but adjusted for inflation that's \$10.43. So, that's certainly still within the range below the maximum consistent with U.S. history for the minimum wage. I don't think those are unreasonable proposals. I think that maybe we should be looking at adjustments that bring us in line with where inflation would be. But that's not what this Bill says. The ... this Bill gets to that point pretty quickly. It gets up to \$10 by the beginning of 2019. And already, by the beginning of 2020, it would be \$11.25 beyond that highest historical level and it grows from there. In fact, it's interesting to note that if I just look at the years... the last three years as it rises to \$15, the... the increases those years... the increases were large the first couple years to catch up: a 9.1 percent increase in the first jump, 11.1 percent increase in the second jump. But from there it goes to 11.3 percent, 15.6 percent and 15.4 percent jumps. Well beyond what it takes to catch up to historical levels. Right it's getting up to 11 bucks, I get to the highest historical level in U.S. history. Let's put some context for the kind of inflationary pressure that those out-years of those increases would create. And again, I'm going to move back and look at U.S. history. The 1970s, those who are here, some of us might have been alive and remember some of the 1970s, was the highest inflationary decade in most peoples' memory in the United States. The average inflation during that decade per year was 11.2

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

percent. So, the out-years of this Bill all three years exceed the inflation of the highest... the worst inflation in U.S. history. So, both, in comparing to where the... the natural value should be... if you want to catch up and bring it to where people envision this, it'd be somewhere in the \$10 range, give or take. And you certainly would not be increasing it by rates that are running four..."

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

Fortner: "Thank you, Speaker. Four times, five times, well beyond the current CPI adjustment. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davidsmeyer. Mr. Davidsmeyer does not wish to speak. Mr. Breen."

Breen: "I yield my time to Mr. Wheeler."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wheeler."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Wheeler, K.: "Well, I just want to address one thing you said earlier about the notes. We did file notes on House Bill 198 on April 5? So, there has been weeks, almost two months now, where we did ask for that information. I asked for it again on this Senate Bill that you're sponsoring today for the same reason. We want to understand that true fiscal impact. And again, I don't mean to just blow that off in the name of... of, yeah, this is great for... for some people, but the state has an impact here that I don't think you're addressing it very well. Would you care to comment one more time on that?"

Guzzardi: "Give me a sec to take a look at what happened." Wheeler, K.: "Sure. Thank you."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Guzzardi: "Proceed your questions, Representative Wheeler."

Wheeler, K.: "I... I want to go back to the idea that we're taking an entire state and we're going to unilaterally raise the minimum wage with this Bill. And we compete... our manufacturers and our small businesses compete across state lines. That's a true statement. We compete across state lines with our small businesses and manufacturers."

Guzzardi: "The answer is yes."

Wheeler, K.: "And we put them, effectively... or can put them at a competitive disadvantage with the results of what would happen with this Bill because their labor costs are going to be higher than the competing companies across the state lines, their costs?"

Guzzardi: "Representative, this Bill is about the quality of life of working people. This Bill is a question of do working people who show up to work every day, who work 40 hours a week, do they deserve to live in poverty? That is the question that is asked by this Bill."

Wheeler, K.: "Okay. Will..."

Guzzardi: "We can all acknowledge that \$8.25 an hour, \$16 thousand a year, constitutes poverty wages for people who are working full-time."

Wheeler, K.: "Well, I'm asking a question specifically about where they're going to have their jobs? Because if those jobs move across the state line, they don't have a job making \$15 an hour in the State of Illinois. That's my conjecture back to you. Is that there's got to be a better balance here than what you've presented so far. This has been a unilateral argument so far. We want to do something 'cause it will help

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

some portion of the people we're trying to help, not all of them, that's made clear by the fact that they're going to lose 93 thousand jobs with this Bill. Okay? And the fact is..."

Guzzardi: "Representative... Go ahead."

Wheeler, K.: "...the employers who have made their investment, stake their claim in this state, have put up with our ridiculous regulations across the board, our high cost of almost everything: worker's comp, liability, property taxes. We're addressing none of that today and we're addressing one part of it that really... I wish we could... you know, if... really, if you could magically wave a wand and say we're going to raise the wage of every person in this state by some piece of legislation, you'd have done that by now."

Guzzardi: "Representative..."

Wheeler, K.: "That doesn't do this."

Guzzardi: "...that's why this legislation... It's not a magic wand; it is a piece of legislation that raises the wages for working people in the state. It..."

Wheeler, K.: "It also lowers some of them to zero."

Guzzardi: "Representative, there have been extensive studies across this country about the effect of raising..."

Wheeler, K.: "Well, you can cherry pick numbers all you want.

You've got to know better than that."

Guzzardi: "Representative, Representative, please. I let you speak; please let me speak."

Wheeler, K.: "I will be happy to."

Guzzardi: "There have been extensive studies across this country about what happens to employment, net employment, in jurisdictions that raise their minimum wage. And the

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

conclusion of all those studies is that net employment remains roughly the same and the impact on wages is upward. That is the..."

Wheeler, K.: "There are other studies that counter that in..."

Guzzardi: "There are other studies from... from business groups perhaps to counter that."

Wheeler, K.: "Shockingly. The ones you hear from on the other side of it."

Guzzardi: "...are from..."

Wheeler, K.: "You can cherry pick numbers all..."

Guzzardi: "academic researchers and economists, Representative."

Wheeler, K.: "...and they all really..."

Guzzardi: "They're not from minimum wage workers. I'll tell you that much."

Wheeler, K.: "They have a motive. Representative, there's one aspect of the Bill I want to ask you about very quickly here regarding the... the under 650-hour threshold."

Guzzardi: "Yes, Sir?"

Wheeler, K.: "Okay. So, I want to make sure I understand that if you're under 650 hours in a year, you can be paid about \$3 thousand less than... at the end of the ramp. Then..."

Guzzardi: "If you were under the age of 18. That's correct."

Wheeler, K.: "Under the age of 18. So, here's my question to you very quickly."

Guzzardi: "Yes, Sir?"

Wheeler, K.: "If a person is under age 18, they're making... yeah... they're making under the 650... they're making 12 an hour... another person doing the same exact... the same exact job who's been there for 651 hours is now making \$15 an hour."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Guzzardi: "Yes, Sir."

Wheeler, K.: "Okay. We have an equal pay problem. Because they're doing the same exact work and they're getting paid a different wage. We are just passing legislation recently that says, oh, by the way, you can't do this. Unfortunately, I think one of the effects of this Bill is that you would."

Guzzardi: "Which legislation are you referring to,
Representative? Are you referring to Representative Moeller's
Bill?"

Wheeler, K.: "I am."

Guzzardi: "So, that... that concerns gender equity and that..."

Wheeler, K.: "So, if one's a male and one's a female?"

Guzzardi: "Yes. But so, this is not a distinction that is specifically on gender. It's based on the amount of hours that you work."

Wheeler, K.: "So..."

Guzzardi: "And we already have, for instance, a provision in the minimum wage law. We talked about the training wage earlier and I need to get you some verification about that. But people who have..."

Speaker Lang: "Please bring your answer to a close. And then, Mr. Wheeler, you'll bring your comments to a close."

Wheeler: "Thank you."

Guzzardi: "Conditions of employment can lead to different salaries. That's already exists in statute and lots of other places. It's not discrimination based on gender which is what we're hoping to prevent."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wheeler."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Wheeler, K.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To... this Bill while well intentioned and I appreciate the Sponsor's efforts to... to make concessions that may make a difference ultimately will make Illinois a more uncompetitive place than it already is. I have stood here I don't know how many times in my two years and five months of being a State Legislator trying to protect the small business environment that this state that has already done more harm to than we care to actually admit and sometimes never truly discuss. This is one more element that just tells those employers... those potential employers... this is not where you're going to make your money back on your investment. This is going to be a very, very difficult place. We're going to keep raising your costs and making it very difficult for you to return your investment back to you and your other shareholders. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Skillicorn."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Skillicorn: "Thank you very much, Representative. Well, just a couple of questions. I see that there's carveouts and exemptions in the Bill. I saw something about park districts and... and young people cannot... can you explain some of the rationale and reasoning for that?"

Guzzardi: "Sure. So, the structure of this Bill is such that... so, we want to address two sets of com... competing concerns. One, is the idea that people under the age of 18 who are working part-time, working a summer job, working a couple hours here and there, not... they're not sole providers. They're not taking care of a family. The concern that those folks shouldn't

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

necessarily be earning a \$15 an hour minimum wage. Already young people in current statute have a slightly discounted minimum wage, but we also wanted to balance that against the concern that there are people under the age of 18 who are working pretty much full-time who are trying to support their family, maybe their parents are disabled, they're homebound. You know, whatever the conditions that may be, they're out there working trying to support folks. So, we wanted to balance those two concerns. And the way we came to balancing those concerns was the following: We created a provision such that if you're under the age of 18 and you work for fewer than 650 hours in any given calendar year for your employer then you're eligible for a lower minimum wage. The ramp gets you up to \$12 an hour. So, what that would do is take care of the young person who's a lifequard at the pool, right, over the summer. They work, you know, 12 weeks full-time. That keeps you under the 650 do... 650-hour threshold. So, they'd be eligible for the lower rate. But whereas that young person who really is working 25 hours a week at the Target yearround, trying to provide for their family, that young person does in fact get the same living wage that someone over the age of 18 would receive."

Skillicorn: "So, the argument to the carveout would be that there's a difference between the person under 18 years old working at Target and a lifeguard? Is that... it that correct?"

Guzzardi: "I don't want to make it a difference of professions.

It's really a difference of how much this person is trying to work, right? Like if we've got a young person who is trying to work year-round full-time, we're trying to navigate, as I

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

mentioned, this dynamic between young people who are working sporadically for a little extra pocket money and young people who are really working to try to be providers."

Skillicorn: "No. It was hard to hear with it. Did you say it was what their time was worth? Is that..."

Guzzardi: "No, no, Sir. No."

Skillicorn: "Okay, okay. So, I'm just doing a quick bit of math, 650 divided by, you know, 50 or 52 weeks. And it's under 13 hours a week. That's very, very low."

Guzzardi: "So, I'll tell you where that number came from. We're trying to address seasonal... youth seasonal employees. Right? It's a number we worked on with the Illinois Association of Park Districts. They said that... it's a good look to roughly 16 weeks of full-time work in a year. They said, you know, over the summer it's 12 weeks and then we have youth who are working for us over the summer and then they come back for a week in spring break and a couple weeks in winter break. So, that gets us to around 16 weeks a year. They said that's about the most that our seasonal youth employees ever work."

Skillicorn: "Okay, so that's how you got that 650 number? But..."

Guzzardi: "Correct."

Skillicorn: "...I mean, I did a little bit of seasonal work. I don't... you mean that seasonal work is probably 30, 40 hours a week for, you know, it might be less than 16, it might be a little more, but whatever that is. And it's just odd that, you know, someone that's under 18 years old, might be at Target as you said and might and might do another type of job that maybe is seasonal and they aren't worth the same. I... I

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

- mean, there's an inequity there. And I don't know if it's because they're seasonal, is that fair?"
- Guzzardi: "Representative, you're arguing that everyone deserves a \$15 an hour minimum wage. I'll be happy to work with you on a trailer Bill to make that happen."
- Skillicorn: "Okay. I mean, it just seems odd that the as it's written today that there's that discrepancy there. But it was also brought up the lifeguard. Well, I mean, I was a lifeguard in high school. And you know, I don't see why, if we're going to treat one people as differently... the logic is, is that you should treat all of them the same, right? I mean, isn't their time the same value?"
- Guzzardi: "Representative, I'm not quite sure I get where you're heading with this. I hope I made clear the ... the distinction that we were trying to address with this Amendment. We were trying to address the distinction and it's a concern that I heard from Members on both sides of the aisle that, you know, the kid who is flipping burgers at the Dairy Queen for a few hours a week over the summer maybe he doesn't ... because they're not providing, right? They're, you know, they are provided for. They are a dependent. That and they're trying to just earn some pocket change. That young person doesn't need a living wage, right? So, that's why we tried to tailor this, very specifically, to youth seasonal employees. Young people who are only working a limited number of hours who are just trying to make a little extra money, so that the young people who are, in fact, out there working trying to provide for themselves and their family, those folks can still remain eligible for the \$15 an hour living wage."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Skillicorn: "Okay. Well, I mean, it's... it's just one point if you try to make an argument for a living wage and instead there are exemptions, you know, some people may not deserve the living wage. I mean, I'm not sure that's the argument that I would run with if I was... I was, you know, was the Sponsor of this. But you know, to the Bill. I would just argue that I think peoples' worth is based on what they... what value they can bring and I want to see people..."

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

Skillicorn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to see people who aren't referred to as just lifeguards or just seasonal workers or just flipping hamburgers at Dairy Queen. I want to see them as valued people that can earn a living that they can... their skills can grow. Their knowledge can grow and the value they bring to a business can grow. And I think the market... the free market answers that question."

Speaker Lang: "There are still 13 people who wish to speak. We are going to allow everyone to speak who wishes to. I would just simply ask Members who have had their comments made already to refrain in the interest of time. The Chair recognizes Mr. Demmer."

Demmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speak..."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Turner in the Chair."

Demmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. There have been in several comments made on the floor today about what the research shows in situations in which the minimum wage is increased what effect that has on the net number of jobs. And there was an assertion made that those studies that show job loss might be skewed somehow. I'd just like to cite one study

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

that came from the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco, not known for being a particularly conservative area. And this is the quote, 'the overall body of recent evidence suggests that the most credible conclusion is that a higher minimum wage results in some job loss for the least-skilled workers with possibly larger adverse effects than earlier research suggested.' Then taking that caution, I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Wehrli is recognized."

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

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

Wehrli: "Representative Guzzardi, how did you put yourself through college? Did you do..."

Guzzardi: "Pardon me, Representative?"

Wehrli: "Yeah. Did you... did you do work study when you attended,
I believe it was, Brown?"

Guzzardi: "Representative, yeah, I had a job when I was in college actually."

Wehrli: "You did?"

Guzzardi: "Yeah, I did."

Wehrli: "Did you work for the university?"

Guzzardi: "I didn't work for the university."

Wehrli: "You didn't. Okay."

Guzzardi: "I worked privately."

Wehrli: "'Cause I know a lot of students do that. They go to work; you know, they want to go to school. To offsets some of the costs, they actually work for the university. And under this proposed legislation, now that \$10 an hour job... maybe it's mowing lawns or you're handing out towels at the rec center... is now going to be \$15 an hour. So, let's... do you disagree

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

- with that concept under this Bill? That this Bill would raise..."
- Guzzardi: "That the minimum wage will increase? No, no. That's the purpose of the Bill, Representative."
- Wehrli: "Right. So, it's going to raise it for our state universities. Maybe they're paying \$10 an hour now and all of a sudden they're going to pay \$15. Is that correct?"
- Guzzardi: "Everyone over the age of 18 will be required to pay...
 will be paid \$15 an hour as the minimum wage."
- Wehrli: "Okay. So, it's... you just agreed that it's going to cost our state universities more money, but yet earlier the fiscal notes on this were ruled inapplicable because they don't apply which... help me understand that. How... how can you on one side of the argument say it's not going to cost us anything and we don't need to know what the fiscal notes are, but then here in debate you just admitted that it's going to cost our state universities more 'cause they're going to have to pay their students a higher rate at \$15 an hour?"

Guzzardi: "Representative..."

- Wehrli: "So, that's... that's a fiscal impact to the state. So, help me understand how the fiscal notes are ruled inapplicable?"
- Guzzardi: "I want to be clear. I never said that there was not going to be any fiscal impact to this Bill. What I'm trying to tell you. Students working is a great example because we can all... and we've all talked at great lengths... about the enormous burdens of student debt in our society, right? The crippling burden on my generation of the enormously high cost of college and the debt that we're required to take on to pay

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

for it. So, I think for students to be able to earn those few extra bucks while they're in college so that debt load that saddles them for the rest of their life might be minimized, I think it's an awfully good thing, Representative."

Wehrli: "But this also shows just the one-sided myopic view point you're taking because that money has to come from somewhere and where that is, I don't know. That's why the fiscal notes are so important. In-state tuition is already too expensive in the State of Illinois. You, yourself, have argued for free college education, laudable goal, financially irresponsible. This Bill is yet another example of that. You're trying to do the right thing and I applaud for that, but there's no money to pay for it. So, I'm going to respectfully ask my colleagues to vote 'no' on this. This is going to cost the State of Illinois... whether you agree with the fiscal impact notes or not. This is going to cost us money. Money that we don't have. We need a budget in order to fund higher education. We don't have that. I don't see any light of a budget coming out in the next 24 hours which is sad. So, I urge a 'no' vote. And with that, I yield the rest of my time to Representative Wheeler."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Wheeler."

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

Wheeler, K.: "Well, I just want to come back to some of the points that my colleague was making."

Guzzardi: "Yeah."

Wheeler, K.: "I'd asked you about the fiscal notes that... you brought it up about House Bill 198. And I brought back to you

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

that they were filed in April and you said you were going to get back to me. I wanted to just give you that chance to get back to me about what those fiscal notes were, since we applied it two months ago... almost two months ago."

- Guzzardi: "Yeah. And so, I... I don't know why this is the case, but many of the other notes have been filed here and the fiscal note was not filed. There was not received on the Bill, yeah. I... I guess these are why not the case, but..."
- Wheeler, K.: "I just read it off the, you know, here the fiscal note as requested as... on... on April 5th. House Floor Amendment #1 state mandates fiscal note... requested on amendment by Representative Tom Demmer."
- Guzzardi: "Yeah, so the department never answered the note. So,
 I... I can't speak to why. That's the Governor... that's an
 Executive Agency. The note was filed on the Bill. You know,
 it was the agency's responsibility to respond to it in due
 course."
- Wheeler, K.: "Thank you."
- Guzzardi: "I can't speak to why that was the case."
- Wheeler, K.: "I appreciate that. I guess I'm going to get one more time, to my friends on the other side of the aisle who all voted to hold that inapplicable..."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative, please make your final remark."
- Wheeler, K.: "Very brief, I promise. That you are voting to raise the cost of doing business in the state and doing business within the state. This is not an inapplicable thing. It's not inconvenient; this is substantial. If you really are interested in a balanced budget in the future of this state, you have to look at a 'no' vote."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

- Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Reis."
- Reis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Turner: "Sponsor indicates that he will yield."
- Reis: "Representative, we've heard all day today \$15 an hour, \$15 an hour, \$15 an hour, but you know it's not really just \$15 an hour, don't you?"
- Guzzardi: "I suspect you're getting at something very clever here,

 Representative but I can't quite see what it is. Can you tell

 me?"
- Reis: "Well, we have to pay... most employers pay half of the federal withholding, so how much will that add to the \$15?"
- Guzzardi: "Representative, make your point, Sir."
- Reis: "Well, another seven and half percent. So, employers have to pay work comp, some of the highest rates in the Midwest that we can't seem to get under control in this state. How much is that going to add to the \$15?"
- Guzzardi: "I am so eager to work with you all on the question of workers' compensation insurance. We have..."
- Reis: "That's not my question. How much is that going to add to the \$15?"
- Guzzardi: "Representative, I hope that we can lower the cost of workers' compensation insurance..."
- Reis: "You don't know, do you?"
- Guzzardi: "...by making sure that insurance companies aren't pocketing excessive profits at the expense both of our..."
- Reis: "You don't know how much this is going to add to it, do you?"
- Guzzardi: "...employers and our employees."
- Reis: "What about unemployment insurance rates?"

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Guzzardi: "Representative..."

Reis: "Highest... some of the highest that... I'm making a point. It's not just \$15. It's going to be almost \$17. The cost to employers by the time they pick up all the other costs that they have to pick up now. So, you take that on top of already uncompetitive stuff in Illinois and it's going to make it even more uncompetitive. Is... my next question is, agriculture exemption? How does that work in your Bill?"

Guzzardi: "It hasn't been changed in this legislation, Representative."

Reis: "So, you're telling me that ag is exempt?"

Guzzardi: "Yeah. The exemption exists at... will continue to exist as it currently exists in statute."

Reis: "Well, and here's another enlightening comment that you may not have known. That is just a bunch of baloney. We don't pay minimum wage in agriculture. We can't put a \$8.25 person on a quarter of a million dollar tractor or a \$200 thousand spray rig. We are already in agriculture are paying 12 to 15 dollars an hour. We have to, to get the type of people that can handle today's equipment, larger farms with a lot more inventory of livestock. We're already paying that. So, we're going to have to go to 20... I'm paying 5 bucks an hour over. I'm going to have to go to 20. And guess what, I get to add on federal withholding and all the other things to make that 20 even higher. So, let's be real about what we're talking about here. This is going to be a major impact on employers, a major impact on agriculture. A lot of my factories at home are paying 12 to 15 dollars an hour starting out. They still have openings. How can we re... even remotely remain competitive

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

with Indiana which is across the river from me, whose minimum wage is 7.25? We can't. Our factories can't. It is so much easier for them to move across the river and you say..."

Guzzardi: "So, Representative, I got to get to this question because I'm having trouble wrapping my head around it."

Reis: "I understand you..."

Guzzardi: "Would you all support a two dollar an hour minimum wage in Illinois? We'd be a heck of a lot more competitive in Indiana or in Kentucky or Missouri if our minimum wage was 2.50."

Reis: "Representative, I've said for years and I've watched it and been a part of these debates since I've been here. It should be a federal issue, so that we're even."

Guzzardi: "Right."

Reis: "Okav?"

Guzzardi: "Right."

Reis: "We get killed in southeastern Illinois with Indiana stuff. So, we're going to lose jobs. You make the point that you've never seen a study where we lose jobs. What happened to all of you when we had the last minimum wage increase? You fill your own soda at the fast food places. Now, McDonald's and all the others are developing kiosks. You're going to place your own order. You're going to swipe your card. Some machine is going to hand you a cup so you can go fill your own drink. And that's how they're going to conform to this. It's going on already. Less jobs."

Guzzardi: "It's going on already. That's exactly right,
Representative."

Reis: "Less jobs."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Guzzardi: "It's going to happen. The cost of this technology is getting lower every year. There will come an inflection point when it's cheaper for McDonald's to automate than to hire people. And whenever that point happens, they're going to do it whether this Bill passes or not, Representative."

Reis: "Why do we ask? Exasperated here in Illinois is the question. To the Bill. You know, it's awful easy to use other peoples' money to... to try to move an agenda. Facts are there's going to be less jobs. African-American males in the City of Chicago have some of the highest unemployment rates. Why do we want to make that worse? It's not just \$15 an hour. It's all the other costs that goes on. No one in this chamber has talked about reimbursement rates to nursing homes and other things that are going to need to go up. We all know what's going to happen to this Bill. It's going to pass, go to the Governor's Desk and be vetoed. But let's be fair about the comments we make on the floor about what the true costs are to the people of Illinois."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Davidsmeyer."

Davidsmeyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wasn't prepared to speak earlier because of my crutches. I couldn't get all the way over, so I appreciate it. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Davidsmeyer: "So, I hear a lot from my, you know, disability service providers who have disability homes and I know there's going to be a Bill coming up later to provide a \$15 minimum wage for those folks. And I also heard somebody earlier speaking about nurses and that throws into the… into the process, CNAs, and things of that sort. So, raising a \$15

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

minimum wage for somebody who is, you know, flipping burgers, what does that do to a CNA wage and then the nursing wage and the cost of health care and... and on and on throughout the..."

Guzzardi: "I'm so glad you brought that up, Representative. Because as it stands right now, the people who are taking care of the most vulnerable in Illinois, our seniors, our people in institutions, these folks are being paid embarrassingly low wages. And there's... the reason that we have enormously high turnover in these industries and that turnover puts our most vulnerable people at risk. The fact that we can't retain nurses and home care providers that puts our seniors and our children and our people with disabilities at risk every day. We've seen the stories in the *Tribune* of what happens to those institutions and it's because we can't hire and retain good people. We need to pay these people more and this Bill will do that and I'm proud that it will do that."

Davidsmeyer: "But... but this Bill will keep the status quo on that, right?"

Guzzardi: "Oh, my goodness, no."

Davidsmeyer: "You're still competing with a..."

Guzzardi: "It will increase their wages by a considerable amount."

Davidsmeyer: "...a low responsibility job and the responsibility for caring for people. So, you're... you're not doing anything with this Bill. You're exacerbating the problem. So..."

Guzzardi: "I could not disagree with you more about that, Representative."

Davidsmeyer: "How?"

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Guzzardi: "I think that... so, from the people I've spoken to..."

Davidsmeyer: "So, if you're comparing a \$15 burger flipping job to a \$15 caring for a senior citizen job..."

Guzzardi: "Yeah. They can both survive now. Unlike today, when both of those folks are..."

Davidsmeyer: "Why..."

Guzzardi: "...having to make decisions about whether they pay rent or keep the lights on or pay their medical bills."

Davidsmeyer: "Why would anybody..."

Guzzardi: "These people in your district and mine are making these decisions every day and it's unfair."

Davidsmeyer: "Why would anybody go to community college or to college and get a CNA to take care of grandma when they can flip a burger for... with less responsibility and not have the... the worry?"

Guzzardi: "I've spoken to a lot of these folks, C.D. and...

Representative..."

Davidsmeyer: "I have, too."

Guzzardi: "...and the reason why they do it isn't for the money. They do it because they care about people. They want to devote their life to caring and service. They're not in it for the money. They... they wouldn't be working for \$9 an hour if they were in it for the money. They... we want to continue to allow them to fulfill their dream of serving people in need, but to do it in such a way that they can also put food on the table at home. That's what this Bill does, Representative."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. So, I was talking to a friend over the weekend who works a 40-plus hour job at a factory. He just recently purchased a laundromat to try to make things better for his

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

family, to increase income, and provide a nest egg for his future and for his kids. He said he currently can barely afford... he's working 30 to 40 hours a week in a fac... or he's working 40-plus hours at a factory, plus 30 to 40 hours a week trying to run this laundromat and he can barely afford to keep people there at minimum wage currently. Who, in general, probably uses those laundromats?"

Guzzardi: "Who uses the laundromats? People with dirty clothes."

Davidsmeyer: "Generally, people who can't afford to purchase a washer and dryer. I mean, generally, you're going to be pushing these costs off on people who already can't afford things, right? So, your costs are going to continue to..."

Guzzardi: "But those same people will be making a living wage, so they can afford to pay for stuff, Representative."

Davidsmeyer: "If you raise their wage to 15... if you a raise a working persons' wage to \$15 an hour, what about somebody who is not working? You're going to raise the cost of the laundromat. You're going to raise the cost of the dollar menu at McDonald's. You're going to raise the cost of everything in your grocery store. So, what about the people that are not working?"

Guzzardi: "What's your question, Representative?"

Davidsmeyer: "What about the people that are not working? You're going to raise the rates. It's going to have a ripple effect through the economy. And you're going to have to come back and figure out how to pay everyone who can't work for more money as well."

Guzzardi: "I think that it's... if you look at..."

Davidsmeyer: "How... how are you going to do this?"

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

- Guzzardi: "The State of Illinois has raised the minimum wage in the past. Jurisdictions around this country have raised the minimum wage including some states for \$15 an hour. You have not seen massive price inflation in any of those jurisdictions, okay?"
- Davidsmeyer: "We raised it a buck. We raised it from 7.25 to 8.25 or whatever it is right now, right? So... so, we raised it a buck. You're talking about an additional \$7, \$7. You're... you're doubling peoples' wages. This is a ri..."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative, please bring your remarks to a close."
- Davidsmeyer: "This is just... it's a horrible idea on how to bring people up. I understand what you're trying to do. And I'd like to work with you on trying to figure out how we actually bring people up without keeping them in these entry-level jobs. I vote... I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reick is recognized."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Reick: "Will, this is going to sort of be a lightning round. I got some questions for you."

Guzzardi: "Let's go."

Reick: "All right. In the Bill, it says each employer that does not employ more than 50 employees at any time during the applicable payment period may claim a credit against payments due. It's credits multiplied by the number of hours worked, yada, yada, during the reporting period. First of all, what is an applicable payment period?"

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

- Guzzardi: "Those are... I believe those are 90-day reporting periods for tax purposes, Representative."
- Reick: "No. Applicable payment period not reporting period, applicable payment period."
- Guzzardi: "The payment period, I believe, is referring to a period in which they... let me make sure I've got this right for you, Representative. I want to make sure I answer your question with the most accuracy."
- Reick: "Then I'll ask you another question while you're waiting on that. Questions?"
- Guzzardi: "I'll get back to you on that, Representative. I'll take question number 2 while we're waiting."
- Reick: "Okay. If an employer exceeds 50 employees for even one day during the applicable payment period, does that mean the employer then becomes ineligible for the credit for that entire..."
- Guzzardi: "Right."
- Reick: "...reporting period or just the applicable payment period?"
- Guzzardi: "Well, we're talking about these 90-day reporting periods, right? So, if you go above 50 for any one of those 90-day periods, you won't be eligible for the credit during... for that 90-day period. So..."
- Reick: "Fair enough. Do employees who take leave under VASA or FLMA stay on the rolls as employees for purposes of determining the number of employees counted in the Bill?"
- Guzzardi: "I think they do, yes."
- Reick: "Okay. If an employer hires temporary workers to replace those on leave, are they counted toward the 50 in the employer threshold?"

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Guzzardi: "If they're considered employees, then yes."

Reick: "Then if an employer has 49 employees and 2 of them take leave within the applicable payment period and are replaced with temporary employees then the employer's ineligible for the credit 'cause now he's got 51?"

Guzzardi: "During that period, the answer is yes."

Reick: "Okay. All right. The Bill also provides that the credit or credits may be taken against payments due for reporting periods. This Bill provides for only one credit. When you say credit or credits, does that mean that the credit anticipated in this Bill is aggregated in some way with other credits available to the employer during any particular reporting period?"

Guzzardi: "No. I believe it means... you're asking, why does a credit or credits rather than just a credit?"

Reick: "Yeah."

Guzzardi: "Is that what you're asking?"

Reick: "That's correct."

Guzzardi: "I believe it's just referring to consecutive credits pertaining to this Section of the Act."

Reick: "Say that again?"

Guzzardi: "I believe that the reason why it's pluralized there...
although I will indulge you in this line of questioning,
Representative. I believe the reason it's pluralized in that
instance is because it's referring to the possibility of
claiming multiple consecutive credits for consecutive
reporting periods under this single Section and not the other
credits in other Sections of the law."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Reick: "All right. Now, you're limited to 25 percent of your... of your tax liability for a... for any reporting period for this credit. What are the hierarchies of credits? Does this credit... is this credit offset 25 percent of the total liability or does it offset 25 percent of the liability that's reduced by DCEO credits and IDOR credits?"

Guzzardi: "I believe it's for the net liability, Representative." Reick: "Okay. Here's an example. An employer was 18 years old or older in 2019. This employee is paid \$10 an hour. If this employee worked 30 hours a week, he'd be paid 300 a week or \$15,600 annually. The employer could claim a per-hour credit for the year at 75 cents an hour worked or \$1170. But let's further assume he's the only employee and has Illinois income tax withheld at a 5 percent rate. That means he'd only have \$195 withheld from his pay per quarter. Since the employer is limited to the credit of no greater than 25 percent of what's withheld from the employees pay, the employer would get a maximum credit of \$48.75 or 1.25 percent of that employee's wages. That's in the Bill. Twenty-five percent of the net liability, that's it. Before ... before I go on, though, I'd like to request verification of this Bill, please. To the Bill. Anybody who's going back to your district and say I'm voting for this Bill because you're being given a tax credit, you better be careful about what you go back with 'cause this credit is nothing more than a fig leaf that is insufficient to cover even the most inadequate of genitalia. This Bill... this credit is meant for one of two things. There's either going to be a... employers are going to throw up their hands and completely give up on this thing..."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Speaker Turner: "Please make your final remarks, Representative."

Reick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. They're either going to give up because it's too darn complicated to keep track of or there are going to be a mountain of Department of Revenue auditors ready to come down on them like a duck on a June bug. This credit is not meant to do anything other than to provide a smokescreen to anyone thinking that they can come home with a... with a... a minimum wage Bill and then walk into a local restaurant or grocery store and stare that owner in the face and say I did something for you. I urge strongly a 'no' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Wallace is recognized."

Wallace: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think I'm just going to go straight to the Bill. And I'm going to thank Representative Guzzardi for bringing this Bill forward and all of the individuals who introduced legislation related to increase in the minimum wage. There's been a lot of discussion about studies and some studies being fake news and some studies being peer-reviewed studies and some being studies people just conducted on their phone late at night. I don't know. But what I do like to deal with is science. Social science is science. Economists are social scientists. And they do know what they're speaking about when they talk about how this measure or measures like this can actually impact the economy. When individuals who are poor or working class have discretionary money, they spend it. They spend it on the products, goods, and services that are manufactured or sold or produced by the very people that we're standing here trying to protect. I asked this question when we had the subject

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

matter hearing on this particular Bill and I mean it and I would really love to have an answer, but I've never been able to get one. And that question is, why is it the responsibility of this Body to figure out ways to supplement the income of those who make minimum wage? Because we know they cannot afford adequate housing. They cannot properly in... provide themselves with child care. They have food insecurity, there are a number of things that happen when you make \$8.25 an hour. There's been other misnomers about what was the average minimum wage worker. Who is that? It's not a 16-year-old kid. The average age of the minimum wage workers in the United States is about 35 years old. And she... it's typically a she... and it's in half the cases a single head of household. Disproportionately women of color are represented in the number of minimum wage workers. So, in short, the average minimum wage worker looks like me, not a 16-year-old kid flipping hamburgers. There was also some discussion about what's the intent? Or what was the intent of the minimum wage? And roughly, after the Depression... at some point after the Depression the economy needed to bounce back and part of that was to be able to protect the labor force and the wages that they earned. And it was to set a basic standard of living for individuals. One that allows for healthiness and a healthy well-being. And so, with that intention being stated, I think that it's fitting for us to just think about our own State Constitution. And our own State Constitution opens with a preamble that includes these words: that we will work to eliminate poverty and inequality. I'm going to say that again. We will work to eliminate poverty and inequality and ensure

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

legal, social, and economic justice. We will do this and provide for the opportunity for the full... a fullest development of the individual, ensure domestic tranquility, and provide for the common defense. That's just a portion of the preamble of the very Constitution that every single one of us rose our hand and swore to uphold. We are fighting here for economic justice today and all of the myths and all of the not fake news but fake research that has been cited here today should not be the basis for the... for the decision that we make when we vote on this particular Bill. The Department of Labor is very clear. The history books are very clear as to the intent. And then our own Constitution requires that we stand and eliminate poverty and that we stand for economic justice. And this is one way of doing so. So, to that end, I encourage a resounding 'yes' or 'aye' vote on this particular measure. And I thank Representative Guzzardi for bringing it forth. And thank you to Senator Lightford who was..."

Speaker Turner: "Please make your final remark, Representative."
Wallace: "And thank you to Senator Lightford who has worked
tirelessly over the years to increase the wages of the
citizens of Illinois."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Welch is recognized."

Welch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I want to first begin by addressing one of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who said that we don't know what we're talking about because he's a small business owner. Well, let me say this, I'm not smarter than any of you guys because I'm a lawyer and you're not smarter than any of us because you own businesses or own airplanes or those types of things. We are all leaders

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

in our community elected to do a job. You represent your constituents and we'll represent ours. When I knock on doors in my district, you know what people tell me? Number 1) get them a budget. Number 2) help me bring more money home. People who make 40... who work 40 hours a week should be able to make a decent wage and making a decent wage is not going to drive businesses out of this state. Fifteen dollars an hour will not drive people out of this state and we need to raise the minimum wage today. That's what the facts show. Decades of research have shown that the claim that you're making here today is just not true. Just recently, just last week, Michael Reich, the Director of the Institute for Research on Labor and Employment at the UC-Berkeley specifically disproved that fact that you're making here today. We have not lost any businesses or jobs because of raising the minimum wage in the City of Chicago or the State of Illinois. That's a fact; it's been proven. At a time when Illinois is worried about population loss, we should be considering raising the wage. We should raise the wage. It's going to bring people to this state because they know they would make a decent wage. I will ask all of you to strongly consider raising the wage today and fighting for people to make a decent wage. If you flip a burger, you should make a decent wage, too. What makes them less of a person because they're flipping a burger? They should be able to go home and pay their bills. Support Senate Bill 81 and raise the wage today."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Cassidy."

Cassidy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to go straight to the Bill and lead with a quote from the great statesman Chris

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Rock.' I used to work at McDonald's making minimum wage. You know what that means when someone pays you minimum wage? You know what your boss was trying to say? It's like, hey, if I could pay you less I would, but it's against the law.' I'm hearing a whole lot from the other side of the aisle about the poor, put-upon corporate interests in Illinois. And I want to thank Representative Guzzardi for the hard work he's done putting this Bill together. This has been a long road and a lot of us have been on it for a long time. And I remember one of the earlier hearings in the Labor Committee on this Bill and... and we heard from a woman by the name of Gloria, who many of us have come to know over the years. She's a leader with the Chicago Coalition for the Homeless. And she told the story of how she worked at a minimum wage job hauling 65-pound tubs of... of meat across a warehouse floor every day. And frequently, at the end of the day, she had to choose between bus fare and paying her bills. And so, she would walk home from that job hauling 65-pound tubs of meat across a warehouse floor. Now, Gloria is not a big woman. I cannot imagine the end of an eight-hour day having to make that choice. You know, we don't want to close corporate tax loopholes. We don't want to make sure that those of incredible wealth pay their fair share. We want to make sure though that the State of Illinois will continue to subsidize corporations who pay people a lower living wage and put that ... someone who works full-time still in need of public aid. That subsidy were all good with, but we don't want to make sure that people are paid a living wage. We on this side do. We care about those people. I represent women like Gloria. I'm here on

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

behalf of the women that I see when I'm leaving my house early in the morning who are getting off work on the overnight shift at a nursing home fighting bedbugs and putting up with all sorts of indignities not making a living wage. Our job is to represent those people, too. And I... I beg the Members of the other side of the aisle to look at how we're subsidizing those corporations by letting them pay people below a living wage, by putting people in that position of Gloria. Put yourself in Gloria's shoes for just a minute, please. Would you be able to walk home after spending eight hours schlepping a tub of meat across a warehouse floor? I don't think so. There is not a soul in this Body that's as tough as Gloria. And I'm here for her. And I am telling you that people like her deserve to... the dignity of a living wage. Vote 'yes'."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative David Harris."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Harris, D.: "Well, first of all, Mr... Mr. Speaker. If I may, my colleague who spoke over all with a colorful... colorful analogy a little bit earlier did request a verification which I don't know if you acknowledged."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reick did request a verification and that is acknowledged."

Harris, D.: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "Yes, Sir."

Harris, D.: "Representative, one of the previous speakers did talk to you about the computation of the tax credit. And I had an employer that I talked to just a bit... a little bit

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

earlier today. The tax credit applies to the withholding tax, correct?"

Guzzardi: "I believe so, yes."

Harris, D.: "Well, it applies to do withholding tax. So, whereas before the employer simply had to make the deduction from the employee's salary for the withholding tax and send it in to... send it into the... the State of Illinois. Now, the employer, a small employer, now has to go through a fairly complicated computation to figure out does he get the... whatever it is... \$48 credit that is offered. He has to go through a computation for the withholding tax before he sends it in. Is that correct?"

Guzzardi: "The answer is yes."

Harris, D.: "Yes. Yes. Okay so, now, you've increased the administrative burden as well. Ladies and Gentlemen, to the Bill very briefly. I know we've had a very long and thorough debate on this. I did talk to a small employer in my district here just as we began the debate on this. The employer employs high school students as well as full-time employees. The fulltime employees he pays more than the minimum wage. The high school students he employ... he employs, they don't work fulltime obviously, he pays them the minimum wage. And I asked him what happens if it goes to \$15 an hour. And first of all, he commented on the credit that it would take time to compute being an additional burden on him, but regarding the employees, he would... said he would eliminate the need for unskilled help. He'd cut back on hours. He'd hire fewer people. This is a gentleman who employs people in my... in my district right now. Eventually, he would have to raise his

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

prices because 45 percent of his costs... 45 percent of his costs are in labor. And the labor cost is going to increase 81 percent under this Bill, so he's going to have to increase costs. And then he said, you know, my older customers who come in to buy my doughnuts, they're on Social Security and they don't get these kinds of increases. My prices are going to go up so maybe I sell less, maybe I don't. Let me... let me just turn for a second to another... another angle. There's in today's Chicago Tribune there's an article that says, the typical CEO with the largest U.S. companies got an 8.5 percent raise last year. Over the last five years, median CEO pay in the survey has jumped by 19.6 percent. CEOs for major U.S. corporations make 347 times more than the average worker. To me, that is disgraceful. That argues for a minimum wage increase, without a doubt, because these people are... are being disadvantaged. At the same time, however, the people who work for the minimum wage generally are unskilled labor, generally are unskilled labor. Here we're talking about... we're talking about skilled labor with these people who that get hinds of ... these kinds of increases. We're talking about unskilled labor that if you look at and we can ... we can add fact studies back and forth, the Congressional budget office projected that a minimum wage increase from 7.25, which is at the federal level, to \$10.10 an hour would result in a loss of 500 thousand jobs. A study from the Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland found that although low-income workers see wage increases their hours and employment decline and the combined effect of these changes is a decline in earned income. Minimum wage increases the proportion of families that are poor or

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

near poor. There are effects here and there are macro effects to raising the minimum wage especially to the tune of 81 percent. You ask the question, should government set the wage? Yes, should govern... yes, government should set a wage and that's what we're doing here arguing back and forth what it should be. The government sets child labor laws and that's a good thing because businesses operate for their own interests and we do need to protect the workers. But what should it be? What should a fair wage be? And I'll close on this. It's not just wages. And I think we need to keep that in mind. We recognize, although many of you would say, well, you're fighting the minimum wage so you don't care about people. Yes, we do care about people. Yes, we do. And I'm... I'm willing to support an increase in the earned income tax credit which many of these people benefit. I'm willing to support child care credits for the... for single moms who need to go to work and to may be working at the minimum wage but need child care. They may qualify for Medicaid. So, my point here is, there are social service benefits for people who get... work for the minimum wage. It's not just the minimum wage here. They do get benefits from the state that others do not get. And I ask you to consider that before you raise the... the rate..."

Speaker Turner: "Representative, please make your final remarks." Harris, D.: "I ask you to consider that before we raise the rate 81 percent. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative McDermed."

McDermed: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Early in the discussion there

was a fair amount of talk about what exactly is the Chicago

minimum wage. So, I thought I would make the record very clear

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

that today it is \$10.50. On July 1, it will be \$11.00. To the Bill. I had the privilege last Session of serving on the Child Care Reform Commission with three of our esteemed colleagues from the City of Chicago. This was a very interesting experience for me. Most of the providers who came and talked about changes that we needed in our child care system were... had their businesses and were providing services in the City of Chicago. And during the course of the discussion which concerned reforms in the application process, reforms in the approving of the applications, changes that we could perhaps make in... in the hiring of the qualified people, a discussion came up about the fact that the Chicago minimum wage at that time was going to go to \$10. Now, consider the owner of the child care business. This is a small business in the City of Chicago owned by a female. And she was highly, highly, highly incensed by the fact that the Chicago minimum wage was going up to \$10 an hour. She said, how am I supposed to cover that expense? How am I going to find somebody that's worth that \$10 an hour? And when is the state going to reimburse me at the new \$10 an hour rate? So, I think that this small, innercity entrepreneur raises exactly the issues that we're grappling with here today. Who is it? How do we make sure that our employees are value... are bringing \$15 an hour value? She was pretty skeptical about the 10 and now, she's going to have to pay 15. And she was, by no means, sure that they were going to be adding \$15 an hour value to her business. The next problem we've got is that she was like, and when is the state going to increase my reimbursement? Now, we haven't had the benefit of the fiscal notes we requested, so we don't

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

know how much this \$15 an hour would cost us in providing reimbursement to all our child care providers in the State of Illinois at this new higher rate. But I'm going to suggest to you that just like for the other providers for our seniors and for our disabled, we're talking in the hundreds of millions of dollars. Where's that money going to come from? The other thing I think we need to consider here is that when our minimum wage workers are making \$15 an hour the amounts by which they qualify for child care reimbursement, they will no longer qualify for child reimbursement. So, we're taking our people, these working poor, right out of their ability to qualify for child care services. I think we need to look at all the consequences of what it is that we're doing here today. I wonder if the owner of that child care agency in the City of Chicago even knew that this \$15 an hour wage would require her to pay an extra 50 cents an hour to the Social Security Administration as her part of that. The final point I want to make is this. When we move the lowest rung of the employment ladder up to \$15 an hour, are we putting it out of reach of the very people that need to reach that lowest rung? I'm going to suggest to you that by putting it at \$15 an hour we have moved it far above the ability of folks that are not highly valued, highly experienced to even grasp the lowest rung of the employment ladder. We want folks who haven't finished high school, folks who haven't had the benefit of a superior education to be able to grasp that lowest rung and pull themselves up. By moving it up to 15, I'm afraid that we're moving it out of the reach of the very folks that we want... that we need most to benefit from this Bill. All our

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

businesses have told us is this is not the way to go. We need to encourage business. We need to encourage business expansion. Everyone who takes Economics 101 knows that the very best way to increase wages is to increase demand. If our... if more employers come, if more employers expand..."

Speaker Turner: "Representative, please make your final remarks."

McDermed: "This is my final remark. If we allow our businesses to come here and grow and expand by having business-friendly policies, businesses will expand and they will have to pay more money in order to get more workers. Let's... let's change our ways, be probusiness. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Guzzardi, thank you very much for bringing this Bill. I really appreciate all your hard work and your efforts. And I'm going to try to be very brief. I'm really offended by some of the remarks that's been made in regards to a person's value and worth because they can only get a job paying minimum wage. That's not their value. That's not... they're worth more than that, but because we're not willing to pay more they're willing to work at this small amount because they don't want to be a burden on the state. Someone said earlier that this is going to cost the state. These people that's working for 9 and 10 dollars an hour right now, quite frankly, they would be better off if they did not work at all. But because they do want to work, they know they are of value and worth. They do want to better themselves, but we're not allowing them to do so. We are controlling their purse string. Unlike the business person that one of my previous colleagues spoke about who gave

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

themselves thousands of dollars' worth of increase, they didn't come to us and ask if it was okay. Could we afford them to have an increase? No, they chose to do it on their own, but it is the working poor, the income in quality. These are the people that's coming to us hand and knees asking us to please help them to pull themselves out of poverty. But every time they try to do something for themselves, they can't. Someone mentioned the City of Chicago. Oh, they're going to get an increase of \$10.50 an hour, maybe \$11 an hour. Well, let's talk about a one-day pass on a Chicago bus, \$10, \$10. Let's talk about the price of rent, lights, gas, mandated insurance coverage. Let's talk about that, Ladies and Gentlemen. How do you expect a poor family that's making 8 to 10 dollars an hour be able to live in the City of Chicago? How do you expect a family that's working three part-time jobs to be responsible to their children by helping them with their homework? It's amazing how we could subsidize businesses. It's amazing to me how we could subsidize farmers. It's amazing to me how we can give grants and all other kinds of subsidies to businesses. But dare we want to help poor people? And the most important things is this. If you look around us, you'll see that there's a problem in our communities. Businesses leaving. The are reason businesses are leaving is because there are no working people with discretionary funds to go to the ice cream parlor, to go to J.C. Penny, to go to Sears, to go to the movie, to go and have someone to flip a hamburger for them. And so, if we are interested in saving businesses so they can keep the subsidies that we gave them, let's give their workers \$15 an hour. And

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

for the... the high schoolers, I want to remind some Members that high schoolers, some high schoolers are adults. They are working to help their family. They are working to take care of themselves. They don't want to be a burden on the state. They don't want your public aid. They don't want your food stamps. And for those who talked about low-income or people without high education, well, you have to remember we do not have a budget, and surely we cut the educational budget and as a result of the educational budget being cut, we can be assured that we will have more people on poverty working for less than \$15 an hour. So, let's stop it, Ladies and Gentlemen. Let's give something to the people, the working people... the working people that's holding up this state. I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Mitchell."

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

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

Mitchell, C.: "Representative Guzzardi, have you heard any of the Members on the other side of the aisle advocating for additional Medicaid funding today?"

Guzzardi: "Today, no, Sir."

Mitchell, C.: "You heard any Members on the other side of the aisle repre... advocating for more TANF?"

Guzzardi: "No, Sir, not today."

Mitchell, C.: "How about WIC-women, infants and children?"

Guzzardi: "I have not heard."

Mitchell, C.: "Have they advocated more for any of the work support programs that we have in the State of Illinois. Have you heard that today?"

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Guzzardi: "Not in the course of this debate, no."

Mitchell, C.: "Is it true, Representative, that in this country on average the average CEO gets paid about 204 times more than the average worker, roughly, give or take?"

Guzzardi: "I would... I would trust your figures there, yes."

Mitchell, C.: "So, I'm going to go to the Bill. So, my friends on the other side of the aisle, here's the challenge. You don't want to pay an increased cost, I understand that. There's some people who feels this number is too high. I understand that as well. But the bad news is, is that you're paying for this right now. Every time Walmart or some other company doesn't pay their workers enough, we had to subsidize in their health care and their food and their housing and everything else that they rely upon to live. So, just because it's a hidden cost that every taxpayer is paying, that's okay. But when we want to ask those who are doing well to pay a little bit more to workers, now it's a problem. Right now, there's stu... we talked about studies. There's one that shows that the minimum wage would be over \$20 an hour if it had risen with worker productivity. Now, nobody's supported a \$20 minimum wage and nobody on the other side, by the way, has suggested a level that makes any sense or keeps people well or clothed or fed. Now, the Gentlelady from Mokena was... was particularly interesting in her commentary, because as Representative Flowers noted, she talked about value. That we couldn't find somebody who was worth the value of \$10 an hour as if human being's value is based on how much money they make. You wonder why sometimes you hear from this side that folks over there sound a little heartless. That's a really good vision. That...

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

that's a really good window into why people say that about the Republican Party because you say things like that, which is just patently false and immoral. And what I'm wondering is, if anybody on the other side of the aisle has read Jonathan Swift's A Modest Proposal. And I ask that question because, you know, if you're saying that somebody can live on 8.25 or 10 dollars an hour, why don't you just go the whole way. You should propose that perhaps, you know, some of those kids might be, you know, potentially sold off to the families of richer children as sustenance. It's market value. So, potentially, you know, people might be able to live that way. Well, let's stop being ridiculous. And for people who said, well, if you haven't gone to a really good school, then, well, you're just not worth any more money. That is patently absurd. This... though... So, my grandfather, for example, was a union steelworker, had a 8th grade education. He always emphasized to me how important education was, but he was able to go through the entirety of his life being willing to work hard, working 40 hours a week, working for 40 years, putting his kids through school. That's not true anymore. And so, the idea that somehow if you haven't gone to a really great school, you're not worth enough money to live. If you're going to say that, then just say it. But if you're not saying that then get in the game. We're talking about people being able to make \$30 thousand a year. No one's going to get rich if we pass this Bill, but they will be able to live. And by the way, the largest numbers of people on public aid and food stamps, they're not in Chicago; they're south of I-80. They don't look like me. And that's not to say that anyone is less

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

valuable based on the color of their skin. It is to say that this is a shared problem. It isn't just about Democrats. It isn't just about the City of Chicago. It is a shared problem. It costs more money to live than people are being paid. We can address this. And I would ask that we do so by voting 'aye'. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Drury."

Drury: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I rise in support of the Bill, but I want to ... to make this comment, which is a little bit different than what other people have been talking about. When this Bill passes, and I hope that it does, my biggest concern is that it's going to be bittersweet. And my concern is it's going to be bittersweet because we only have 67 Democrats in the House and the Governor has promised to veto the Bill. Which means that we can't actually take care of Maria by passing this Bill or any of the other people who need this Bill to pass. And I think as Democrats we need to look at how we got to this point because in 2013 when I came into the House we had 71 Democrats and a Democratic Governor. The Bill didn't get called. In 2014, we had 71 Democrats and a Democratic Governor. The Bill didn't get called. In 2015, we had 71 Democrats. The Bill didn't get called. In 2016, we had 71 Democrats. The Bill didn't get called. 2017, we have 67 Democrats and we're running the Bill. And we have a Governor who has promised to veto it and we know that we can't override that Veto. That is not the Democratic Party that I signed up for. When I was at the University of California Berkeley and there were protests after protests where the free speech movement started, they weren't protesting for

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

what is going on here because we are letting people down. I am truly, truly concerned that what is going on here, is that Maria, that one of our colleagues spoke about, is being used as a pawn to embarrass our Republican Governor and maybe that's good. Maybe in this scenario that we're in, that's something that we want to do. It's all about the left embarrassing the right and the right embarrassing the right. But you know what, I guarantee you that Maria would much rather have had a minimum wage increase back in 2013 when we had 71 Democrats and a Democratic Governor and as a Party, we didn't do that. And so, I hope that we all can look inward and say, look, this isn't the Party that we're about. This isn't my Democratic Party. We're better than this, we can do better than this. And that we wish that the games that are being played on both sides of the aisle would stop so that we can really help people... so that we can really help people. Because like I said, I'm just so concerned that today is going to be bittersweet. We will pass this Bill and there won't be any relief for the people that we're trying to help."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Bryant is recognized."

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

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

Bryant: "Thank you. I want to read one note and then have some...
a comment in regard to something that the previous speaker
said. So, this is from a constituent just commenting about
the increase in minimum wage in Seattle. And he writes, one
restauranteur there that owns some of the hottest eateries
and clubs went on record that telling those like him to not
worry 'cause of a TIF credit plan that was implemented and a

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

service charge applied to every bill to cover the increase in wages. There are not ... these are not kept by the employees. It goes right back to the owner. He also tried to calm the nerves of the other owners, because it's the workers who should be worried. That's a direct quote. Now, I want ... with the comment that I wanted to make goes... goes back... or maybe goes back to a previous speaker who thinks that something to the effect of... that she... all due respect, that she was tired of hearing about the hard put-upon corporate interests and mentioned a lady... a constituent named Gloria. So, I want to talk about a constituent of mine named Gloria who happens to be my best friend. She and her husband Ramone came to the United States as political asylees from Nicaraqua, helped to come here through then U.S. Senator Paul Simon. When they came, they were basically below the poverty line. They had a small child. They worked very hard to get their citizenship, began a business in the Murphysboro, Carbondale area. It's a cleaning business that's very successful right now. So, Gloria and Ramone hire specifically migrant workers. They do a lot of the cleaning at the SIU campus. So, I just had dinner with Ramone and Gloria before I came up this past week and Ramone very soundly and Gloria echoed their concerns basically saying that whatever minimum wage is, they pay two dollars an hour more because they want to get folks... number 1) they want to help those who... who are coming to this country the same way they did. Number 2) they have some high-end clients and they want to be sure that those that they get to clean stay working for them. So, that they can get used to their... their clientele and do a good job for them. Both Ramone and Gloria

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

said if the minimum wage is raised to \$15 an hour, they would have to pay their workers two dollars an hour more because otherwise they'll go to a different company. And in response to that, they just said they would close down their business. They would just stop. So, you now have a situation of a small business, not a... not a large corporate interest, a small business that employs primarily migrant workers that are telling me, loud and clear, we'll just close our business. So, as we debate this today, let's really try to remember that this isn't just about corporate interests. This is about small businesses who do employ those who are just starting out or those who do actually try to step up above a minimum wage and now, we're going to affectively say to them we're going to put them out of business. So, thank you very much for the time."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, I move to the previous question."

Speaker Turner: "You've all heard the Gentleman's Motion. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the previous question is put. Representative Guzzardi to close."

Guzzardi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Members of this Body for the exhaustive debate on this issue. I appreciate the questions. I want to speak very briefly to... to a point that was made a couple of times in the debate about the cost that the state bears when business pays substandard wages. The people who are earning low wages have to rely on government benefits in order to survive, right? We've heard that argument and that argument it was... the... it was made in

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

reference to the opposition to the original minimum wage in 1938. I want to quote President Roosevelt who said, 'Do not let any calamity, howling executive with an income of a thousand dollars a day'... and Representative Fortner can adjust that for inflation at the current level... 'who has been turning his employees over to the government-relief rolls in order to preserve his company's undistributed reserves tell you... tell you that a wage of \$11 a week is going to have a disastrous effect on all American industry.' That was 1938. We've been hearing the same objections to a decent standard of living for 80 years. And we've heard a fair amount of calamity howling here today. I think fundamentally this debate highlights a philosophical difference in how our respect..."

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Representative."

Guzzardi: "How our respective sides of the aisle view fixing the economy. Then we've heard time and time again from my colleagues on the opposite side of the aisle is that the way to fix the economy is to help job creators. That is the philosophical perspective that you all hold and I don't fault you for holding it. But what we've seen in the last 40 years of the American economy is we've bent over backwards for job creators waiting for the wealth to trickle down to the rest of us and the trickle just has not come. Wages have been flat for everybody in this economy except for the folks at the very top of the totem pole. Our perspective on our side of the aisle about how to grow the economy is different. We believe that when you invest in working people, when you put money in peoples' pockets, they go out and spend it. And that

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

business growth. That stimulates economic stimulates development. We believe in lifting people from the bottom up, growing the economy from the middle out, those basic premises. That is what we as a Party stand for and that is what this Bill as a piece of legislation reflects. We simply ask for basic dignity. For people like Quavlin Moore, who I want to tell vou about before I close. I met her in Peoria. She's a hotel worker; she cleans hotels and she makes \$8.25 an hour. And she has four children. This woman is making... she's working full-time \$16 thousand a year. Anyone in this chamber, please, look into your heart, try to imagine what it's like to raise a family working full-time and living in poverty. You can imagine the... the profoundly difficult challenges that this woman faces every day and it's not just her. It's the 2.3 million people around the state in my district and in each of yours, who needs a raise today. I urge an 'aye' vote and I thank you for your time."

Speaker Turner: "Members, a verification has been requested.

Please be at your seat to vote your switch. The question is,

'Shall Senate Bill 81 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 61 voting 'yes',

53 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'. Representative Reick has

requested a verification. Would you like to proceed with your

verification, Representative? Mr. Clerk, please read the

affirmative votes."

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

Representative Ammons; Representative Andrade;

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Representative Arroyo; Representative Beiser; Representative Burke, Daniel; Representative Cassidy; Representative Chapa LaVia; Representative Conroy; Representative Conyears-Ervin; Representative Crespo; Representative Currie; Representative D'Amico; Representative Davis; Representative Representative Drury; Representative Evans; Representative Feigenholtz; Representative Fine; Representative Flowers; Representative Ford; Representative Gabel; Representative Gordon-Booth; Representative Greenwood; Representative Guzzardi; Representative Halpin; Representative Representative Harris, G.; Representative Representative Hoffman; Representative Hurley; Representative Jones; Representative Lang; Representative Representative Mah; Representative Manley; Representative Martwick; Representative Mayfield; Mitchell, C.; Representative Representative Moeller; Representative Moylan; Representative Mussman; Representative Nekritz; Representative Phelps; Representative Riley; Representative Rita; Representative Sims; Representative Slaughter; Representative Soto; Representative Stratton; Representative Katie Stuart; Representative Tabares; Representative Thapedi; Representative Turner; Representative Wallace; Representative Walsh; Representative Welch; Representative Williams; Representative Willis; Representative Yingling; Representative Zalewski, and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reick."

Reick: "Where's Mr. Zalewski, please? Oh."

Speaker Turner: "Right down in front, Sir."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Reick: "Representative Sims."

Speaker Turner: "Right in the back, Sir."

Reick: "I see the crutches. Huh?"

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman does not wish to persist with his verification vote. With 61 voting 'yes', 53 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present', Senate Bill 81, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Andersson, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Andersson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I guess it's a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Sir."

Andersson: "Thank you. In that last debate, we had a person move the previous question. And one of the things that I do here is to try to enforce process and Rules because that's important. I also think the person in the Chair, up there, regardless of who it is, has a responsibility to enforce process and Rules. So, today, this afternoon at least, the process was someone moved the previous question and you indicated the 'ayes' have it. And the question was moved. I believe that's actually the correct process; however, this morning, it was clarified by a different Member of the Chair that yesterday's Motion for the previous question, which was made by one of my... the Members of my side of the aisle, the answer was, well, the custom is that we'll allow the last speakers whose lights were lit up to finish. And in fact, a few weeks before that you, Sir, had indicated the exact same thing and done the exact same thing. Now, there is a commonality to that, which is that in both of the two previous

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

cases where the Motion for the previous question was not honored and was ignored that happened to be on my side of the aisle. Today, the Rule changed literally in the afternoon after the morning's interpretation because someone on your side of the aisle made the Motion. Sir, I would ask that the Rules be enforced uniformly. You did it correctly today; I will concede that this afternoon. But can we stop switching the Rules every time it's the person who makes the Motion. Let's do it one way, the right way. Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Wallace is recognized."

Wallace: "Thank you. And I ask for a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed."

Wallace: "I just want to recognize my not so baby, baby sister is in the gallery visiting me here today, stand and say hi."

Speaker Lang: "Good to have you here. Representative Lang in the Chair. Page 33 of the Calendar, under Motions, Senate Bill 1722. Mr. Jones is recognized. Out of the record. Page 3 of the Calendar, Second Reading, House Bill 1424, Mr. Harris. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1424, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Harris, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris. Does the Amendment become the Bill?" Harris, G.: "Yes, it does."

Speaker Lang: "With leave, we'll adopt the Amendment and debate it on Third. Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

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

Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1424, a Bill for an Act concerning

public aid. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

Harris, G.: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, thank you for your attention to this critically important matter. I've had legislation similar to this before. This is legislation that would prevent the implementation of the CRP Program which would take away senior services from 39 thousand seniors who receive services in their home. I've brought this many times as the Governor has persisted in implementing a program that is bad public policy, that is bad fiscal policy, that is untested and is, in fact, dangerous. And I will go through and I will explain why I believe each of those statements is true. And remember that what we're talking about is taking 39 thousand seniors who are in their homes and removing the services that traditionally kept them in their homes. Now, I will also say, as I've said every time in iteration that this Bill has come forward, I and the advocates for the elderly, the various senior provider groups, the home care providers, all of us understand that as the baby boom gets older and the number of people who are being served grows, we need to do things to reduce our costs and to make the program work more efficiently. The providers, the advocates, myself have offered to come to the table with the Governor and the Department of Aging many, many times to develop other alternatives that we think are far superior and less dangerous than this untested mass movement of 39 thousand, you know,

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

vulnerable senior citizens into an untried program. Those offers have not been accepted. And just to give you an idea of how the program is viewed outside this room, you know, I refer you to an article that was just recently in the Sun Times in the City of Chicago in the last couple weeks which they described this program as Orwellian. They go through explaining what the program does and what the Department of Aging is wanting to do and they call it an Orwellian process being inflicted on senior citizens in the City of Chicago. And they go on to say, if Governor Rauner had a better track record on social service issues instead of using the poor and sickest pawns in his political battles, it might be easier to give him some leeway to try him at his way. As it is, there's not much reason to trust that. So, Ladies and Gentlemen, yeah, this is a view that is widely held in the public. It is held in the media. It is held by the families of the seniors who worry about their parents and grandparents. It is bad public policy because 39 thousand seniors statewide are at risk. And if any of you want to see how many of those folks live in your districts, stop over at my desk or ask me in debate. I can tell you how many families will be affected, how many seniors will be affected and their families. Frail elderly should be given personalized service by people they can trust. The proposal to say we're going to give... have the senior citizens in their 90s, who are very frail, smartphones and have them summoned on their smartphones gig workers to provide them service to medical appointments, to help them with home care, to help clean their linens should they soil them. I mean, the whole program is based on concepts that on their

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

face are bad. Asking seniors to let strangers into their homes, people who they've never met, who they've summoned on a phone app and then expect someone to come into their door raises all types of issues. This is going to drive up the cost of senior care because if these folks decide they cannot stay in their homes, they cannot manage an app-based system with gig workers to do what they traditionally had home care workers provide for them, these folks are going to go into nursing homes. That is an entitlement under Federal Law and the cost to the state will rise three to four times... three to four times over what we are now paying to allow people to stay in their own homes and reside in the community. It is untested. There have been no pilot programs for this. Here we are going... about to roll out statewide on 39 thousand people a new program untried and untested. We can expect wholesale disruption, not only to the seniors who dis... are going to have their supports and their services taken away, but this will be wholesale disruption to the families of these people, to their children, to their grandchildren, you know, who are going to have to figure out how then when they lose their services to take care of grandma and grandpa, you know, who's going to be coming into their house, can they trust them? And this gets to the area of dangerousness. Ladies and Gentlemen, when the Department of Aging sends workers into folks homes, there is an elaborate series of vetting for those workers to be sure they are not on the fraud and abuse registry, to be sure that they have not been guilty of financial crimes against seniors, to be sure that they have not been convicted of elder abuse or neglect. All of those protections are taken

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

away now because you're going to be going on your cell phone and pushing a button and requesting a stranger, who happens to be a gig worker that day, show up in your house. You're going to let them in with no knowledge of who those people are and what their background may or may not be. So, Ladies and Gentlemen, I would tell you look at the analysis of this Bill. Look at who is in support and who is in opposition. The proponents of this Bill are: AARP, Access Living, Alzheimer's Association, the Illinois Council of Case Coordination Units, the Adult Day Services Association, the Shriver Center, the Illinois Association of Comm... Community Care Program providers, the folks who do this work. And not one of those people is saying we can't make any changes; we've got to keep the things the way they are. What each of these people are saying is this program is wrong. It is, as the Sun Times called it, Orwellian. And each one of these groups, the people who do the work, the people who serve the seniors, the people who care about the seniors, the people who advocate for the seniors say bring us to the table. We have pages of ideas that we are willing to do to adopt to lower the liability of this program, to control costs and to safely continue to serve the senior citizens of the State of Illinois. Thank you for your attention."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Demmer."

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

Speaker Lang: "This Bill is on the Order of Short Debate. I will move it to Standard Debate. And the Sponsor will yield."

Demmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Harris, we've debated legislation very similar to this on multiple

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

occasions. I don't want to relitigate all of those comments that we've had on the floor. I just point out that in the 99th General Assembly we had both House Bill 2482 and House Bill 4351 that were very similar to this and had exhausted debate on those. So, let's talk about what's different in this Bill from those previous Bills, both of which, in fact, were vetoed by the Governor. So, do you believe that the Governor had vetoed those Bills because they were not restrictive enough, that the Legislature didn't assert itself over the line far enough?"

Harris, G.: "Representative Demmer, I believe the Governor vetoed these Bills because he is, you know, so dedicated to inflicting this program on senior citizens that he is not interested in what the Legislature thinks on this issue. And the reason I keep bringing this Bill back... I'm just going to tell you why I keep bringing this Bill back. Just because I have failed one time... you know, I think this is so wrong. I think it is so dangerous. I think it is such bad public policy and such bad fiscal policy that I will bring this Bill today. Should it fail today to get the Governor's signature, I will bring it back again because I think that there's 39 thousand folks out there who really are at risk, and I will do everything that is in my power to protect them."

Demmer: "I'm glad you brought up bad fiscal policy 'cause I think this Bill locks us into quite a bit of that. So, let me ask you about this. This Bill establishes levels of eligibility and services that will be covered and puts those into statute. What happens when a program with a statutory promise has either no appropriation or an insufficient appropriation?"

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Harris, G.: "Well, as... what... what is your question?"

Demmer: "What happens when we make a statutory promise and then fail to appropriate the enough money to cover that statutory promise?"

Harris, G.: "We have to appropriate enough money to cover it. And as I said, Representative..."

Demmer: "And if we don't?"

Harris, G.: "...you... you and I would agree..."

Demmer: "If we don't?"

Harris, G.: "If we don't then there is no appropriation to pay for the services."

Demmer: "Yet we still incur liabilities."

Harris, G.: "We still incur liabilities."

Demmer: "We still incur liabilities. We add to the pile of unpaid bills. We extend payment cycles. We have providers who receive a fraction of the dollars for the services that they're actually providing because we made a disjointed action as a Legislature to promise something and then not to pay for it. This Bill's not an Appropriations Bill, right?"

Harris, G.: "This Bill is a substantive Bill."

Demmer: "This Bill is a substantive Bill that makes a promise that will deliver services regardless of whether or not we pass Appropriation Bill to actually pay for it. This is exactly the kind of legislation that we've seen in so many areas. The state... in order to make a promise, we have to follow through with an appropriation to pay for it. If we can't do that, we're making hollow promises and we're actually making things more difficult for providers across the State of Illinois. What we have in this Bill, changed from previous

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

years, we've discussed previously how it's not a good idea to lock us into a DON score, which is a tool that's being phased out by every state across the country. We've talked about how when we don't make a sufficient appropriation to have a statutory promise like this, puts us into even further and more difficult position. But this Bill also says that you can't make any changes in copayments. When I've talked to providers, they've... they've suggested that we have copayments for people that are not on the Medicaid program, for people who do have the ability to pay. You're saying they can't be changed at all in future programs. Isn't that an extension of this bad fiscal policy you brought up?"

Harris, G.: "If you, you know, paid careful attention to my opening remarks, Representative, you know, I said that each one of these groups that provide services, myself, the AARP, other advocates, all understand there have to be changes. But they are united in opposition to this particular change, they have all indicated to me, I believe to the Governor's Office and the Department of Aging, bring in the people who do this work, they will work to reduce our liability and make the necessary recommendation in changing... changes which we can enact in statute. There is no lack of willingness to make changes and reform. There is no lack of willingness to drive down the liability because we can see, as the traunches of baby boomers grow older, we're going to have more and more costs associated about this. This Bill is not about the... that process. This Bill is about this one particular proposal."

Demmer: "I... I appreciate that. And Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. What we have is a very mixed message coming from... from the Sponsor.

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

On one hand says we're willing to make changes, on the other hand we have an extremely restrictive Bill that we're debating here today. That's what we're voting on. A Bill that says you can't make any changes to copayments that you can't make any distinction between people who are in the Medicaid program and people who are out of the Medicaid..."

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

Demmer: "Thank you. That you can't implement a program that the administration designed as a way to manage the best delivery of services that we can within the financial frameworks that we find ourselves in. The Legislature can't continue to make promises in statute and not follow up with appropriations and expect the Executive Branch to carry those out. Every time we advance a Bill like this, it makes it more difficult for us to pass a budget because we're taking options off the table time and time and time again. No matter how good... how well-intentioned programs are, we have to live within the realities that we find ourselves in. We can't divorce ourselves from reality by passing statutory Bills that make changes and not follow through on the appropriation process. That's precisely what we have here today. And for that reason, I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

Ives: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I'd just like to note that I understand that this is the Sponsor's priority, he has worked many times on this issue and other social service issues. I... I understand that. But the truth is, is that Illinois is only going to bring... it's going to bring in less than \$32 billion in revenue, in fact, the estimates are down

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

about \$1.3 billion from what it was originally thought to be our revenue stream from November 2016. So, given that, we have to prioritize our budget and this is obviously an important issue to you. Other Members have other important issues whether it's infrastructure or education or enforcement. But we can only spend what we take in right now. That's all we really can do. And while I understand the importance of this issue and quite frankly, I have people that manage these large programs that actually live in my district and talk to me about it all the time. I am not insensitive to this issue or those dealing with the disability community. I get it. It's really quite unfortunate though instead of spending really good ... really hard-earned tax dollars that we ask people to take through threat of force, quite frankly, 'cause if you don't pay your taxes you can be thrown in jail eventually... we take that money and we don't spend it on programs such as this. Instead, this coming fiscal year, we're going to spend \$800 million more than previous years on pensions, on pensions. So, why don't we try and solve this pension issue, freeing up some of these dollars, so that we can actually move them into programs that we all think are beneficial. Because we can't continue to spend over 25 percent of our General Revenue Funds and expect... on pensions... and expect then that we can fund every other need that perhaps you have in your district or that... that I have in my district as well. That is the problem. We are not attending to the structural forms that we have to in order to bring Illinois into balance and provide the services to those that we find that are most vulnerable in our society. We do pension reform

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

first, Sir, before we even start to talk about this because otherwise what we're going to do is create a program that without an appropriation and without the money to back it up. And that leaves nobody in a good spot. Fourteen billion dollars in back bills and growing. If we could come to agreement on structural forms, we could actually come together and work on funding these programs that are desperately needed. I'm asking for your side, really, to look at my pension reform Bill, to look at the other solutions that are out there in terms of business and structural reform, so we can grow Illinois, grow our tax base, and actually provide the income needed to service these programs. That's what I'm asking for you guys to do. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bellock."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Everyone in this chamber knows how many seniors moving forward we're going to have over the next 10 years and why the CCP Program is so important. We've taken thousands of seniors, approximately 80 thousand seniors, and kept them out of nursing homes by working on the CCP Program. Moving forward, as some of the other speakers have suggested, this Bill limits the changes that we can make in this program. It puts it into statute, the DON score, and several other things. I know Representative Harris believes that that's the right thing to do, but I think that at this junction, knowing the explosion of people over 65 in the State of Illinois moving forward, that the CRP Program can meet the demands of those. The administration and the Department of Aging has told us... they have told us over and over again on the record that they will

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

provide the same three-core missions of the CCP Program to the members that go into the CRP Program. That is one of the main things that we need. Early Interventions was new when I came in and there was a lot of discussion when we went to means testing and made several changes in that program. That program moved on and it was fine. It served all the children in Illinois, but it made changes over the years as to that program. Recently, in the Senate Bill, the Senate Democrats agreed to this change in their Bill. They agreed to the 120 million savings originally. When they didn't get the Bill... met with the Republicans, they made that change. But they had put that in there which was an agreement between the Senate and the Republicans. The rest of the Bill didn't flow, so it was taken back out. But they realized also that there is this huge explosion of seniors. This administration yesterday tried to make a change in combining that in going 'no' on the Resolution to obstruct combining the Human Rights and the Human Rights Department to save on money moving forward. We pointed it out that every other state that was doing that type of thing in the United States did what we wanted to do, combine them. They... what we are an anomaly. In this case, I think we are looking forward. We need to be open about the changes in addressing the needs of our seniors moving forward. No one cares more than all of us about meeting the needs of our seniors and keeping them out of nursing homes, so they can stay amongst their families in the areas where they have lived their entire lives. I ask you to not restrict those options by voting 'yes' on this Bill. I urge you to vote 'no' on this Bill and not to restrict the administration and the

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Department of Aging in serving the seniors but keeping them into these two programs. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Willis."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Willis: "Mr. Harris, is this Bill going to help our seniors?"

Harris, G.: "I think it's going to protect our seniors from what could be very grievous harm should this new untested program just suddenly be rolled out statewide and 39 thousand people lose the type of services that they've come to rely on."

Willis: "And is not the purpose of the original CCP Program to help our seniors to stay in their homes longer?"

Harris, G.: "Exactly, Representative, because it costs the people of Illinois about one-fourth the amount for seniors to reserve… receive services in their homes as opposed to having to move into an institutional setting, which is the only other option."

Willis: "Right. And we... To the Bill. It has been shown statistically and anecdotally, however you want to look at it, that seniors that age in place that can stay in their own home, do better both mentally and physically by being there. That's what this program does. The Community Reinvestment Program or whatever the Governor's calling it right now is an untested program. It has not set there. We don't know how it's going to go. One of the things that before this huge budget impasse that we're dealing with that Illinois could be proud of was how well we treated our seniors. The number of great senior programs we had. This is not doing that. This is going to undermine the program that we know works that is

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

beneficial to our seniors. This is something that we need to keep in place. In fact, I think we need to increase funding to it to be... make sure that we have more seniors that can take care of it, not reduce the number of seniors which is what the Governor's program has to do. I urge an 'aye' vote from my colleagues on this. This is good legislation. I thank you, Representative, for bringing it forward."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Moeller."

Moeller: "Thank you, Speaker. Thank you, Representative, for bringing this Bill. To the Bill. As a Chair of the Aging Committee over the past year, we've heard testimony from the Department of Aging and from AARP and other senior advocates on what the changes the department is proposing to make will... will mean to seniors across the state. And I remain very concerned about the... the impact that the CRP will have on the level of care for our most fragile and vulnerable citizens. Based on the testimony that we've heard, it's clear that the intent of the department is to cut \$180 million in what we are currently spending to provide this care to seniors without a great assurance that... that these ... the elderly will be able to stay in their home as the current program is designed to do. As has been noted in previous testimony, the Community Care Program was created to save the state money. And over years... over the decades, it's demonstrated that effectiveness. The care... the cost of nursing home care is quadruple what we spend today on the Community Care Program. So, if the Governor and the Department of Aging are able to move forward with the changes that they're making... that they're proposing, there is a good chance they'll save money

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

the first couple years, but in the long run, as seniors are forced to move into nursing homes because their home health care worker is no longer eligible or able to come and help them with meals, to make sure that they're taking their medications, to take them to doctor's appointments, to make sure that they're eating properly, the state is going to end up spending an exponentially more for these seniors or seniors just won't have the care that we've been promised to them over the past several decades. So, I would caution my colleagues on both the right and the left to ... to make this move to change what we are currently providing to our seniors here in Illinois. If this program is going to be so effective and... and cost the state money and still provide the care that they... that the department is alleging, then... then they should bring the program through the General Assembly instead of trying to make these changes through JCAR, which is another indication that the promises they're making with this proposed change can't be guaranteed. So, before we make a change that's going to affect 36 thousand vulnerable, elderly senior citizens in our state, we need to ensure that the ... that the changes that are being made are not going to damage the seniors in our state and end up costing so much more in the long run. So, I strongly encourage an 'aye' vote on this ... on this legislation. And I strongly caution my colleagues to move with... with due diligence in making such a change that'll affect the most vulnerable in our state. Thank you very much." Speaker Lang: "Representative Bryant, we've already had three in opposition. Do you wish to speak in opposition? Then, I'm

10000058.docx

sorry, you will not be able to. Mr. Harris to close."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Harris, G.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. And you know, thank you for the comments and the debate. You know, we all spend a lot of time going around to our seniors and saying we're there for you. We support you. We're going to Springfield to watch out for you and take care of your needs. You know, as you've done the right things your whole life, you've worked hard. You've raised your family. You've helped them get jobs. You've gone through the happy times and the sad times with them. And our commitment as a state to these elderly people is, and when your time of need comes, we as a state are going to stand there with you. We're going to help you to have a quality of life in your elder years that you deserve that you have earned that you've pay taxes for that is your right to live with a little bit of dignity in your own home as you grow older. I'm just afraid that the program that is being suggested is not going to keep those promises that we've made to our seniors. It's bad public policy. It's bad fiscal policy for our state. It's untested. It is dangerous. It is wrong. You know, I hope we, match our words with our actions today and please vote 'yes'."

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 68 voting 'yes', 45 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Mr. Andersson. For what reason do you rise, Sir?"

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

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

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Andersson: "Thank you. And to the Members of the House, this is, I believe, the most important personal point I will probably ever make on this House Floor, so I do appreciate your attention. So, I met a girl..."

Speaker Lang: "We... Ladies and gentlemen in the gallery... ladies and gentlemen in the gallery..."

Andersson: "It's okay."

Speaker Lang: "Members will return to their chairs, please. The House will be in order, the floor and the gallery. The House will return to order. Mr. Andersson, you were about to give us your most important point of personal privilege. You may proceed, Sir."

Andersson: "Thank... thank you, Sir. And I appreciate that and I guess timing is everything, right? So, anyway what I was about to say was in 1984 I met a girl. And I saw her walking across campus at NIU, wearing the cutest pink shorts I'd ever seen. And I said I need to meet this girl. So, I did and I started to date her for a few weeks. And I really fell for her. She thought I was a little clingy, so she dumped me. And so, for three years after that, I amorously pursued her. Now, these days that might be characterized as, you know, stalking, but it wasn't illegal then. So, I successfully courted this young lady and 30 years ago today... 30 years ago today, she agreed to be my wife and she's up in the gallery. Thankfully, I asked for the Speaker's Gallery. And... and I will tell you also... I will tell you also that on our 20th anniversary... so 20 years

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

ago... we took a trip and we had a hotel room and when we walked into the hotel room, I had filled the room with flowers for her. Absolutely, filled the room with flowers. Now, this room's a little big. I can't quite do that, but I could do a little. So, please, everyone thank you for indulging me. But, Ladies and Gentlemen, I know you all... I know you all think that you have the best spouses, partners, et cetera. I'll tell you you're wrong. I won; I got this one. So, thank you all for indulging me."

Speaker Lang: "Congratulations. The Chair would like to know if that's the best you can do for a gift? Motions in Writing. Senate Bill 1722, Mr. Jones. Please proceed, Sir."

Jones: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Before I begin, I'd like to yield my time to Leader Turner."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Turner on the Motion."

Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members of the Body, I'd just like to take a moment to talk about this issue. There was a lot... there was a lot of tension and a lot of emotions around Senate Bill 1722. You heard many Members from my caucus stand up and speak and let's... let's talk about the issues around violence and some of the things... some of the root causes that we have to deal with. After having discussions with my caucus and having discussions with Leader Durkin about how to proceed, we don't want to create a situation around here where we can't work together. Criminal justice issues have been some of the things... some of the few things that we've been able to work together on over our time and come to some consensus... consensus. And Leader Durkin has led the charge on that from the other side of the aisle. We want to continue to

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

be able to work together to address some of these issues. So, said, I made a request upon our Member Representative Jones to withdraw this Motion. I'd like to hope that going forward we can address some of the concerns that were brought up on our side of the aisle in dealing with poverty and some of the other issues that lead to the gun violence that we're experiencing in Chicago. We don't want to make this situation any more tense than it is and we don't want to throw out some of the good efforts that we've already made around this issue. So, that is the request I've made. And I hope that we can work together in a bipartisan effort around many different issues but in particular the ones that involve gun violence and criminal justice reform that are very important to me and other Members of my caucus. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Thapedi."

Thapedi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I, too, was a little taken aback by the way that Senate Bill 1722 came to fruition, but... but I do want to say thank you to Leader Durkin for meeting with us. And I definitely want to thank our Leadership team: Leader Jehan Gordon-Booth, Leader Art Turner, Leader Mary Flowers, Representative Camille Lilly, who are intimately involved in trying to come to an accord. I think that moving forward especially on criminal justice issues, we have rather than an adversary but someone that we can work with in Leader Durkin. And I appreciate that as well, Mr. Speaker. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Durkin."

Durkin: "Thank you. Point of personal privilege."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Speaker Lang: "Proceed, Sir."

"You know, the Bill yesterday, 1722, brought a lot of emotions out of Members of this caucus and... both sides, both sides of the aisle and it was a healthy debate, highly charged and that's what happens at this time of the year. And I was a little bit taken aback over the last 24 hours of how this... this Bill has been handled. But I will say that I've had some very productive meetings within the last few hours with the Leadership of the Black Caucus and I gave them my assurance, as I always have, is that I'm willing to work with them on matters of criminal justice reform and that is my commitment. So, I want to thank Representative Jones for withdrawing your Motion. And I also want to thank you for the comments that have been made by Representative Thapedi Representative Turner. And we'll continue to have this discussion over the coming months to handle or address the concerns that you have that you believe need to be part of a follow-up. I've always taken a position that I will work with you on your priorities as long as you respect and work with me on our priorities... priorities. And that's what I believe we've come to an agreement on. So, thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Jones is recognized."

Jones: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As Leader Durkin said yesterday was contentious. We almost... in the last couple days of Session, everyone's emotions are kind of charged. But one of the reasons why I filed the Motion to reconsider is because we need to have an honest discussion about gun violence as played in our black, tan, and brown... in our communities. The root causes of gun violence in our community that we all can

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

work on together is social-economic issues that lead to gun violence and ways in which we can work together. I want to thank Leader Durkin not only for his leadership, but also for the conversation that we can continue together and also thank Representative Turner, Representative Gordon, Representative Lilly, Representative Thapedi for making sure that the Black Caucus and our issues and our concerns are heard because many of our Black Caucus Members are highly concerned about the root causes of gun violence that's plaguing, not only the City of Chicago, 'cause 1722 is not just about the City of Chicago. It's about what we do statewide to address the root issues and causes of gun violence. So, I want to thank all the Members. I meant no disrespect to Leader Durkin. I've known him for a while. And also want to thank Speaker Madigan as well for his leadership in making sure that we move this discussion forward. So, I will withdraw my Motion, Mr. Speaker. And as soon as I get those documents in writing, I'll make it... Heather, make sure I get it to the Well. So, thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Sir. The Gentleman withdraws his Motion. Ladies and Gentlemen, we're returning to Senate Bills-Third Reading starting on page 8. If you've left the floor, return to the floor. We're going to go with the same speed we were going through earlier. The first Bill on this Order is Senate Bills... before I do that, Mr. Sims is recognized."

Sims: "Thank... thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Sir."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

- Sims: "And we... we just talked a lot about the things that are going on in and some of the investments we need to be making in our community. And I am pleased to be joined by two super stars here today with us. They're my Pages for the day. We've got Jae Rucker and Naudiyah Rucker. Two super... one ... Jae just graduated from Sacred Heart Griffin right here Springfield. He's going on to college; hopefully, Alabama State or... or Tennessee State, but she's going to go to college. And we've got Naudiyah, who is a two-time all-star for Sacred Heart Griffin in basketball. So, these are young people who are making a difference. So, as we continue to talk about investing in communities, I wanted to showcase some super stars here in our local community and some of the work that they're doing. And I'd like the House to welcome them as my Pages for the day."
- Speaker Lang: "Glad you're with us on the floor. Thank you very much. Senate Bill 1774, Mr. Evans. Please read the Bill. The Clerk advises you have a Floor Amendment, Sir. Mr. Clerk, place this on the Order of Second Reading and please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1774, a Bill for an Act concerning health. This Bill was read a second time a previous day.

 Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Evans, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Evans."

Evans: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and the great Members of this Assembly. Floor Amendment 1 is an initiative of the department

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

to clear up how they're going to handle this program. I request your adoption of this Amendment."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1774, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Evans."

"Again, thank you. This Bill... First of all, I'd like to thank everyone initially for voting for the pilot program. This Bill addresses the CLEAR-WIN Program. It's an acronym for the Comprehensive Lead Education, Reduction, and Window Replacement Program Act. Many of you all voted for an Act to create a pilot program in two communities: Englewood and Peoria. What this Bill does is makes that program permanent statewide. But even going beyond that the department's Amendment wanted to really clarify this great program. Working with the director of the Department of Public Health, we have now is the Lead Direct Assistance Program. So, we'll have the CLEAR-WIN Program, but moving forward the department will have the purview to do even more as we look to eliminate lead issues. So, I'm available for questions. And I think the Governor has made some steps to address our lead issues. This program now will actually do the work as we passed legislation with regards to this. It is subject to appropriations, but the Governor's budget that was introduced, House Bill 3997 contains an appropriation. So, I believe the hope is that

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

we'll appropriate enough dollars to make this great statewide program a reality. I request your support."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bellock."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Bellock: "Representative, we went over this Bill in committee the other day, but I didn't ask the question... I don't think... I know the pilot program cost \$2 million, I think. Was that correct?"

Evans: "Yes."

Bellock: "But I think going to the full program, is it \$35 million?"

Evans: "What was appropriated of the Governor's capital budget was \$30 million. I think in the Appropriations Committee the... will determine that amount. But the appropriated amount was \$30 million, subject to appropriations."

Bellock: "And is that for one... what time period does that cover?

One year of..."

Evans: "Yeah. My understanding would be, yeah."

Bellock: "And how many more homes or residences are going to be taken care of?"

Evans: "I would assume with... I haven't talked to the director specifically, but it was a pilot program. With it being expanded out, I don't know if they have an exact amount of numbers. They would have to probably go through a year, but they didn't... they don't have an exact number of homes that we service as many as possible."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Bellock: "And was there any result from the pilot program? I mean, is there a report on that or anything?"

Evans: "Oh, yeah, without question. My understanding is that they spent roughly 1.4 million on window purchases, about a 1.6 million with contractors, and 11 percent of that which was roughly \$0.8 million with local administrators. So, every dollar that was spent produces at least \$2 of results. So, it was great reports from the pilot program and it's really not even quantifiable the results of what we're doing, getting rid of these lead and dangerous living conditions for children."

Bellock: "Thank you. To the Bill. I agree with the program. And I was in support..."

Speaker Lang: "Representative, you'll bring your remarks to a close."

Bellock: "Okay. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I just have concerns. I'm... I'm in full support of the program and in full support of the testing of lead windows for the... I mean, lead-based paint for the kids especially because of the cost of asthma and we've seen that. I just have concerns over \$30 million for the program moving forward with our budget in such a terrible position. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Evans to close."

Evans: "Thank you. Request your support."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Please record yourselves, Members. Moeller. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 76

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

voting 'yes', 39 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Chair recognizes the Majority Leader."

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

Speaker Lang: "Thank you very much, Representative. Moving on to page 9 of the Calendar, Senate Bill 1781, Mr. Sims. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1781, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sims."

Sims: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1781 amends the Criminal Identification Act to extend the sunset date for the Cook County pilot program, which waives the petition filing fees for adults seeking to seal or expunge records, if the records are related to arrest that result in no charge, a conviction that was dismissed or aquit... or where the defendant was acquitted, or a conviction that was reversed or overturned. This Bill has passed the House previously. And the... one of rec... the reasons for needing the sunset extension is because the year was too short, so they needed additional time to collect the data necessary to make sure that they're... that the process is effective. I know of no opposition. And ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andersson."

Andersson: "Oh, I'm sorry. I didn't see. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Andersson: "So, this is an existing program, correct?"

Sims: "Yes, Sir."

Andersson: "And we are extending the... the date from January of '18 to January of '19. Is that correct?"

Sims: "Correct."

Andersson: "And I see that there is opposition by the Department of Corrections due to the negative fiscal impact and the premature extension of the pilot program?"

Sims: "That..."

Andersson: "Have you spoken with them and..."

Sims: "That's news to me, Sir."

Andersson: "Is it really? That's disappointing. Did they... so, I... what I understand is that they were hoping to wait to hold the pilot program and weigh on the extension until they could assess the fiscal impact."

Sims: "So, it's my... Mr. Andersson, my understanding is that the... under the original pilot they had... they had... the timing was too short. So, the clerks were actually still collecting the fees. So, this... by extending the... the pilot this time, it allows them to now have the... to collect the data that they were trying to collect originally."

Andersson: "So, have we actually started the waiver process now in earnest where tho… the fees are being waived so they can collect the data?"

Sims: "So… so, the clerk… the clerk sent out… under the clerk's orders, she sent out an order to… to stop the collection of the fees. So, now that… that is now occurring. So, now this… by extending it, it will allow for the collection of that data."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Andersson: "So, in effect what you're telling me is the original date really didn't develop the data that we needed to begin with?"

Sims: "That's correct."

Andersson: "Okay. And this is... this is a specific type of expungement if I understand it correctly. It's for those who are released without charges or arrest. Is that right?"

Sims: "That's correct."

Andersson: "Can you describe what that means for those of us who are not..."

Sims: "Well..."

Andersson: "...necessarily as well familiar?"

Sims: "So, an indi... say an individual is arrested, but they're not... they're never charged and they're just released. That conviction still stays on their record. So, now, this will allow them... allow them to be able to expunge that from the record."

Andersson: "Very good. Thank you for the answers to the questions."

Sims: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sims to close."

Sims: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

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? Record yourselves, Members. Chapa LaVia, Conroy. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 61 voting 'yes', 55 voting

'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1783, Representative Wallace. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1783, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Wallace."

Wallace: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to present to you the River's Edge Historic Preservation Tax Credit Program. We're seeking to extend it for five years. This program has done quite a bit of work in terms of developing communities that have blight. Communities like Aurora, Elgin, Rockford, Peoria, and East St. Louis. I encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andersson."

Andersson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in full support of the Bill. This is an excellent program. It's... it benefits all five communities. I only wish at some point that we could expand this so that we could do it in more communities. It's a complete win. It's jobs that can't be outsourced. It renews our urban cores. This is a win-win proposition. Thank you for bringing the Bill. I urge an 'aye'."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

Ives: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in strong opposition to this Bill. Once again, here we have a tax credit that we're giving to specific entities when instead what you're pushing forward and what went through the committee yesterday in the Revenue Committee was a massive tax increase on businesses and individuals. So, we're carving out particular credits for some people and then massively taxing others. We need a comprehensive tax reform project... policy that basically levels the playing field for everybody that includes EDGE

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

credits, this credit, housing credits, everything. Continuing to support credits like this and then saying that you want money for all other of your extras while giving people these types of tax credits is absolutely hypocritical. So, I urge a strong 'no' vote because anybody who is getting this River Edge Credit to begin with already knew that this... this credit was set to sunset and should have taken that to account when they started their first project. Just to willy-nilly agree to expand these credits and extend them all the time is not good tax policy. We need comprehensive tax reform and this isn't doing it."

- Speaker Lang: "This Bill is on the Order of Short Debate. For those who... lights are on, I apologize. Representative Wallace to close."
- Wallace: "Thank you. Contrary to the previous speaker, this is an economic driver particularly for the City of Rockford. I am very happy to stand here with those who will also benefit throughout the state. And you are right, we should be trying to implement this all over so that we can have the type of development that we need in our urban areas. I encourage an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill 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 101 voting 'yes', 12 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1795, Representative Wallace. Please read the Bill."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1795, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Wallace."

Wallace: "Thank you. This is another Bill in terms of reducing urban blight. It allows for a tax abatement for properties acquired to reduce that blight."

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? Members, record yourselves. Flowers, Lilly, Manley. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 107 voting 'yes', 6 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1796, Mr. Hoffman. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1796, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1796 will create the Student Online Personal Protection Act. It would... establishes prohibitions and obligations that an operator of an Internet website online service or online application which is used primarily for K-12 purposes must abide by regarding the disclosure and protection and mostly protection of information collected from or disclosed by a student using the product. It establishes procedures for when and to whom an operator may disclose information about a student finds that a violation of the provision of the Act is considered an unlawful practice under the Consumer Fraud and Deceptive Business Practices

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Act. And it includes a severability clause. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wheeler."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

- Wheeler, K.: "Representative, we talked about this for quite a length in committee. There are a couple things that came up I just could get clarification on and put them on the record with you. There was an element in the Bill here regarding recommendations that are made by a third party. Can you delve into that a little bit for me?"
- Hoffman: "Yes. So, an example would be if a student's having problems with spelling. An example, he puts 'i' before 'e' except after... exactly 'i' before 'e' except after 'c'. A product could prompt the student to challenge themselves with extra work on that topic. So, that's the... the type of thing that we would like to encourage being able to utilize modern technology to help educate a student. That's the type of recommendations that would possibly be made."
- Wheeler, K.: "And then... and the origin of this Bill is this taken from... was it California that the... that first tried this?"
- Hoffman: "Yes. The... the Bill is patterned after a Bill in California."
- Wheeler, K.: "And the... the all-encompassing nature of this Bill... this is not a do every single thing perfectly forever Bill. This is a Bill that we actually want to... just take a first step with, monitor and see how we can improve this and go forward. Is that correct?"

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

- Hoffman: "Yes. Well, first of all, I think we want to make sure and primarily make sure that a student's privacy is protected. We don't want to use these programs in order to market to those students. So, this would, I believe, strike the balance between being able to provide the technology that can help the student and protecting their privacy."
- Wheeler, K.: "Thank you, Representative. We had a good debate on this in committee. I think this is a great first step for Illinois to protect our students, to protect our families. And I'd urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Drury, do you rise in opposition? You're up." Drury: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. If the goal is to protect students and student data then Senate Bill 1796 is a Bill you should not vote for. Again, if the goal is to protect student data, you should not be voting for Senate Bill 1796. This Bill is supported by the tech companies. It is a tech Bill. It's supported by the school administrators who just want free stuff even if it means selling out our children. When you look at the opponents of the Bill, Raise Your Hand, individual parents, this Bill has so much leeway, so many loopholes in it to allow your children's data to become the data of tech companies. While it says that the companies themselves can't use it, if someone logs into their website... if any of you have children that have a Chromebook or an I-Pad in school... once they log in and they go anywhere outside of the Google suite or the Apple suite of programs, all of their searches, everything they've done can be gathered about that student and used and sold to third parties. This Bill was not negotiated in good faith. They cut people out of the ...

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

they didn't let certain people at the table. I certainly understand the goal of the tech companies to want to have and sell the data. But someone mentioned that this is modeled after the California Bill. Since California passed this law, it has been trying every year to fix the law, to fix the very problems that we're now about to embed in our Bill. So, again, if your goal is to sell out our children then you should vote for 1796. If your goal is to protect our children then we should go back to the drawing board and come up with a Bill that actually accomplishes that. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hoffman to close."

Hoffman: "With all due respect to the previous speaker, it could... his... I take him at his word and I know to be a fact that he would like to protect the privacy of children. This Bill does that. Now, let me just say, it's condescending at best and repugnant at worst to say that in any way I am standing here trying to sell out our children. If I am doing that, let me tell you who else are sponsors and supporters of this legislation: the Attorney General's Office that would be Lisa Madigan, a well-known person who likes to help children, not sell them out; the Illinois High School Organization; the Illinois State Board of Education; the Illinois Statewo... Statewide School Management Alliance; Large Unit School District Association; Legislative Education in DuPage County; and Science? Cooperative Organization for public education. All people who spend their educating children, ensuring their privacy and protecting them from harm's way. Now, let me just say this. Does this do everything everybody would want? No. But what it

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

does is it strikes a balance. A balance that allows us to use modern technology to educate our children while at the same time protect their privacy. I don't have pride of authorship. If someone else would have sponsored this Bill, I'd be voting in favor of it. Other people aren't that way. They want to have the authorship; they want to get the credit. I don't care if I get any credit. I just want the privacy of our children protected. I ask for 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. Feigenholtz. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 98 voting 'yes', 15 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1842, Mr. Hoffman. Please read the Bill. Mr. Clerk, place the Bill on the Order of Second Reading for an Amendment and please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1842, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment 1, offered by Representative Hoffman, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Yes. This makes a needed change in the statute of limitation. It says that when a victim is under 18 years of age and has... has had the... the charge against them and they're the victims of involuntary servitude, in voluntary sexual servitude of a minor, or trafficking in persons that the

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

statute of limitations will be raised to 25 years from the age of 18."

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: "Senate Bill 1842, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hoffman, did the Amendment become the Bill?" Hoffman: "Yes, it did."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Flowers. Please take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Moving to page 13 of the Calendar, Senate Bills-Second Reading, Senate Bill 886, Mr. Riley. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 886, 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 Riley, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Riley."

Riley: "Thank you. I'd like to adopt Floor Amendment #2. Essentially, Floor Amendment #2 allows the Governor to sell the Thompson Center and with certain... certain conditions of

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

- some of the purchaser and other people involved in the legisla... in the Bill."
- 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. But a fiscal note, Home Rule note, and state mandates note have been requested but not filed at this time."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Riley is recognized."
- Riley: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to declare all of the notes to be rendered inapplicable."
- Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves to declare all the notes inapplicable. The Chair recognizes Mr. Andersson."
- Andersson: "Can the speaker explain why he thinks the notes are inapplicable? We're talking about a fiscal impact, a Home Rule, and a state mandates fiscal im... impact note. And I think they're all quite relevant to the question."
- Riley: "Well, first of all, as the Bill is constructed right now, there is no impact on Home Rule, first of all. Second of all, the Governor himself has said that the sale of the Thompson Center would yield about \$300 million. You know, we can bandy about whether or not that's an accurate figure, but because of that and because he doesn't have to sell the property then a fiscal note would be inapplicable. What was the other note for this? And there is no mandate here."

Andersson: "We object. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Butler, do you speak to the Motion, Sir?"

Butler: "I do."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Butler: "I would ask for a verification on any vote on these notes, please."

Speaker Lang: "Your request is acknowledged, Sir. Representative Willis."

Willis: "Can... can... will the Sponsor yield, please?"

Riley: "Sponsor of the... Sponsor yields."

Willis: "Mr. Riley, what notes are they looking to put in that you feel are inapplicable?"

Riley: "I'm sorry?"

Willis: "Which notes are they saying that are applicable that you say are inapplicable?"

Riley: "State mandate, fiscal, and Home Rule note."

Willis: "Okay. And if those notes came back, would they actually have any bearing on your intent?"

Rilev: "No."

Willis: "That's why you're calling it inapplicable, right? Because this..."

Riley: "Yes, that's true."

Willis: "'Cause this is a good Bill and we don't need to waste time."

Riley: "Well, it's definitely a good Bill. And it does something that clearly the Governor wants to do."

Willis: "Right."

Riley: "And I think most people who are familiar with the building and what that site could be would want to do it."

Willis: "Right. I mean, is... is this about or is this not one of the main things that the Governor came to us and he said he wanted to see happen?"

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Riley: "That's true. And this was one of the Bills that I took up, you know, along with the Speaker's feeling that he wanted to do the same thing. Clearly, I think that the sale of that property is extremely important. It's a very important site right downtown in the City of Chicago. So, clearly, there's some things in there that have to be fleshed out. Those issues that have to be fleshed out are far beyond what this Bill is trying to do. This Bill basically provides a framework for the sale of the building. The Governor and the administration are still going to have to negotiate with the City of Chicago for a lot of important issues that we may, you know, have a chance to talk about later."

Willis: "And this is actually exactly what we should be doing.

And he cannot sell the building until we, as a Legislature,
get permission for that to happen. Is that not correct?"

Riley: "That's true. That's true, but the provisions are extremely simple. Again, I say now and I'm going to continue to say, this is a framework for him to sell the building which he can do or not do. I would hope that he would."

Willis: "Right. So..."

Rilev: "Yeah."

Willis: "The..."

Riley: "Which of course is negotiated with CMS."

Willis: "So, the procedure of putting notes on and slowing down this process is doing nobody any good, right?"

Riley: "Well, I don't think it's doing anybody any good. Everyone has the right to do what they... they feel is... that they want to do, but in a way, it flies in the face of what, as I say,

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

the Governor said he wanted to do which was to sell that building."

Willis: "And the goal of selling the building is to generate money, to get rid of an eyesore that we have. I know I've done a lot of discussions with CMS and their concerned over the amount of money it will take to keep the Thompson Center up to par. So..."

"Well, in my view and in another life, I've met Phil Riley: Mignon, so I... I wouldn't say that, you know, I wouldn't characterize it as an eyesore. What I would characterize it is that the building that does not make very good use of space. It's a building is rather archaic, and frankly, over the years, it has not been maintained to the extent that it should be. And so, to that end we could, you know, tear the building down, build something else that would add more value not only to the City of Chicago but to the state. And you know, a lot of things have changed since the building was built. You know, we have the LEED Council, LEED standards where, you know, buildings can get credits, you know, for becoming, you know, more environmentally friendly and make good use of space. So, there's a lot of opportunities I think that exist with the demolition of the Thompson Center."

Willis: "Right. So, well, and we're not even necessarily talking about the demolition. It could be sold and refurbished inside however it may be."

Riley: "Well, the..."

Willis: "But that's not what this Bill is doing. It's just giving permission..."

Riley: "It's just giving a framework. Again..."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Willis: "A framework to go to the next area."

Riley: "Well, you know, it's funny. I said demolition. That could be, you know, one of the many things that could be done. You tear it down. You could repurpose it. In planning speak, we call that adaptive reyouth. But again, this Bill gives the framework for the Governor to go ahead and do whatever he wants to do in his negotiations with the City of Chicago in terms of doing something for that building."

Willis: "And... and..."

Riley: "Which... which, again, was the whole idea is to add value at the site."

Willis: "Right. And at this point in the game when we are with less than 48 hours left to make things go... to slow down the process to wait for the legislative notes to come back really doesn't make sense. That's one of the reasons, I'm sure, that you're calling it inapplicable because it's not going to really have a bearing on setting up the framework for you to proceed with this. As you say..."

Riley: "Time is of the essence."

Willis: "Right. So, that's what we're looking at. To the Bill. Thank you, Representative, by the way. To the Bill. This seems... seems crazy not to go and let us continue on to vote on this Bill the way we should. To delay it by going and waiting for notes to come back just doesn't make sense to me because in all honesty the notes aren't going to have absolutely nothing to do with the integrity of this Bill. This Bill is just putting in as the Sponsor said is putting the framework forward so that the Governor's Office can do what the Governor's Office is asked to do for two years... two

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

and a half years, almost three years now. One of the main things that he put in there is let's get rid of the Thompson Center. It's a drain on the budget. We want to make sure we move it forward. I don't see why my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would delay this Bill any further by waiting for the legislative notes to come back. I concur that they are inapplicable. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mitchell."

Mitchell, C.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Question of the Sponsor?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Mitchell, C.: "Representative Riley, what generally is a fiscal note for? It's to discuss the fiscal impact of a piece of legislation to the state. Is that accurate?"

Riley: "That's correct."

Mitchell, C.: "And can... can you remind the Body who originally made the request to sell the Thompson Center in the first place?"

Riley: "It was the Governor of the State of Illinois."

Mitchell, C.: "So, Governor Bruce Rauner, who controls GOMB and the agencies that do the fiscal notes, made the original request. Is that correct?"

Riley: "That's correct."

Mitchell, C.: "And... and you know, and the Governor by the Constitution submits a budget to this General Assembly. Now, it's supposed to be a balanced budget and we know Governor Montgomery Burns has been able to do that, but it's my understanding that that had \$300 million in savings from the sale of the Thompson Center. Is that accurate?"

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

- Riley: "Well, there will be... there will be savings. Three hundred million dollars has a lot to do with what ends up, you know, happening on that site, but yes, that is their... that is their estimate."
- Mitchell, C.: "So, just for the clarity of the Body. So, the Governor, who controls the agencies that put in the notes, made the original request to sell the building and counted the savings from that building in his budget. Is that correct?"

Riley: "That's correct."

Mitchell, C.: "And my understanding is that that Governor also said that it would be a \$45 million windfall for the City of Chicago. Is that also correct?"

Riley: "I've heard that, yes."

Mitchell, C.: "So, I'm going to spend a little time, I think, educating the Body since we have time because the other side wanted to verify a Bill that they know is going to pass, a Bill they requested, talking a bit about the state of play. The Governor's Office estimated that the sale of the JRTC would generate \$300 million. This estimate makes a couple of presumptions. One presumption is that the city rezones the JRTC property prior to the sale from a 12th floor to area ratio, also known as FAR to a 24 FAR. Basically, they want the city to rezone without knowing what's going on in the property. The city has never rezoned a property. This is relevant information because claim this could happen tomorrow, but the city's never rezoned a property prior to a sale without any information about the development. The city has told the state that they cannot rezone the property

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

without knowing the specifics of the development and what impact it would have on traffic and on city services. Sorry, I just heard somebody request that I read a little slower, so I'll be willing to do that. Further, city ordinance requires an entity seeking a zoning change to make an impact payment. If the city were to agree to change the zoning prior to the sale, the state would technically be required to make this impact payment unless the city were to waive it or agree that the purchaser make the payment. In the event the city agrees to make the zoning change prior to the sale, the Bill protects state taxpayers by requiring the purchaser rather than the state to pay any costs associated with rezoning. The language doesn't impede the city zoning authority in any way, but it does ensure that state taxpayers aren't on the hook for zoning payments, which I'd imagine as fiscal conservatives our friends on the other side of the aisle would be in favor of. On Monday, CMS, that being an agency of the Governor's Office, again, which controls the fiscal notes, proposed new language that would require the city and the state to enter into a memorandum of understanding with respect to any payments for additional zoning. This would apply to any changes in zoning prior to the sale or after the sale. In other words, the Bill gives the state some power over the city with respect to zoning, which considering it's a state purchase seems to make some sense. Now, in committee yesterday, our... some of our GOP Members... I would presume some of those who request a verification on this Bill, which is a great use of everyone's time, argue that the state is looking for a seat at the table because they're concerned the city may try to change the

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

payment amounts and tank the sale of JRTC. The reality is the city gains the most from a profitable sale of JRTC because any redevelopment will bring in both, sales and property taxes as the current building is exempt, but since we still have some more time, as we're waiting on a verification, which as usual is a great use of taxpayer dollars, I'm going to read from the article that the Governor's handpicked director of CMS wrote in the Chicago Tribune a couple days ago. Selling the Thompson Center is 'The best option for taxpayers. The deferred maintenance for the building has risen to over \$326 million with critical HVAC and fire suppression systems well beyond their useful life and in need of complete replacement. inherent deficiencies addition, there are in building's design itself that no reasonable amount renovation could address including both extremely high operating costs, the ability to use only 70 percent of the 1.2 million square feet of space that currently sits on this massive parcel.' This concludes the most recent addition of the more you know. I would ask that the votes... the notes be ruled inapplicable. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wehrli."

Wehrli: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd move to put the previous question on whether the notes are to be ruled inapplicable."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves the previous question. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The previous question is put. Mr. Riley to close on his Motion."

Riley: "As I say, I render these notes inapplicable for the reasons that I stated. And I'd like votes in the affirmative."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

- 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Mr. Riley, vote on your Motion. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 64 voting 'yes', 49 voting 'no'. And Mr. Butler had asked for a verification of that vote. Do you persist, Sir? Mr. Clerk, please read the affirmative."
- Clerk Hollman: "A poll of those voting in the affirmative..."
- Speaker Lang: "Excuse me, Mr. Clerk, before you proceed. Mr. Butler, you do know this requires simply more 'ayes' than 'nays', not 60 votes? He withdraws his Motion. Mr. Demmer is recognized."
- Demmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Republicans request an immediate caucus."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Demmer, we'll get right back to you on that.

 Let me complete this process. The vote is 64 to 49. The note
 acts are held inapplicable. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Motions."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. The Republicans asked for an immediate caucus. That will happen. The... two things: the Republicans will caucus immediately in Room 118 and the House will reconvene at the hour of 4:15. Members, are advised not to use the main door of the chamber; there's some stuff going on out there. So, please use the rear doors of the chamber to go wherever you're going. The House will be in recess 'til 4:15. The House will be in order. Page 13 of the Calendar, Senate Bills-Second Reading, Senate Bill 886. I'm sorry, this

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

is on the Order of Third Reading, now. Senate Bill 886, Mr. Riley. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 886, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Riley."

Riley: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Members of the House, I'm presenting to you Senate Bill 886, which essentially provides the framework for the sale of the Thompson Center. We had quite a discussion during the discussion about the notes and other things, but I will say again, it is a framework for the sale of the Thompson Center. And I will answer any questions you may have."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andersson."

Andersson: "I feel so..."

Speaker Lang: "You, Sir."

Andersson: "...I feel so alone."

Speaker Lang: "We're with you."

Andersson: "Oh, thank you. I appreciate that."

Speaker Lang: "If you're with him, raise your hand. We're here.

There are a lot of people with you. Your turn, Sir."

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

Speaker Lang: "Can't wait."

Andersson: "I bet. So, my understanding is there's been a lot of discussion about this Bill. You've been working with the... with the second floor on it, but it looks like we've run into a few issues. Is that correct?"

Riley: "Well, a few issues that I think came up at the last minute. The work on this Bill has ensued over a matter of months and... and in my estimation, I think the Bill is pretty

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

benign. But you know, there are some concerns that... that you have brought... your side has brought."

Andersson: "So, then... so, yes. And there's one specific concern and... and it relates to the commitments that have to be made under the Bill with regard to any contract to dispose of the property, so contract with a purchaser. And that is that there's a requirement that there be a commitment made from the purchaser to make any applicable payments to the City of Chicago with re... respect to additional zoning density. Can you explain to me the basis for that?"

Riley: "Basically, so the people of the State of Illinois don't have to... to pay for this endeavor. I mean, that's... that's basically it, putting the onus on the purchaser. The onus on the purchaser to do that is part and parcel of the negotiations that the administration must have with the applicable entities in the City of Chicago."

Andersson: "And I understand the logic of that. The difficulty is the typical process... and I've done a lot of development work over the years..."

Riley: "So have I."

Andersson: "...I, indeed, so we've got two experts in the room. All right. Is the way that it typically happens in every development project I've ever been involved with, is that the city, whichever city, not just the City of Chicago, but whichever city, the seller and purchaser negotiate during the contract process to figure out what that exposure is because quite frankly, while you say we're putting it on to the purchaser, the reality is if it's a blanket commitment that they have to enter into, that's going to reduce..."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

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

Andersson: "Are we on Short Debate?"

Speaker Lang: "Yeah, I am. I hope you are as well."

Andersson: "I would like not to be."

Speaker Lang: "Okay. Well, if you had seven people here... no I'm kidding. Just go right ahead anyway. It's your anniversary."

Andersson: "I... I thought you were with me. I figured you'd raise your hand."

Speaker Lang: "Have we said happy anniversary to you yet, Sir?"

Andersson: "You did not."

Speaker Lang: "Happy anniversary."

Andersson: "Thank you, Sir."

Riley: "Could you finish that last part of your..."

Andersson: "Yes. So, the point is, is while I understand the concept of putting the burden on the purchaser, the difficulty is by making a blanket commitment in the contract itself to purchase what you end up doing is you end up deducting because if the... if the sale price is going to be \$300 million or whatever price it's going to be and now, they can't negotiate that, that price goes down."

Riley: "Well, a couple of things. One of the things that I don't want to do... I don't think we want to do is enter into negotiations in statute. That is something that the administration's going to have to do with the City of Chicago. In terms of reducing any amount, you know, let's... let's be honest. We don't know if we will get \$300 million from that sale. A lot of that sale price is contingent upon what's built on that property."

Andersson: "Correct."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

- Riley: "And that's part of the negotiations that the administration has to do with the city."
- Andersson: "Correct. So, my... my suggestion is the administration had suggested a very small Amendment to this language to say that rather than saying a blanket commitment that instead that there would be an agreement between the city, the seller, and the purchaser to enter into an MOU, a memorandum of understanding, on that negotiation. Is that such an unreasonable way to approach this?"
- Riley: "Again, I don't want to do negotiations that the administration has to do with the city. But I would tell you, if you did something like that then frankly that would obviate Home Rule because it would be changing the... the zoning ordinance of the City of Chicago."
- Andersson: "I... I would disagree. I'd think that... I mean, I cannot tell you how many times that's exactly Home Rule and non-Home Rule do. Is they enter into a three-way agreement to figure out what the exposure is for a given impact fee, a given charge, whatever the case may be. I'll... I'll speak to the Bill."

Riley: "Okay."

Andersson: "I... I think I understand your point. What I would suggest is this, Ladies and Gentlemen, is that the sale of the JRTC is something that the Governor's Office favor. I think many people in this chamber favor. The difficulty is by... by creating a blanket commitment that a purchaser must agree to in the sales contract, you are limiting the flexibility and the ability of the parties to negotiate to a mutually beneficial conclusion. That is simple contract law.

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

That is simple development work. So, unfortunately, even though this is close, I would urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Demmer."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Demmer: "Representative, is there anything in this Bill that would prevent the City Council of Chicago from changing their impact fee after the enactment of this legislation and prior to the sale of the JRTC?"

Riley: "I'm sorry, Tom. Could you just repeat that one more time?"

Demmer: "Sure. Is there anything in the Bill that would prevent the City Council of the City of Chicago from changing their ordinances regarding the impact fees or other related fees between the time of this legislation and the sale?"

Riley: "Well, they can do that anytime, but you know, I wouldn't want to speak for the City Council or the depart... the Department of Planning and Development. They can do that at any time."

Demmer: "So, we can put into legislation that the... the buyer must pay the fee to the City Council and we might make our decision today based on what the existing ordinance is only to have the City Council in Chicago change that after this law was passed and change the fee and the developer then would be required to pay that?"

Riley: "Representative Demmer, you know, we cannot write any legislation based on speculation of what a body will do. The zoning ordinance of the City of Chicago is what it is. And so, simply speaking, what you want to do... or I think what some people might want to do is to try to enter in

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

negotiations... we don't know what's going to happen once the Governor's Office and the City of Chicago start talking... we don't know what's going to happen. That's what negotiation's all about. I just don't think that this is the place to do it. And that's why, as I say, this Bill is fairly benign. I think because it is it gives wide latitude for the administration to negotiate with the City of Chicago and the CTA and whoever else they have to negotiate with."

"Well, thank you, Representative. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. I think that wide latitude is what might raise some concerns from folks who have spoken on this Bill. understand that both the latitude that comes with the administration is also latitude on the City Council side. What we want to make sure that this Bill maintains is that the state has a seat at the table. So, when the sale of the James R. Thompson Center proceeds, we're looking out for both the best interest of Illinois state taxpayers as well as people in the City of Chicago. We were opening... and you have conceded that we're opening the fact that this statute would require the developer pay all applicable fees to the City of Chicago. And that after we pass this Bill, the City of Chicago could change what those applicable fees are. They could change what those fees are without any input from the General Assembly. Let's make sure we maintain a balance between the interest of the State of Illinois and the City of Chicago. That's why a memorandum of understanding or a continued negotiation, something that gives us an opportunity to maintain a seat at the table is the right way to go forward.

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

So, on this version of the Bill, I'd encourage a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sosnowski."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sosnowski: "The language that was suggested... we discussed it a little bit in committee... is fairly mundane. I believe it... it generally says that we want to have a memorandum or an agreement with the city prior to the state selling. I don't think it goes too much further than that. So, my question is, why not include that in your Bill?"

Riley: "Because, again, negotiations means people sitting down and determining... I mean, even determining things like what's going to be built. Again, remember what I said. I mean, I hope we get \$300 million for the sale of that property or even more, but a lot of that ... you're not going to get it right now. And a lot of that depends on the negotiations that the administration makes with the city. For example, what's going to be built on it. Are you going to just adaptively reuse the existing building? Are you going to build something new? I'm seeing some proposals where, you know, there was a 100-foot story tower. There's another one where there were three buildings, you know, with different FARs on that site. So, a lot of that has to do with what you're actually going to get from the property. But again, to put that sort of memorandum of... of understanding, which sounds real nice about those fees, again, obviates the zoning ordinance of the City of Chicago. And that's something that I just don't think that we should do."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Sosnowski: "Well, just as a follow-up question. I agree that there's a lot that goes into it, but this is simply saying that prior to us selling the building that would all be worked out. We're not mandating; we're not dictating what those terms are. We would just say in order to maximize the sale price that should be worked out ahead of time. It's up to the city and the state, CMS, to negotiate that. We're not laying out of the terms, but why would we want that done prior to the sale in order to maximize the sale price?"

Riley: "I've never seen a situation where a city council or any other body has agreed... I mean, the zoning has to be changed. And it's my understanding that when you do changes in zoning... well really in most jurisdictions, certainly the City of Chicago, you do these kinds of chaning... changes in zoning where you're increasing the floor area ratio by the amount that it's stated that the administration wants to do, then all of a sudden, you know, the... the character of that land changes. You have to get... you become a PUD. You have to get a planned unit development designation for that area. There's all kinds of things that have to be done, you know, before you can even enter into their agreement. We're just saying that opfori putting in strictures, if you will, to those negotiations doesn't make a lot of sense to me. And that's, you know, that's... that's the reason."

Sosnowski: "Okay. To the Bill. I just am concerned that as a state... as an entity we want to maximize the sale price of this building. And what we see as a potential increase in occupancy tax is almost 20 to 25 percent of what the sale price of the building would be. For those of you in real

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

estate or otherwise that have dealt with that, a 20 to 25 percent surcharge based off the current city ordinance is very concerning and something I think should be negotiated ahead of time otherwise the sale price will end up being less and the profit... 'profit' to the taxpayers to the state is going to consequently be less. And I don't think that's a positive thing for us to do. I think we can have this set up ahead of time through some simple negotiations. And secondly, I'm just concerned, you know, this... we see that sometimes around here with negotiations that happen you mentioned... and in committee was mentioned, we had several months of good negotiation between the two sides, but then a Bill was pushed forward before a final compromise was agreed to. And that... we can't really call that negotiation or final compromise if one side still had a couple sticking points. And I'm just concerned that, you know, we continue to do that. We continue to say, well, we're negotiating in good faith, but then in the end we're just going to push through something that the other side doesn't agree to. And I truly believe in this case CMS and the Governor's Office is looking at protecting the taxpayers and simply maximizing the sale of property. I would suggest that we go back, make those changes before we put the building up for sale. I think it's going to benefit the state and it's going to benefit the taxpayers. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mitchell."

Mitchell, C.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to go straight to the Bill. So, I understand now why my colleagues on the other side of the aisle had to go to caucus, 'cause they needed to find ways to do gymnastics to try to figure out, to

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

know how to justify the fact that they're not supporting a Bill that they originated. So, here's the deal. So, on Sunday, the Governor's Office and CMS wanted the language that's currently in the Bill. But today, what they wanted... I'm going to read this into the record... is for the language to say any contract to dispose of the property is subject to the following conditions: commitment from the purchaser to make applicable payments to the City of Chicago with respect to additional zoning density as agreed to between the administrator, that's the state, and the City of Chicago in a memorandum of understanding or other agreement. So, Team Local Control, that's you guys, the ones who always say we've got too many mandates and we need to give more back to our local governments because they're local and they're closer to the ground. Team Local Control wants to take zoning authority from the City of Chicago, wants the city to rezone the building, but wants to be in charge of it. This is ridiculous. It's negotiation in bad faith. I feel absolutely terrible for those of you who have to stand up right now and defend this. I have bad news. Sometimes the Governor lies to you. This is a situation where the Governor is lying to you. This is a good Bill. It's doing what the Governor's Office wants. You should vote 'aye'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Ford."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ford: "Representative Riley, I just have one question because this is a concern of some constituents. Once the sale of the

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Thompson Center takes place, does this Bill speaks to who has the responsibility for relocating the CTA transportation?"

Riley: "Well, part of that is in there and again, I keep saying, that's part of... and the negotiations are going to be tough, but I have faith, at least in this case the administration that they will, you know, talk and negotiate with the City of Chicago in good faith. But what happens to... I think it's the second most-used transit stop in the city, is extremely important. So, that's part of the negotiations that's part of this Bill and that's something that they're going to have to come up with. How is it going to be protected? And some of those are some design ideas. And how was it going to be protected and how are people still going to use the facility?"

Ford: "So, Representative, that would not be our responsibility to vote... this vote, if it passes, becomes the responsibility of the city to protect that. Is that right?"

Riley: "That would be part of the negotiations, again, between the administration and the city. I would presume that, again, when I say the city, that also would include the CTA."

Ford: "Right."

Riley: "And that's what negotiations are all about. They want to protect a very important, you know, transit station. We want to protect it, too. So, all those things, you know, to the extent that they could, were built in the Bill in terms of what needed to be done. But again, the negotiations between the city and the administration are extremely important to be sure that those things happen."

Ford: "And so, it's not my responsibility, your responsibility.

If I vote for this and..."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Riley: "Representative Ford, I can't hear you. Mr. Speaker."

Ford: "...I just want to be clear that if I vote for this Bill, it's CTA's responsibility along with the City of Chicago to make sure that the ridership is protected. The state doesn't have that responsibility. Is that correct?"

Riley: "Well, the state has a responsibility in so far as, you know, the citizens of the City of Chicago, the riding public, are also our constituents. But again, that will be part of the negotiations between the City of Chicago and the administration. But we stated in the Bill the concerns about transit that had to be done. And believe me, you know where I stand regarding mass transit. I've been a proponent and a protector of it for a long time."

Ford: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Thapedi."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Thapedi: "Representative Riley, it seems to me that what you're trying to do here that you're statutorily shaping the ground rules for the transaction. Is that a fair statement?"

Riley: "That's a fair statement."

Thapedi: "So, what you're doing essentially is that you're providing more certainty as far as how the transaction should go forward, correct?"

Riley: "That's true."

Thapedi: "So, ultimately, when there is an RFP and the RFP process does go through, you're positioning those potential bidders to put together their best and their strongest bid, right?"

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

- Riley: "Their best and their strongest bid, and hopefully, in the negotiations the, as they say, the highest and best use for that land will be negotiated."
- Thapedi: "And I'm glad that you brought up highest and best use.

 Are there any appraisals currently of the parcel?"
- Riley: "Not that I know of. What I'm hearing are just sort of figures thrown around. And again, we want to get, you know, the greatest amount of money for the sale also, but again, that has a lot to do with what the final design of that site is going to be. That... that drives many things. It drives the density; it drives the value of the property. You know, if... if you put... if you put a playground on it, you know, you're not going to get a lot, but if you put a very nicely designed building that may be a multiuse building, that's going to get you more... more money on a potential sale. We don't know what it's going to look like right now."
- Thapedi: "And exactly. And by... and by actually passing this piece of legislation, when the time comes, when the NAI appraisers come in and they're ready to actually do an appraisal of the site, they're ascertaining the highest and best use of the subject property and all the other analyses that they have to go forward with, they're, again, positioning perspective bidders to put together their best and their strongest bid which is in the best interest of the state and the citizens of the state, correct?"

Riley: "That is true."

Thapedi: "All right. Now, also, about a plan development. Have there been any discussions about looking at the site as basically as being a plan development with the Department of

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Planning and Development with the City of Chicago would primarily oversee the development of the parcel?"

Riley: "When we get this authorization, get this Bill passed, that's what all the consultants will do. Again, we all know that zoning has to be changed. I'm not sure… well, I hope, you know, that the consultants, the administration understands the Chicago zoning ordinance, you know, that you, you know, do have to get a zoning variance. And then all those things will come into play. But that's what the consultants will do."

Thapedi: "So... so, to make a long story short, you're laying out a red carpet to get this deal done, correct?"

Riley: "That's the way I look at it."

Thapedi: "Thank you, Leader. I... I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Riley to close."

Riley: "Thank you very much. We've had a robust debate. This is a good Bill for a lot of different reasons. As I said before earlier, I knew Helmut Jahn. And the building had a lot of historic significance, but you know, form follows function. Everybody bought... built things and designed things in the '70s and '80s that had sweeping facades and open space and they weren't very utilitarian. And I would hope that in negotiations between the state and City of Chicago we come up with a building and we come up with a site, whatever happens to be that is the highest and best use of that property, that benefits the people of the City of Chicago and the State of Illinois. And also, as I also put in this Bill that honors the namesake of this building right now, James R. Thompson. Thank you very much. I request 'aye' votes."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 67 voting 'yes', 48 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 May 30, 2017: recommends be adopted Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 3 and Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1904; and recommends be adopted, Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2589."
- Speaker Lang: "Page 13 of the Calendar, Senate Bill 1276, Mr. Turner. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1276, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. 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."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1276, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Turner."
- Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Body. Senate Bill 1276 is an initiative of the Illinois Department of Human Service. This proposed legislation makes two changes. It would change the initial forensic examiner's report to align the likeness of retaining fitness with the statutory period of fitness restoration. Second, it will change the reporting

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

period for individuals adjudicated not guilty by reason of insanity from every 60 days to every 90 days. I'd ask for the Bod... the Body's support. Thank you."

'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Harper, Wallace. Please take the record. There are 74 voting 'yes', 38 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Page 12 of the Calendar, Senate Bill 647, Mr. Turner. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 647, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. 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."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 647, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Turner."

Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Body. Senate Bill 647 extends the... until January 1, 2020, the imposition of additional fees on residential foreclosure complaints and judicial sales which are used to support housing counseling programs for homeowners and maintenance, demolition, and rehabilitation of abandoned residential properties by municipalities, The Foreclosure Prevention Graduated Fund is used by the Illinois Housing Development Authority to make grants for housing counseling programs statewide and the Abandoned Residential Property Municipal Relief Fund provides

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

grant funds which may be used for securing, maintaining, demolishing or rehabilitating abandoned homes. The rehabilitation of the abandoned residential property is strictly limited in scope to address exterior building safety concerns such as repairing the roof, windows, doors, masonry, or walkways of an abandoned residential property. I'd ask for the Body's support."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andersson."

Andersson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll speak directly to the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, this was a fee that was put into effect during the housing crisis of 2007, 2008 to address the proliferation of abandoned and foreclosed... or partially foreclosed homes in municipalities. While I recognize that at the time, I think that that was appropriate. The money was used appropriately. There has to come to a point where it ends, and quite frankly, we are passed that issue at this point. I know of the municipalities that I have the pleasure to represent are no longer feeling the effects of that massive residential crisis. As a result, now we're going to propose to continue to charging fees, \$500 for the initial program and then \$1 per thousand during the foreclosure process. This is simply a fee that needs to end at this point, Ladies and Gentlemen. I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen, you can have the remainder of Mr. Andersson's time."

Breen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Look, this Bill was agreed to... there was an agreement years ago before we were here, before most of us were in this chamber... it was on a limited scope. The bankers, all of the financial institutions

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

agreed with the advocates and said, hey, we'll put a limited time on it. When the foreclosure crisis passes, this Bill leaves. It goes out of effect. And now, entirely outside of that deal, you now come back and say, no, no, we want to hit you with more fees. And folks, I mean, look, the number one way to prevent abandoned properties, to prevent deteriorating conditions in our neighborhoods is to get these properties turned over to new owners. So, why in the world would we put fees on the very foreclosures that will help to turn the communities around for the remaining properties that are being foreclosed? This is a terrible Bill. And again, it... it really breaches the agreement that was made by the bankers and others in good faith years ago and..."

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

Breen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, it breaches that agreement.

And if this Bill receives the requisite number of votes, I would request a verification."

Speaker Lang: "Your request is acknowledged, Sir. Mr. Turner to close. Excuse me. Oh, the Chair recognizes Mr. Andrade. I'm sorry. I did not see your light, Sir."

Andrade: "Thank you. So, my dis... may the Sponsor yield then?" Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Andrade: "Will the Sponsor yield, so thank you very much. So, in my dist... Representative, in... in my district I have not seen the decline of foreclosures. Is... has there been a decline of foreclosures?"

Turner: "You know, there had... someone suggested there have... foreclosure rates are declining and they are much lower than in the past, but there is still a lot of work to do. During

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

the first quarter of 2017, the following Illinois metropolitan areas had some of the highest foreclosure rates in the nation: Rockford was number four in the nation. Peoria, fifth in the nation. Chicago, eighth in the nation. There's and I'd also like to mention that in the... from one of... what the previous speaker suggested that \$1 dollar bill... \$1 dollar fee for each 1 thousand is capped at \$300. Yeah. So, foreclosures are still a major issue in a lot of areas. And this is a good Bill and a good program to help deal with some of that blight. And if foreclosures are on the decline, banks won't have to pay this fee. So, they're worried about fees."

Andrade: "Representative, do you know how many properties were actually taken off the roll and actually, how many people have benefited from the program that was in place? Do you have some numbers on that?"

Turner: "Sure. Under round one of the program, which began in 2014, 52 local governments were awarded approximately \$7.2 million for projects dealing with 2,484 abandoned properties. Twenty-five percent of the funds are distributed to the City of Chicago, 75 percent of the funds are distributed to other local governments. Funds pay for demolishing, securing and rehabilitating properties. Under round two, in February 2017, IHDA approved more than 9.5 million in grant awards to 68 local governments to turn abandoned properties into assets for renewing neighborhoods and assisting with community revitalization and stabilation plans... stability plans."

Andrade: "The... the properties in the City of Chicago were they mostly in one targeted neighborhood or do you believe that

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

the whole City of Chicago probably benefited from this program?"

Turner: "Representative, the entire City of Chicago benefited from the program because when you bring up some of the neighborhoods that deal with blight like on the net... like on the west side of town where I represent, the 9th District, and other areas of town on the south side in different parts of the city, this is a good thing for the City of Chicago as a whole, a good thing for our state, a good thing for the residents of the city as well."

Andrade: "So, I also see besides the City of Chicago you also have 30 percent in collar counties and 50 percent among the remaining counties. Do you know which are the 50 percent of those remaining counties you have? You know, will... Representative?"

Turner: "All throughout the state, Representative. It's a very, very diverse program in terms of the areas of the state in which they... they deal with and provide these services."

Speaker Lang: "Please complete your remarks."

Turner: "There's still a great deal of neighborhoods throughout the state in different areas that benefit greatly from this program. And that's Members on both sides of the aisle, not just the City of Chicago, not just Democrats, Republican areas all over the state this is a great program."

Speaker Lang: "Have you completed your remarks, Mr. Andrade?"

Andrade: "Thank you. Yes, I have. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Martwick."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

- Martwick: "Representative Turner, can you address some of the opposition to the Bill? Some of the things that have mentioned to us is that this was originally set by agreement to sunset at this year and that this extension is sort of going back on the deal. Can you... can you address that?"
- Turner: "You know, I wasn't around for the agreement portion that was discussed before, but you know, we set sunsets on Bills to come back and discuss them. We're looking to extend the sunset for three years. The main opposition is coming from the banks. The Bankers Association is opposed to continuing the additional filing fees on residential foreclosure complaints. Banks don't want to pay fees, period."
- Martwick: "And one of the things that's been mentioned is that if this fee continues on these foreclosures that this fee is then just passed to the consumer that the person who buys the property out of foreclosure then is going to... the bank is not going to eat this fee. They're going to push it to the person who buys the property out of the foreclosure proceeding. What do you... what would... how would you respond to that?"
- Turner: "I don't believe that to be the case. Banks are opposed to paying this fee. It's a minimum fee for multimillion dollar national banks. And that's the real problem behind this. Consumers are benefiting from this Bill, neighborhoods are benefiting from this Bill."
- Martwick: "And I'm sorry, I might have missed that when you were going over the fee schedule. Could you... could you go over that fee schedule for me one more time?"
- Turner: "Great question. The fees are as follows: plaintiffs who file a foreclosure complaint related to residential property,

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

generally banks, are required to pay a 50 dollar fee to be deposited into the Foreclosure Prevention Program Funds, which are used as grants to HUD approved housing counseling agencies and community-based..."

Speaker Lang: "Please continue, Sir."

Turner: "...community-based organizations for a capacity building operational expenses, pre- and post-purchase counseling, foreclosure counseling education, and staff counselor training. The additional... Go ahead."

Martwick: "I'm sorry. So, I just want to... and I want to hear the rest of it, but I do want to hear that one point. You talked about... so, there are... I know that there are these neighborhood housing organizations that do a lot of housing counseling for people that fall into foreclosure, helping them manage those situations. Does some of this money get used for those purposes? Is that..."

Turner: "Yes. Yes."

Martwick: "Okay. I'm sorry. Please continue with the fee schedule, if you would."

Turner: "Additionally, a fee is imposed on purchasers of residential real estate at a judicial sale who must pay a fee of a dollar for each thousand dollars or a fraction thereof up to \$300. Ninety-eight percent of the fee is deposited into the Abandoned Residential Property Municipal... Municipal Relief Fund and two percent is retained by the Clerk of the Court. This fee expired on January 1, 2017. We're looking at increasing it another three years under this Bill."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

- Martwick: "And... and what is this provision where they... the fee varies depending on the number of complaints filed? How does that work?"
- Turner: "So, the additional fee, the amount of which will vary depending on the number of complaints. It's based on the number of complaints filed in a year: \$500 for 175 or more, \$250 for 50 or more complaints... 50 to 175, excuse me, and \$50 for less than 50."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Martwick, can you bring your comments to a close, Sir."
- Martwick: "Yes. No... thank you, Mr. Speaker. And thank you, Representative Turner, for answering those questions. That's all I have."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Welch."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

- Welch: "Leader Turner, just a couple of quick questions. I'm sitting here looking at the analysis that were provided. And when I see the list of proponents for this Bill, it looks like folks that are trying to help the less fortunate, the most vulnerable."
- Turner: "Absolutely, Representative. The proponents on this Bill are the City of Chicago, Housing Action of Illinois, Affordable Housing Corporation of Lake County, Genesis Housing Development Corporation, CEDA of Cook County, Metropolitan Mayors Caucus, Business and Professional People for the Public Interest, Western Egyptian, Northwest Side Housing Center, Will County Center for Community Concerns, Illinois Municipal League."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

- Welch: "So, these are folks that are trying to get houses back on the market. There's no benefit to keeping these houses empty, correct?"
- Turner: "No benefit at all. And homeownership is a... it's very important, very important. So, the counseling that's involved with it and giving the opportunity to... giving people an opportunity to buy homes in their neighborhood, build back up their neighborhoods, be vested in their neighborhoods. This is what this program is all about."
- Welch: "So, in a district like mine... a community like the Village of Maywood that was hit hard by the foreclosure crisis and many homes are still boarded up today. Are you telling me that this Bill would help my district?"
- Turner: "Millions of dollars were spent in your district,
 Representative."
- Welch: "Let me ask you some logistical questions. Who actually collects the money, the fees from the banks?"
- Turner: "The money is collected and the fees are administrated it's all housed in the Illinois Housing Development Authority, IHDA."
- Welch: "And how do I... how do I tell someone in my..."
- Speaker Lang: "Please try to complete your remarks, Sir."
- Welch: "You know what, we should support this Bill. It helps get houses back on the market. I say vote 'yes'."
- Speaker Lang: "Chapa... Representative Chapa LaVia."
- Chapa LaVia: "Thank you... thank you, Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield, please?"
- Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Chapa LaVia: "Representative... I'm sorry. Leader Turner, do you know how much money has come in to Aurora through this program? Do you have that number? And I think that..."

Turner: "Representative..."

Chapa LaVia: "...Representative... the last Representative was asking where the money gets deposited before it's given out. I'm sure it's more like a grant or a block grant kind of program.

But I'm just curious."

Turner: "So I believe the number in Aurora may be around \$750 thousand. I can... correct...."

Chapa LaVia: "And it... it... and because it's something that you can't like, no pun intended, bank on, you can't tell me what number next year's going to be or the next year? It... it depends on the transactions?"

Turner: "That's correct, Representative."

Chapa LaVia: "Okay. I support this legislation. I just would like and I think that the prior Representative was trying to get to also is how it's distributed in our community. If we're here setting legislation statute into place, I think duly respect is to make sure that the Legislators know where it's going so we can help support it a little bit more thoroughly. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Thapedi."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Thapedi: "Leader Turner, I just want to get a little clarification. I think that we're not a hundred percent sure where the money is going. So, basically, the process works as follows: if a lender decides to file a foreclosure action and

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

they pay the fees, the big filing fee and the other fees, all that money is all collected by the Clerk of the Court, correct?"

Turner: "Yes, Sir."

Thapedi: "And then the Clerk of the Court then makes sure that it gets into the appropriate pots, right?"

Turner: "Yes, Sir."

Thapedi: "And the idea behind the legislation when it was first enacted was to ensure that lenders, during the height of the foreclosure crisis, would act as good neighbors in our communities, right?"

Turner: "That's correct, Representative."

Thapedi: "That the challenge was, was that once the lenders would foreclose on properties and they would board them up, they would just walk away and just do absolutely nothing, right?"

Turner: "That's correct."

Thapedi: "So, what you're doing here is that you're just preserving the integrity of our neighborhoods that as foreclosure actions continue to be filed and the lenders continue to board up properties, we have a safeguard to ensure that those properties will be maintained so that other citizens, other unit owners, other property owners on the block and in close proximity don't have losses to the fair cash market value of their properties, right?"

Turner: "That's correct, Sir."

Thapedi: "I urge an 'aye' vote, Ladies and Gentlemen."

Speaker Lang: "Representative McCombie."

McCombie: "Thank you. Would the Sponsor yield, please?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

McCombie: "Savannah... As the mayor of Savannah... excuse me... we benefited from this and just recently also received another grant for this. It is a wonderful program that comes through IHDA. I can't stress it enough. However, that being said, it was an agreement that this would sunset. Is foreclosure still a problem? Yes. One of the things another Representative had mentioned about turning over your housing market. This isn't turning over necessarily your housing market, but it is helping with your assessed values in your neighborhood. Okay?"

Turner: "That's correct."

McCombie: "So, the lot is going to be vacant and the owner still is going to own the property. You're not... you're not going to owe a debt to your municipality, so there's no property for the municipality to turn around and sell to turn this to increase home buildings because these homes are going to be taken down? I just think we need to stand behind what originally is agreed upon in the Bill and that hurts my feelings because it really is a wonderful program. But I think oftentimes people in our position start programs and don't follow through with what we said. So, as well as it pains me for this Bill, I'm not going to be able to support it. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hays, do you still with to speak on this Bill, Sir?"

Hays: "I'm sorry?"

Speaker Lang: "Your turn."

Hays: "I would like to call the previous question."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

- Speaker Lang: "You were the last speaker, Sir. You'd like to call it anyway. Mr. Turner to close."
- Turner: "Thank you for the discussion around this Bill. This is a great program as the previous Representative mentioned. There was no agreement on this Bill, however. There was no agreement on the Bill. The sunset was put in place so that we could come back and revisit whether or not the fee should go up or go down, but there was never an agreement that this would not happen. So, I'd ask for an 'aye' vote. Do right by your constituents."
- Speaker Lang: "Ladies and Gentlemen, Mr. Turner moves for the passage of the Bill. Mr. Breen has asked for a verification. Members will be in their chairs and vote their own switches. Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves, Members. Ammons, Crespo, Feigenholtz, Nekritz. Please record yourselves. Take the record, Mr. Clerk. There are 62 voting 'yes', 49 voting 'no'. And Mr. Breen has asked for a verification. Do you persist, Sir? Gentleman persists. Mr. Clerk, please read the affirmative votes."
- Clerk Hollman: "A poll of those voting in the affirmative: Ammons; Representative Representative Representative Arroyo; Representative Beiser; Representative Burke, D.; Representative Burke, K.; Representative Cassidy; Representative Chapa LaVia; Representative Representative Conyears-Ervin; Representative Crespo; Representative Currie; Representative Representative Davis; Representative DeLuca; Representative

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Representative Feigenholtz; Representative Fine; Evans; Representative Flowers; Representative Ford; Representative Gabel; Representative Gordon-Booth; Representative Greenwood; Representative Guzzardi; Representative Harper; Harris, G.; Representative Representative Hernandez; Representative Hoffman; Representative Representative Jones; Representative Kifowit; Representative Representative Lilly; Representative Representative Manley; Representative Martwick; Representative Mayfield; Representative Mitchell, C.; Representative Representative Moylan; Representative Nekritz; Representative Phelps; Representative Riley; Representative Scherer; Representative Sims; Representative Slaughter; Representative Representative Spain; Representative Stratton; Representative Katie Stuart; Representative Tabares; Representative Thapedi; Representative Turner; Representative Wallace; Representative Walsh; Representative Welch; Representative Wheeler, B.; Representative Williams; Representative Willis; Representative Yingling..."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, the Gentleman withdraws his Motion. 62 voting 'yes', 49 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair is in receipt of a Motion by Mr. DeLuca to reconsider the vote by which Senate Bill 886 passed. Chair recognizes Mr. DeLuca."

DeLuca: "I withdraw the Motion, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman withdraws the Motion. Senate Bill 1869, Representative Mah. Please read the Bill."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1869, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Mah."

Mah: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 1869 addresses a need for translation for the ILGA website. This is an issue we've considered in this chamber before. The current version of the Bill adopts a suggestion by our colleagues across the aisle to improve upon the Bill as previously proposed. It does utilize a free Web-based translation service to provide Spanish language translation for the ILGA website in some portions. It does also include a disclaimer that addresses the source of the translation. In addition, this version of the Bill adds an Amendment that reestablishes the Language Access Task Force, previously established in a form... a previous General Assembly. There is no known opposition. And I ask for your support. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wheeler."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Wheeler, K.: "Representative, I'm glad you brought this forward.

I'm glad we had the conversations we had that were collaborative in how we approach situations like this, where a dialogue had gone back and forth within the Senate but also here in our chamber. I know I'd worked with the Gentleman who runs the systems that we... that drive our information systems for the General Assembly and this looks to me like an approach that's balanced, makes sense, and really will give access to people who don't have it right now. People can see what we're

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

doing, add a bit more transparent government before them. Thank you for bringing it. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Olsen."

Olsen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I want to thank the Sponsor for bringing this forward. This is a good Bill to improve accessibility without creating a fiscal impact. And so, where we can work together on issues like this I look forward to doing so in the future. Thank you very much. I urge your support."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Flowers. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1882, Mr. Costello. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1882, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Costello."

Costello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 1882 is introduced with one purpose in mind to provide a strong, statewide regulatory framework to ensure animals sold by pet stores in Illinois are from reputable sources. The Bill does not preempt Home Rule. I'll repeat that again. In its current form, the Bill does not preempt Home Rule. I know of no opposition to the Bill. It's got some primary components. It prohibits pet stores from purchasing animals from large commercial breeders unless the breeder is USDA

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

licensed, has no direct or critical noncompliant citation over a two-year period. It requires pet stores to obtain copies of USDA inspection reports from the USDA website or directly from the breeder. Requires pet stores to microchip dogs and cats. It allows pet stores to be an option for rehoming animals. And it retains the ability of pet stores to purchase pets from large breeders, hobby breeders, rescues, and shelters. I thank you. And I ask for your 'aye' vote."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Record yourselves, Members. D'Amico, Gabel, Harper. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1884, Representative Fine. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1884, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Fine."

Fine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill creates the Research Dogs and Cat Adoption Act. It says that after research is completed, the research facility must assess any dogs or cats used in the research and determine if it's suitable for adoption. And if it is suitable, make reasonable efforts to adopt out the animal."

Speaker Lang: "Representative McDermed."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

- McDermed: "Representative, I worked on this... both of us worked on this Bill last Session. So, I have a couple questions that I want to ask you to clarify the record..."
- Fine: "Absolutely."
- McDermed: "...and to create some legislative intent going forward.

 Does this Bill codify the way that our universities, our research universities currently work with their research animal?"
- Fine: "Yes, it does. Right now, this process is already in place, but this codifies it into law."
- McDermed: "And isn't it true, Representative, that one of the things discussed during the work leading up to this Bill coming here today, wasn't it one of the things that was agreed over the course of the negotiations is that this would be the final action in this regard and that the Legislature would take no further action with respect to these animals at our universities?"
- Fine: "You're absolutely right. As a result of the two sides working together on this Bill, the legislative intent is that there will be no more Bills on this topic or any attempt to limit the facilities' research."
- McDermed: "To the Bill. This is a Bill that's been a couple of Sessions in coming. It's a great Bill that improves the lives of these research cats and dogs. And I very strongly urge an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andersson, you can have the rest of Representative McDermed's time."
- Andersson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Andersson: "Representative, I... just as I look at my analysis, it's a little confusing in that the committee vote was unanimous in favor of it, but there seems to be a lot of opponents, the universities. And it sounds like you've with the comments of Representative McDermed that you've resolved them? Are they still in opposition and if they are, why?"

Fine: "There are some who are still in opposition because they're afraid that this is the first step in a process that once we take this step, there'll be more steps when it comes to..."

Speaker Lang: "Please complete your answer."

Fine: "...condemning animal research. But the legislative intent says that that is not going to happen because this is our final Bill in the process."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andersson, complete your remarks, please."

Andersson: "Well, thank you very much for that. I appreciate that.

And there are no penalties associated with this, right?"

Fine: "None that I know of."

Andersson: "Thank you."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Conroy, Gabel. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1895, Mr. Phelps. Please read the Bill. Gentleman has a Floor Amendment. Please place the Bill on the Order of Second Reading and please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1895, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. The Bill was read for a second time previously.

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment... Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Phelps."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Phelps."

Phelps: "This Floor Amendment just gut and replaces the Bill. And I ask that we go on Third and ask for its passage."

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."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1895, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Phelps."

Phelps: "This was a Sponsor initiative of the Senator. And what happened was is that an employer... employee got it fired on a discipline for using a cell phone during an emergency flood. And this more or less just tells the employer that if happens that he or she cannot be fired."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andersson."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Andersson: "Thank you. So, it looks like it does two things. What you just described that you can't be disciplined for responding to an emergency on your cell phone or a text message, and also, prohibits the creation of employee policies that would... would reflect that same intent?"

Phelps: "Yes, Representative. I'm just trying to be brief."

Andersson: "Okay. I mean, is that all this does?"

Phelps: "That's all it does."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Andersson: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bryant, you can take the rest of Mr. Andersson's time."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Bryant: "Question of the Sponsor, actually. Department of Corrections is opposing this Bill. Brandon, I'm just wondering, have you talked to them about what this would do with the rules in the Department of Corrections that basically says that you can't take a cell phone into an institution? It's probably true with the Department of Juvenile Justice as well."

Phelps: "Yeah, Terri. They never came to me one time about this."

Bryant: "I... I may not be able to support you on this."

Phelps: "That's fine. But you know, you can't bring cell phones in to prisons any way, as you know."

Bryant: "Right."

Phelps: "I mean, you used to work there."

Bryant: "And so, I... I'm just kind of..."

Phelps: "But they did not talk to me one time, honestly."

Bryant: "Okay. I'm just... I'm just wondering..."

Phelps: "Sure."

Bryant: "...if this would get in the way of... of their rule saying that you can't take a cell phone in because... because there are a lot of volunteer firemen and stuff who might want to, you know, in this case would they not be able to be fired because they had their cell phone in there?"

Phelps: "If it does... if it has to do with an emergency, like this was during a flood. It was a volunteer fireman that happened,

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

but this does not supersede any department policy, just so you know."

Bryant: "Does not supersede i?"

Phelps: "Does not."

Bryant: "Thank you."

Phelps: "A current and existing."

Bryant: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Swanson, you can use the rest of the time that's left over."

Swanson: "All right. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Were you able to talk with CMS or the Alliance to get a concurrence on them?"

Phelps: "Representative Swanson, no one... no one came to me. I think with the Amendment they became neutral, be honest with you."

Swanson: "Okay."

Phelps: "Yeah."

Swanson: "I know we had that discussion..."

Phelps: "Sure."

Swanson: "...in the committee hearing."

Phelps: "Fine."

Swanson: "Thank you."

Phelps: "You're welcome."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Phelps moves for the passage of the Bill. 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? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1944, Mr. Ford. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1944, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Ford."

Ford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker Members of the House. Senate Bill 1944 is an initiative of the Illinois Pharmacists Association and the Department of Public Health. It allows for pharmacists to sell up to 100 rather than 20 sterile hypodermic needles or syringes at a time. Move for the passage."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andersson."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Andersson: "So, what... what's the intent here? What's the goal we're trying to achieve by increasing this number... okay?"

Ford: "There are a couple of intents: 1) people can purchase up to a hundred needles online, we learned in committee and this will allow for local pharmacists to compete with the online sales. And it's also an opportunity for us to make sure that we use this Bill as a means of good public health so that illicit drugs... people that are using illegal drugs... that clean needles are available."

Andersson: "Clean needles, sure. Is there any open... opposition to your Bill?"

Ford: "There is no opposition."

Andersson: "It looks like IRMA, Department of Public Health,
Illinois Public Health Association, and the pharmacists all
support. Is that correct?"

Ford: "That's correct, Leader."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Andersson: "Thank you very much."

Ford: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen can use the rest of the time, Sir."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Breen: "And Representative, I just want to make clear. You're allowing local pharmacists to sell a hundred syringes at a time instead of 20, correct?"

Ford: "Yes."

Breen: "And right now, anyone in the State of Illinois can go on Amazon and buy a hundred syringes?"

Ford: "That's right."

Breen: "So, we're just advantaging putting our local pharmacists on the same footing as the online folks?"

Ford: "That's correct."

Breen: "Great. Good Bill. Thank you."

Ford: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 103 voting 'yes', 12 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1969, Representative Ammons. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1969, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ammons."

Ammons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is a Bill of the Prairie Research Institute at the University of Illinois to

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

support continued research of mosquito infected... well infected mosquitoes that inhabit areas of tires in our state. It's been supported for many years. And we ask for continued support for this research at the University of Illinois to get rid of disease carrying mosquitoes in our state. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill... excuse me, Representative... 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, Thapedi. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 103 voting 'yes', 7 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1991, Mr. Costello. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1991, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Costello."

Costello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate
Bill 1991 creates the Agricultural Education Shortage Task
Force. It's a severe problem in the agriculture community.
And I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Ammons, Currie. Please take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1714, Mr. Turner. Please read the Bill."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1714, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this Senate Bill." Speaker Lang: "Mr. Turner."
- Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Body. Senate Bill 1714 builds upon existing efforts to increase utilization of minority, female, disabled-owned businesses with respect to all Illinois public pension funds. Additionally, Senate Bill 1714 provides additional disclosures from consultants as it relates to the economic interest of the consultant in existing or recommended investment managers. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."
- 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please take the record, Mr. Clerk. There are 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2012, Representative Sente. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2012, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Sente."
- Sente: "Thank you. Senate Bill 2020 is a Bill to extend the expired angel tax credit, it was created in 2011. It extends the credit until December 31, 2021. This is an agreed Bill that I worked on with the Lieutenant Governor's Office, DCEO, and the eight... or six other peers who filed Bills. And it retains the current earn... annual \$10 million cap."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish?

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Davis, Gordon-Booth. Please take the record, Mr. Clerk. There are 113 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2034, Mr. Sims. Please read the Bill. Let's move the Bill back to Second Reading for an Amendment, Mr. Clerk, and read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2034, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 1 and 2 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Sims."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sims."

Sims: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House House Floor Amendment #1 adds the Bail Reform Act of 2017 to the underlying Bill. It also adds an extension of the RICO Act. And I know of no opposition. And ask for its favorable adoption."

Speaker Lang: "Those in... Mr. Zalewski, do you rise on the Amendment, Sir? Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

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

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sims."

Sims: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #2 is purely technical in nature. It cleans up some drafting errors. I'd ask for its adoption."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2034, a Bill for an Act concerning

criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sims."

Sims: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 2034 is the result of a great deal of work by a number of Members of this committee and Members of the House Judiciary-Criminal Committee to adopt a Bail Reform Act that takes into consideration the issues that have been addressed by our courts. And I'd like to read for Members a statement by Chief Justice Karmeier. It says, 'The goal of pretrial services to reduce the pretrial incarceration rate while ensuring that defendants comply with approval of pretrial release. This process includes the application of a validated pretrial risk assessment tool which aids judges in making research-based decisions about whether defendants should be detained or released prior to their criminal trials.' The Bill you have before you does that. It makes sure that we have a plan in place and a policy in place in the State of Illinois that incarcerates individuals who are threats to public safety not because they are poor. I ask for its favorable passage."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Durkin."

Durkin: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Durkin: "Representative Sims, I see up there on the board that it says Criminal Code-Threat Public Official. Now, that is nothing that... there's no threat... anything about threat to public official in this Bill making a new law or enhancing the penalty?"

Sims: "The underlying Bill was... it was a Bill dealing with threats against employees of a public guardian."

Durkin: "Okay. So, what's going on outside this door, maybe we should beefen-up that Section based on this... this little scrum that's going out... on the... outside the... outside the chamber. But more seriously, let's... I just want to walk through a little bit. The RICO Act, was that a five-year sunset when it originally was... when it was passed by the Legislature?"

Sims: "That's correct, Leader."

Durkin: "And we're extending it another five years, correct?"

Sims: "Another five years, yes, Sir."

Durkin: "I think that's commendable. I do know that it has been used sparingly at least in Cook County, but it has been a useful tool on some famil... major operations and investigations they've been conducting. So, I think it's a very good idea. And I'm glad you did this. I would just like some further explanation about the type of crimes that are going to be determined to be a presumption of no bail, no cash bail?"

Sims: "Leader, you're absolutely correct. Let me answer the first one first. You're right. The use of RICO has been sparingly. It's been used only four times in its five years: twice in Cook County, once in DuPage, and once in Lake. But the types of crimes that... what we are talking about these are... these

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

are low-level nonviolent offenders with the presumption against bail exists. But we are not talking about releasing indi... opening the doors and releasing individuals on an ad hoc basis. We are talking about making sure that individuals who are not a threat to public safety, and individuals who are not a threat to flee that they are not held in custody merely because they're poor. If you're not a threat to public safety, if you are not a threat to yourself or others, we want to make sure that your life is not destroyed by it being... being incarcerated."

Durkin: "Well, that's great. I had a few more questions, but you already answered it. So, I want to thank you for doing the hard work on this. It's one of those..."

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

Durkin: "...it's something that a number of Members, I think, when they see anything about bail reform, I think that there's a, you know, that it... people have a way of thinking that there's something inherently wrong with it. But no, I think, the problem that we have in our jail systems with the indigents who are in for Class C, Class B misdemeanors I believe that's a better use of the space in Cook County jail, DuPage County jail, Will County jail. So, I am going to support this Bill. I think it's right. I think it's balanced. I think it's fair. And I would encourage Members of this side of the aisle to support this. Thank you, Mr. Sims."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski, do you rise in opposition?" Zalewski: "No."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Ford, do you rise in opposition? In opposition? Two minutes, Sir."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ford: "Representative, the RICO, I would like some explanation as to why such a great Bill has to be tainted with such bad language and the RICO?"

Sims: "Well, Representative, what we're trying to do is make sure we are improving a criminal justice system overall."

Ford: "So, we had yesterday a Bill 1722 which will probably incarcerate more people. Is your... is it your opinion that the RICO Bill possibly will incarcerate more people as well?"

Sims: "Representative, when I look at the history of RICO and its uses, again, it's been used... over the five years, it's been used four times. And in order for... for a RICO prosecution to be used, there has to... there... it's not just... again, it's not used in a haphazard manner. It has to have... in order to forward a RICO prosecution, you have to have three predicate offenses during a three-year time period. The person... the defendant has to be a knowing participant in ongoing criminal enterprise and the predicate offenses have to be serious crimes. Only Class 2 felonies or higher: murder, kidnapping, and armed robbery."

Ford: "Is this hostile then?"

Sims: "Well, it's not... so, it's not... these are not just low-level offenders. These are... these are dangerous individuals who have... who are part of the... an ongoing criminal enterprise."

Ford: "Is it possible that some low-level offenders could get swept up in this RICO, racketeering and influence law?"

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Sims: "Again, that's not... under the guidelines of the RICO prosecutions, that's not possible. You have to... have to be one of the high-level felons."

Ford: "It's my under..."

Sims: "You can't... you can't just be a... it can be a general association. You have to have a knowing participation in the criminal enterprise."

Ford: "Yeah. Right, a knowing participation, but the goal is to get the big people. Is that correct?"

Sims: "That's correct."

Ford: "And in doing so, there's a possibility that some small people may get caught up. Is that correct?"

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

Ford: "Is that correct?"

Sims: "Again, Representative Ford, you have... it has to be... it cannot just be a low-level offender. This has to be someone who is engaged in a... in a high-level Class 2 felony or higher, part of a... and knowingly... knowing participation in a criminal enterprise."

Ford: "Thank you. To the Bill. I just think that the fact that we have a bail Bill here and we're going to possibly lock up people that may get swept up in a RICO sweep and they would not be able to afford the bail because they're caught up in a situation and they can't afford an attorney. So, this Bill helps some, but it hurts others. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Flowers, do you rise in opposition or support of the Bill? We'll let you proceed."

Flowers: "Well, thank you. I appreciate you letting me proceed.

Will the Gentleman yield?"

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Speaker Lang: "Yes, he will."

Flowers: "Representative, is this Bill about bail bond?"

Sims: "No."

Flowers: "Okay. But the Amendment gives the impression that it's about bail bond because..."

Sims: "It's not about bail bonds. It is about... it is about reforming the access to or making sure that individuals who are not a threat to public safety, they are not automatically held in prison or held in jail until the... until dependency of the trial. It's... it is about making sure that if you... if you are not able to afford bail, if you're not a threat to public safety, you can... you're allowed to... you're allowed to get out."

Flowers: "Okay. So, once again, I just want to establish the fact that the Constitution already allows for the right for a person to have a bail."

Sims: "Not... not only does the Illinois Constitution, but the United States Constitution allows both."

Flowers: "Okay. And... and so, what I'm... what I'm trying to figure out what it is that doing here? Because currently, it is a right, it is in the Constitution. And right now, the biggest problem with the bail and the bail reform is rich... rich people can afford to make bail and poor people can't. And so, you're saying that this Bill will be predicated on the nature of the crime..."

Sims: "No."

Flowers: "...that will depend on whether or not you would be able to get a bail credit or how is this defined?"

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Sims: "Representative, you have... you have just expressed exactly why we are doing this Bill. There are thousands of people sitting not only in the Cook County jail but in jails across the State of Illinois, who are sitting in jail waiting for..."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sims continue your remarks, Sir."

Sims: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Waiting for bail. So, they cannot get out because they are too poor to get out. That's why we are doing this Bill."

Flowers: "Excuse..."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Flowers..."

Flowers: "Okay. So..."

Speaker Lang: "...please complete your remarks."

Flowers: "...what I'm trying to get at is that there's still a bail that has to be paid for a certain group of people. So, this is not a get out of jail free card, that's number 1. But the most important thing is the RICO and this is extending RICO and I don't understand why we are extending RICO as... because of the Bill that we passed earlier. And RICO was supposed to do the same thing, eliminate the crime and the havoc that's going on in the community."

Sims: "Again, Representative, four times over five years that RICO's been used. And I'd also like to note that the Illinois Public Defenders Association and the Cook County Public Defenders are both proponents of this Bill."

Flowers: "My... my final question is, if it's only been used four times, is it really, really necessary? That's my only point.

Thank you very much and I appreciate your time."

Sims: "What I... what I would say to you is state's attorneys believe that it is a tool that they can use to go after the

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

most dangerous criminal enterprises. And that's... that is... that's why... we are... we're reauthorizing it."

Speaker Lang: "So, we're way beyond Short Debate, but Representative Wheeler will be recognized."

Wheeler, B.: "Thank you. I have a very quick question. First of all, Chairman Sims, thank you so much for bringing this. I know you've done a lot of work all Session on this and I appreciate it. My question is, when is this... in regard to the bail, when is it effective?"

Sims: "So, the RICO Section of the Bill is an immediate... it has an immediate effective date. The bail reform Section is January 1 of 2018."

Wheeler, B.: "I'm sorry, say that again? 2018?"

Sims: "The bail... January 1 of 2018."

Wheeler, B.: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sims to close."

Sims: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, I would say to Members of this Body that this Bill allows us to protect communities while making sure that individuals who are too poor to bail themselves out are then... to be able to get out of jail to go and protect themselves and their families. It's a good Bill worked on. I'd like to thank Members Leader Durkin and Minority Spokesperson Stewart and some of the Members on the other side of the aisle, but I'd also be remiss if I did not thank Members on this side of the aisle for some of the great ideas: Representative Ammons, Representative Mitchell, Members who have worked very hard on this Bill. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

- 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Members, record yourselves. Mr. Clerk... Mr. Welch. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 80 voting 'yes', 27 voting 'no', 4 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2046, Representative Conyears-Ervin. Please read the Bill. There's a Floor Amendment. Mr. Clerk, please move the Bill back to Second Reading and read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2046, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. The Bill was read for a second time previously.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Ervin."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Conyears-Ervin."

Conyears-Ervin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the General Assembly. Senate Bill 2046 creates the Thriving Youth Income Tax Checkoff and the Thriving Youth Income Tax Checkoff Fund as a special fund in the State Treasury. As well as it adds the State Policemen Memorial Income Tax Checkoff for taxable years starting January 1, 2018. The revenues will be deposited into the Criminal Justice Information Projects Fund. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

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

Harris, D.: "Representative, I just want to ensure… Melissa, where are you? Oh. Just want to ensure the checkoff fund has to meet all the qualifications that all the other checkoffs have

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

to meet, correct? In other words, it has to… in order to appear on the… on the tax form, it has to have, I believe, a hundred thousand dollars of contributions. Is that correct?"

Conyears-Ervin: "I don't know of anything different."

Harris, D.: "Okay. So, it just fits in with the other checkoffs, correct?"

Conyears-Ervin: "There is no difference, Representative."

Harris, D.: "Thank you very much for that clarification."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen for one minute and twenty-five seconds."

Breen: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Breen: "Are we on the Amendment or are we on the underlying Bill?

Are we on the Amend... running the Amendment?"

Speaker Lang: "We're on the Amendment, but I believe the Amendment becomes the Bill."

Breen: "Okay."

Speaker Lang: "We might as well keep going."

Breen: "Okay. And Representative, I see the underlying Bill is about the Police Memorial Funds and things like that, but you've added something for the Thriving Youth which is non-Medicaid services for community-based youth programs. What sort of community-based youth programs are you looking to fund?"

Conyears-Ervin: "So, the original Bill was the Thriving Youth and then we added the Police Memorial. There was a mistake in which the Amendment came about."

Breen: "Because I... when I see Planned Parenthood as a supporter, are they a supporter of the Police Memorial or the Thriving Youth?"

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Conyears-Ervin: "I haven't spoken to Planned Parenthood."

Breen: "Okay. But I... I'm a little concerned when I see Planned Parenthood and I see Thriving Youth, since their role is not to create thriving youth. So, I'm wondering what exact programs they're trying... you're trying to fund with this?"

Conyears-Ervin: "I don't speak to Planned Parenthood."

Breen: "Okay. But again, what programs..."

Conyears-Ervin: "So, I can't answer that. You know, I don't know."

Breen: "...what programs are you seeking to fund with this particular..."

Conyears-Ervin: "Oh, for the thriving youth?"

Breen: "Yeah."

Conyears-Ervin: "Moneys in the fund would be utilized by the Department of Human Services to distribute grants to providers delivering non-Medicaid services for community-based programs in the state."

Breen: "So, like family planning and things like that? Is that included or not?"

Speaker Lang: "Please complete your remarks."

Conyears-Ervin: "Not that we're aware of, Representative."

Breen: "Okay. Well, again, I'm a little concerned when I see some of the supporters on this about what exactly is being attempted here. So, and again, it's a very broad... a broad look and so, I'm... I would just respectfully say until we can figure this out, you should oppose the Bill. Thank you."

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."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2046, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Conyears-Ervin, did the Amendment become the Bill?"

Conyears-Ervin: "Correct, nothing changes."

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. Please take the record. There are 97 voting 'yes', 16 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Chair recognizes Mr. DeLuca."

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

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Sir."

DeLuca: "Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen, earlier today I had a surprise visit from a constituent, a nice lady, she was up in the gallery. I went up to visit with her and sit with her for a little while and that's when the protest broke out. I just happened to be sitting up there with my constituent. I just want to thank our security and the Illinois State Police for the great job that you did. We appreciate what you do. I thank you for what you do and you continue to do a good job, but I would like to mention that when the protestors, for whatever reason you are that you're protesting, when you are ignoring the orders of our security guards, when you are ignoring the orders of our State Police, when you are physically... physically refusing to follow their instructions, where it gets to a point where you lie down on the ground and have to

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

be dragged out. Furthermore, then you barricade the front door and they were allowed to do that. I'm just going to ask that whatever the protocol is for this chamber that it be reviewed because none of them should be put in that situation. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Mr. DeLuca. Well said. Senate Bill 2068, Christian Mitchell. Please read the Bill. Please put the Bill on the Order of Second Reading and read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2068, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. The Bill was read for a second time previously.

No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Christian Mitchell."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mitchell."

Mitchell, C.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Amendment is a clarification of the underlying Bill which allows libraries to put advisory questions on for referendum on the ballot. The Amendment clarifies that they must be germane to library issues to narrow the scope."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andersson, can we wait 'til Third Reading for your comments? 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."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2068, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mitchell, did you explain the Bill already?"

Mitchell, C.: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andersson is recognized."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Andersson: "Christian, I think the Bill is very appropriate and good. My only question is why are we limiting it to libraries? It seems like that would be a logical extension to say municipal questions should relate to municipalities, schools to schools, libraries to libraries."

Mitchell, C.: "So, my understanding, Mr. Andersson, and I'm not totally sure that I have this correct 'cause I'm not an expert, is that similar language already exists for park districts and other units of local government, but for whatever reason doesn't exist for libraries, which is why we're making a clarification."

Andersson: "Got it. So, we missed one. We're picking it up. We're cleaning it up?"

Mitchell, C.: "That's my understanding, Sir."

Andersson: "Thank you, Sir."

Mitchell, C.: "Thank you."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Conyears-Ervin. Davis. Turner. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. There are 113 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of Senate Bill 647?"

Clerk Bolin: "A Motion to reconsider the vote by which Senate Bill 647 passed has been filed by Representative Thapedi."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Thapedi."

Thapedi: "Mr. Speaker, I move to table that Motion."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Speaker Lang: "Is there leave? Leave is granted. The Motion is tabled. Representative Ammons is recognized."

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

Speaker Lang: "Proceed."

"Thank you. I want to join Representative DeLuca in appreciating the security in this Capitol. But I would like to bring to the attention of the Members that people who look like me in my mother's generation had to walk across the Edmund Pettus Bridge. They had to protest and be bitten by dogs to get the right to vote. They couldn't serve in juries because they didn't have the right to serve and they didn't have the right to vote. The people who have walked here from the City of Chicago should not be vilified by this Body because of their determination to protest in their best interests. And they should not be vilified for coming in here singing the songs that we sang in the '60s to get the rights that we have today. And so, for this Body to take a position that those people outside are not the people that we're supposed to represent, it disgusts me at my core. And it is important for us to protect the interests of our security and our Legislators, but as well as the people who have walked here for child care, for decent wages, and for a right to exist in the State of Illinois with a budget that is a peoplefocused budget and not a corporate-interest budget. And so, when we speak of the protestors out in our State Capitol that they helped pay for, we should not speak of us and them. We should listen to them and be not like the people in the U.S. Congress that are refusing to meet with their own constituents

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

for fear of being held accountable for the decisions they're making in Washington, D.C. I support the peoples' right to protest and I hope you will support their right as well. God bless you for all that you do."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andersson."

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

Speaker Lang: "Proceed."

Andersson: "...I certainly respect the point that was just made and I don't disagree with it. The peoples' right to protest is... is critical. I love a good protest. Even a little bit of disruption in this chamber is okay, but what's not okay and I think what the previous speakers' talked about was the safety aspect. We were advised it was dangerous out there. That ... that it was becoming violent. And I think that's what we're talking about, I that's why we appreciate and why we have safety officials here who take good care of us and of the public that's here. I support the concept of protest. This isn't about not meeting with people. This isn't about we versus them. They are our constituents. I'm glad they're here, but it has to be done in a way that is civil and safe. Nobody deserves to be threatened over any of these issues. So, I certainly respect your point. I certainly do, but I don't think that was the intention of the earlier speakers. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Returning to the beginning of the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading, Senate Bill 57, Representative Wallace. Please read the Bill. Please move the Bill back to Second Reading for an Amendment and Mr. Clerk."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 57, a Bill for an Act concerning domestic violence. The Bill was read for a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 1 and 2 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Wallace."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Wallace."

Wallace: "I'd like to adopt Amendment 2. I don't... I don't want 1."

Speaker Lang: "Do you wish to table or withdraw Amendment 1?"

Wallace: "Yes, please. Let's table Amendment 1."

Speaker Lang: "So, Amendment 1 is tabled at the request of the Sponsor. Mr. Clerk."

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

Speaker Lang: "Representative Wallace."

Wallace: "Thank you. Floor Amendment #2 provides that the carrier be listed in the order of protection and that it be also listed with the ICCB."

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."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 57, a Bill for an Act concerning domestic violence. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative, did you already explain the Bill?"

Wallace: "Not fully. This..."

Speaker Lang: "Then, please proceed."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Wallace: "Thank you. This Bill will allow individuals who are obtaining an order of protection but who are also within a family plan for... with a cell phone provider that that individual may retain their phone number but be let out of that contract. The company has to be listed within the order of protection and then the ICCB will keep a record for the clerks to be able to locate that information. 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 take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 282, Representative Gordon-Booth. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 282, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Gordon-Booth."

Gordon-Booth: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill doesn't need a lot of introduction to this Body. This Bill is naming a day, April 16, after a woman that many of us know and love. Representative Esther Golar was a ray of sunshine in a place like this at a time such as this. She was a woman who walked through these halls and she gave this job her all. I don't want to go into the details of... of what happened on the last day that she was in this Body, but what I will say is that there is no other person that I know... no other person that I know that has been so willing to give so much of themselves to this place. She was unrelenting when it came to advocating

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

on behalf of the communities that not just she served in her district, but she was a staunch advocate for people. Many of the people that were here today that have been protesting because we have gone for so long without providing the support that we should be providing for the least of these. If Esther were here today, she would likely have a piece of paper and a pen writing lyrics to a song. We all know that that's what she'd be doing at a time such as this. I'm not the only one in this place that loved Esther, but God loved her more so He called her home. But I will never forget what she did for me, what she did for this Body, and truly what it means to be a servant leader because Esther could have extended her life, but she chose to come down here and make sure that her name was written in the book as it related to issues like child care. And so, I will never forget the sacrifice that she made for the least of these. And for that, I... my hope is that Esther's name and her work is never forgotten because as we move throughout this place, regardless of whether or not anyone knows our names or remember who we are, hopefully the work that we do while we're here will be remembered. And I love Esther and I miss Esther and I want other people to know the kind of woman that she was. I'd share it, if I could... if I... would be so indulged and then I'll close. I reached out to her daughter, Tiffany, her only child, and shared with her on the day that I ran this Bill in committee and she shared with me that a woman on her route that day gave her a... a token for her to take to the cemetery on behalf... in remembrance, excuse me, in remembrance of her mother. And we don't talk often, but when we do talk, it somehow, someway, like Esther's trying

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

to let us know that she's still here with us, not in the body but in the spirit. And so, in the spirit of Esther, let's continue to go forward. Let's continue to remember why we're here. And more than anything else, what Esther told me as she laid in that hospital room at Northwestern Medical Center is we must stick together in love. If we could… if I could ask for a moment of silence for Esther's memory, I'd like to do that right now."

Speaker Lang: "The Body will take a moment of silence. 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? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 312, Representative Conyears-Ervin. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 312, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Conyears-Ervin."

Conyears-Ervin: "Thank you, Mr. Speakers and Members of the General Assembly, very difficult to follow such a beautiful tribute. Senate Bill 312 amends the Illinois Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act to prevent restaurants from labeling a menu item as containing catfish unless it contains catfish. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives has a question."

Ives: "What else would it be if it weren't catfish?"

Conyears-Ervin: "Oh, that's a good question. Recently, many restaurants are labeling swai as catfish. And so, this would

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

prevent the restaurants from doing so. And customers are paying for the fish believing that it is catfish."

Ives: "So, what about dogfish?"

Conyears-Ervin: "We just want to promote truth in labeling."

Ives: "I... I just can't believe that this is that big of a problem..."

Conyears-Ervin: "You know what..."

Ives: "But in the State of Illinois and honestly, you're going to have every single business now have to label their menus that this is authentically catfish."

Conyears-Ervin: "Do you eat catfish, Representative?"

Ives: "Yeah, I do. But I eat it from... I eat it in South Dakota where I grew up, when my brother-in-law puts it in a special batter and fries it up really well. And that's how I eat catfish."

Conyears-Ervin: "I can appreciate that."

Ives: "'Cause it came right out of the Missouri River. So, I like
 my catfish..."

Conyears-Ervin: "I do, too, Representative."

Ives: "...trust me, but I don't know that we really need to do
 this."

Conyears-Ervin: "And I can appreciate that you like catfish, Representative. I definitely like catfish, Representative. It's one of my favorite foods. So, I was very excited to take this Bill on because this is a concern of not only be... me, but many consumers around the state. Just to give you a little history, the Sponsor of this Bill is very concerned that many establishments throughout the state are mislabeling Asian Caught, Swai fish, as catfish on their menus. Not only does

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

- it taste different, but it also arrives at many establishments not having gone through adequate testing by the FDA."
- Speaker Lang: "Bring your... please bring your remarks to a close, Representative."
- Ives: "I certainly will. I'm not disregarding that perhaps this is an issue. I just think that the market can handle this. And that if you have enough people get on yelp and tell people that these guys are mislabeling catfish, these guys would be put out of business. And I think the market would be the pressure point here, but thank you for the Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Conyears-Ervin to close."
- Conyears-Ervin: "This is a very important topic. I know of no known opposition. And I would apprec... except the Representative over there who also eats catfish... I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who fish? Please record yourselves. Some people are afraid of catfish. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 82 voting 'yes', 23 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Leader Turner in the Chair."
- Speaker Turner: "Senate Bill 314, Representative Stuart. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 314, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Stuart."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

- Stuart: "Thank you, Speaker. This is Senate Bill 314. This Bill would require insurance companies to cover the costs of MRI screening in additional to mammography if a woman has dense breast tissue. Required coverage would be on the same schedule as mammography, so a baseline screening between the ages of 35 and 39 with an annual screening beginning at age 40. Exceptions in a case where a woman is at particularly high risk. It requires coverage for the MRI screening when the dense tissue is present. The dense tissue can make it more difficult to detect smaller tumors with traditional mammogram. So, the Bill passed the Senate unanimously. I'm open for questions. Would appreciate an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 314 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', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 314, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 320, Representative Drury. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 320, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Drury."

Drury: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 320 addresses what's become an embarrassing issue in the state dealing with children in the Department of Children and Family Services. It does two things. It adds a representative to the Child Death Review Team and a representative from the Department of

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Public Health. And more importantly, it makes the special Child Death Investigation Task Force in the southern region of our state a permanent task force as opposed to a temporary one. It's a very important Bill. It's a very timely Bill. And I ask for your 'aye' votes."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 320 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 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 320, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Hurley, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Hurley: "Mr. Speaker, I meant to vote 'yes' on Senate Bill 314."

Speaker Turner: "The Journal will reflect your request. Senate

Bill 322, 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 Bolin: "Senate Bill 322, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. The Bill was read for a second time previously.

No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Rita."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Rita."

Rita: "Thank... thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #1 is an established... a liquor establishment in my district that is already a liquor store. What they're doing is expanding and they needed to get this exemption for this... for them to do the expansion."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Speaker Turner: "Mr. Andersson, would you like to speak to the Floor Amendment? Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 322. 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 Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, please read Senate Bill 322... Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read Senate Bill 322 for a third time."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 322, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Harper."

Harper: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 322 is just clean-up language from a Bill we passed last year. It specifies the square footage of the building that we were referring to."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Andersson is recognized."

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

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

Andersson: "So, are we just doing what we typically do, which is when we need an exemption for an existing business that's too close to a religious institution?"

Harper: "Yes. This is the same thing."

Andersson: "Okay. But you're saying this is because it's one we already granted, but the square footage went up?"

Harper: "So, the square footage didn't go up. It was incorrect in the original Bill and we recorrected the lang... we corrected the number of square feet."

Andersson: "Oh, so, it's literally a typo?"

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Harper: "Yes, literally a typo."

Andersson: "Thank you very much."

Harper: "You're welcome."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Harper to close."

Harper: "I encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 322 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 100 voting 'yes', 11 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 322, having received Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Ford, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Ford: "Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry. Will the record please reflect that I intended to vote 'yes' for Senate Bill 314?"

Speaker Turner: "Journal will reflect your request,
Representative. Senate Bill 448, Representative Stuart. Mr.
Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 448, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Stuart."

Stuart: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill, 448, is an initiative of SIU, Southern Illinois University. The legislation would provide the School of Dental Medicine in Alton the authority necessary to create a faculty practice plan, which would allow faculty to form a partnership to treat and charge students. Under current law, SIU has the authority to create such a plan for the School of Medicine physicians and this Bill would

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

enable the School of Dentistry to do the same. The Bill... this Bill also passed the Senate unanimously. I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 448 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 448, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 611, Representative Ammons. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 611, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Ammons."

Ammons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 611 is entitled the Mahomet Aquifer Protection Task Force which creates a task force to protect the waterway system entitled the Mahomet Aquifer. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 611 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 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 611, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1444, Leader Lang. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1444, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. Today, we have an arbitration law regarding subrogation that makes arbitration mandatory but nonbinding. It's a waste of time for all people because it's nonbinding. And therefore, there's no opposition to a Bill to repeal the mandatory subrogation arbitration law. I ask your support."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Nekritz is recognized."

Nekritz: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Nekritz: "Representative, I was wondering if you could give us a detailed explanation of the subrogation law in the State of Illinois."

Lang: "Sure."

Nekritz: "Oh, sorry, never mind."

Lang: "Okay."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1444 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 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1444, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 641, Representative Burke. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 641, a Bill for an Act concerning animals. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Speaker Turner: "Representative Burke."

Burke, D.: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 641 is simply a local control Bill that would give counties throughout the state the option of using pet population fund money to conduct trap, neuter, spay, return programs. Be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Andersson is recognized."

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

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

Andersson: "It appears there's a large number of opponents and I just want to verify. Is that correct? The Environmental Council, the Ornithological Society, Wildlife Society. Is that correct?"

Burke, D.: "They may have indicated opposition, but they certainly didn't contact me."

Andersson: "Okay. Do you know... Do you have any idea what the basis for... I mean, there's... that's got to be a dozen. Lincoln Park Zoo, Sierra Club, Conservancy. No one has contacted you?"

Burke, D.: "Their concern is with regard to what the feral cat population would have on the bird population."

Andersson: "All righty. Thank you for that answer."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Wheeler is recognized."

Wheeler, B.: "Yeah. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. This was a program that we did in McHenry County. It was a pilot program. And I know that it was very well intended; however, with the pilot program in McHenry County along with the other programs, I think that's why the American Veterinary of Medicine is against it as well as the wildlife programs. It actually doesn't... there's no scientific data that says that

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

it reduces the feral cat population. I think in one of the journals... the wildlife journal wrote that it actually is... endangers the birds, so the audubon societies are against it as well. As well as trying to create this new creation of cat which is the feral cat. So, I lost this argument in the county. I assume I'll be losing it here in the state. But it subsidizes a program that I think, quite honestly, puts wildlife and wild birds at risk. So, I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Burke to close."

Burke, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm glad the previous question that was asked. Let me just give you an example. Sangamon County, for instance, has spayed and neutered approximately 33 thousand cats. As a result, their cat population has been reduced so much that their intakes are down by 47 percent and their euthanasia rate has been reduced by 75 percent. Let me put a dollar amount on that. The cost of euthanasia is about a hundred dollars. The cost of spaying and neutering is 25. This would be a se... a tremendous savings to counties throughout the state who would decide to do this. There is nothing that mandates these counties to utilize these spaying and neutering programs. It would give them total opportunity to engage and it is permissive across the board. I'd be... thank you for your consideration. Look forward to your 'aye' vote." Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 641 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? Members, please record yourself. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 73 voting 'yes', 37 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', Senate Bill 641, having

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 683, Representative Rita. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 683, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Rita."

Rita: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 683 is an initiative of the Illinois Insurance Guaranty Fund, basically does two things. It clarifies... it codifies current practice in terms of records and files and how it then would be turned over from the third party administrator. And it also, then makes a prior... clarifies the priority given under the Insurance Code to expenses being first. I'd be happy to answer any questions. There's no opposition that I'm aware of."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is 'Shall Senate Bill 683 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 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 683, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 707, Representative Breen. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill. Mr. Clerk, please move this Bill back to the Order of Second Reading and read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 707, a Bill for an Act concerning cyber security. The Bill was read for a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Breen."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Breen."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Breen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a... the underlying Bill is a Bill to require faster notice when you've got a breach of confidential data in the Illinois Government. The Amendment is to correct... because the original Bill that came over from the Senate specified particular committees in the House and Senate, and since every two years we get new committees, the Amendment would just take out the specific committees and instead just say generally the General Assembly."

Speaker Turner: "Gentleman moves for the... the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 707. 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 Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 707, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 707, a Bill for an Act concerning cyber security. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Breen."

Breen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, this is a Bill to require a faster notice, 72-hour notice to the Attorney General and to the relevant authority inside the State Government about data breaches. Again, it's an agreed Bill and something that both CMS and the ACLU support."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 707 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', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 707, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed.

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Senate Bill 771, Representative Soto. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill. Mr. Clerk, please move this Bill back to the Order of Second Reading and read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 771, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. The Bill was read for a second time previously.

No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 1 and 2 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Soto."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Soto on Floor Amendment #1."

Soto: "Yes. House Floor... thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. House Amendment #1, the underlying legislation extends the... the Illinois Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology Practice Act for the next 10 years from January 1, 2018 to January 2028. I ask for an 'aye' vote. Well, adopt first."

Speaker Turner: "Lady moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 771. 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 Bolin: "Floor Amendment #2 offered by Representative Soto."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Soto on Floor Amendment #2."

Soto: "It has an immediate effect... effective date."

Speaker Turner: "Lady moves for the adoption..."

Soto: "For the... for the..."

Speaker Turner: "Excuse me, Representative. I'm sorry. Lady moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 771. 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 Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, Senate Bill 771."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 771, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Soto."
- Soto: "Thank you. Yes. There's no opposition to this Bill. And I urge an 'aye' vote, please. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 771 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 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 771, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 852, Representative Zalewski. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill. Mr. Clerk, please move this Bill back to the Order of Second Reading and read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 852, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. The Bill was read for a second time previously.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Zalewski."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Zalewski."
- Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #2 shortens the amount of time of the extension from... to five years. I'd ask for its adoption."
- Speaker Turner: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 852. 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 Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read that Bill for a third time."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 852, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Zalewski."
- Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 852 extends a Live
 Theater Production Tax Credit. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Turner: "Gentleman moves for the... the adoption of... excuse me, excuse me... Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 852 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 97 voting 'yes', 15 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 852, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 864, Representative Davidsmeyer. Out of the record. Senate Bill 865, Representative Mitchell. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 865, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Mitchell."
- Mitchell, C.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, this is a Bill that would say on the statewide report card that we do that we would just have as a line item the amount of payment that goes from the state to Teachers Retirement System every year at the request of Representative Pritchard as well as the agreement... Gentleman Mr. Manar in the Senate. It also includes the state contribution to the Chicago Teachers' Pension Fund

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

and health care for CPS employees. I know of no opposition. I look forward to questions."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Andersson is recognized."

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

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

Andersson: "Thank you. I don't have very exciting questions. I just wanted to verify. With the Amendment, it sounds like you satisfied our caucus as to the concerns?"

Mitchell, C.: "That's my understanding, Sir."

Andersson: "And again, no opposition otherwise?"

Mitchell, C.: "Not that I know of, Sir."

Andersson: "Thank you for your cooperation on that."

Mitchell, C.: "Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Ives is recognized."

Ives: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. So, a more appropriate Bill would actually say that all pension contributions are reported on the school report card so that everybody understands exactly what is being paid in that particular school district for pensions. In this case, make no mistake about it, the only thing that the Chicago Public School at this time has to report on the report card is what the state contributes so their taxpayers aren't going to really understand the amount that is being allocated towards pensions for that district, and it's an enormous amount this year. It's going to be upwards of \$730 million, roughly 1900 per child expense. And actually, that may even be a better way to report it is on a per student basis so that people really understood how outrageous these pension costs have become."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Speaker Turner: "Representative Mitchell to close."

Mitchell, C.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 865 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 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 865, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 885, Representative Gordon-Booth. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 885, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Gordon-Booth."

Gordon-Booth: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 885 is a piece of legislation that I've worked on for the last couple of months. We were able to move opposition from the Rental Property Association. We worked with the Illinois State Bar Association, the AG's Office, IDPFR as well as the Realtors and we moved... we have removed all opposition from this legislation. In the aftermath of the foreclosure crisis, there has been a resurgence of rent-to-own housing opportunities, also known as contract-for-deed. Promising homeowners... promising home ownership to people who generally are not in a financial position to buy a home through securing a mortgage. Rent-to-own contracts are only minimally regulated under Illinois Law and are prone to contain misleading and/or fair... and unfair contract terms even worse some sellers of rent-to-own homes have a business model based

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

on predatory practices that turn a series of consumers through unsustainable agreements that quickly lead to default. These predatory lending practices are oftentimes very much so targeted at poor, low-income, black and brown communities. This... this... these contract for deeds are seeing a resurgence in many communities throughout Chicago and Peoria and Rockford and East St. Louis. And I'm open for your questions. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Andersson."

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

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

Andersson: "Thank you. Representative, we went through this. We had a very good discussion, I think, in Jud-Civ. I guess I actually don't have a question for you. I just want to rise in support of the Bill. One of the things that we discussed in Jud-Civ was the fact that in my district this does not appear to be a problem, does not appear to be ripe for abuse. But you very clearly pointed out that there are other parts of the state that don't exactly look like my district. And I wanted to just rise and fully support you and we have to recognize that diversity in our state and that there are problems that we don't all experience. And I'm glad you brought the Bill; I'm glad you educated me on it. And I'm fully in support of your Bill. Thank you."

Gordon-Booth: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Breen."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Breen: "Thank you. Representative, I just... to Representative Andersson's point... I mean, we're talking about folks that are dealing with, you know, \$30 thousand properties, right?"

Gordon-Booth: "Yes."

Breen: "I mean, so this is in a... I mean, all of these requirements that you're putting here should be in a standard contract to this... of this type?"

Gordon-Booth: "Yes, absolutely."

Breen: "Yeah. And there are computer programs that easily can generate these contracts, right?"

Gordon-Booth: "Yes."

Breen: "Sure. And I... and I want to thank you for your efforts and all the good work on the third Amendment, you know, the second Amendment, first Amendment, all of that just to get this through and get all the opposition lifted. So, thank you."

Gordon-Booth: "I appreciate that."

Speaker Turner: "Representative McDermed is recognized."

McDermed: "Thank you. To the Bill. When I read the article in March in the Chicago Reader about how this outrageous practice has reared its ugly head in our state in the wake of the reforms in the mortgage industry that have made mortgages less available and offered the opportunity for these predators to work in communities where mortgages really are no longer available, I wanted to make sure that there was a Bill out there to deal with this. So, I went looking around to make sure that someone had filed this Bill and was thrilled to discover that you, Representative Gordon-Booth, had brought this Bill. And I was very eager to sign on as a chief co. One of the things I did for so many years was travel

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

around the country talking about compliance with law. So, when I see such outrageous noncompliance with laws, it... it brings back all of my instincts, my compliance instincts, and I have to rush in and solve this problem. So, thank you very much for bringing this Bill. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Riley is recognized."

Riley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And to the Bill. I remember some of the problems that occurred in Chicago and I guess some, maybe a few of us oldtimers will remember the old contract buying league in the City of Chicago and what it did to devastate communities. It seems like sometimes with some issues the more things change the more they stay the same. They were all kind of safeguards that were put in place, but now we see the same similar kinds of situations occurring. So, I would congratulate Leader Gordon-Booth on this Bill and all of the cosponsors. We have to be diligent, you know, to be sure that fairness is applied to people who want to buy a home or even rent because, again, there's just a really bad history of these kind of things happening. So, thank you very much for your Bill. And I'm going to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Gordon-Booth to close."

Gordon-Booth: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just simply put, I will add... first, I'd like to, thank the bipartisan cooperation that we've been able to attain on this Bill. But I'll close simply by saying, when someone is living in despair, you typically also have someone making a killing off of the fact that people are living in despair. I... I'm... it warms me to see that there is an understanding particularly on this issue that regulations and reforms need to be put in place to

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

provide consumer protections for people who are oftentimes merely just looking to submit themselves and their family in a place to call their own. We're looking to provide consumer protections. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 885 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 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 885, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1261, Representative Kifowit. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1261, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Kifowit."

Kifowit: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1261 broaches the subject matter of companion animal in divorce proceeding."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1261 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 109 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1261, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Demmer, for what reason do you rise?"

Demmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please excuse Representative Andersson for the remainder of the day."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative. Representative Gordon-Booth, for what reason do you seek recognition? Senate Bill 1290, Representative Long. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1304, Representative Willis. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1304, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Willis."

Willis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is an initiative of the Associated Fire Fighters of Illinois. Long-standing the General Assembly has recognized the importance of training in the fire service. We have put forth minimal training standards for our firefighters. And now, what we're doing is we're looking forward to making sure that we have minimal standards for our fire chiefs. We have put this in place to make sure that those that lead the fire service have the basic minimal requirements. We're asking that they have a Firefighter II Certification from the State Fire Marshal Office, associate degree from the fire service or a bachelor's degree or 10 years of minimal fire service. This will not take effect and put any current fire chiefs out of things that we are grandfathering in our current fire chiefs, but we are asking for recognition of the professionalism of there. I do urge an 'aye' vote. And I am willing to take any questions."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Breen."

Breen: "The Sponsor yield?"

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

Breen: "Representative, I'm confused. I appreciate the 10 years' experience as a firefighter being a way around the basic

58th Legislative Day

- certification, but why is it limited to 10 years' experience as a firefighter at the Department of Fire Protection District and only the Fire Protection District in the jurisdiction making the appointment?"
- Willis: "The reason behind that is each department has a different set of standard operating procedures. So, if you are not going to be going for the professional training, we feel that if you've come up through the ranks, you learn the actual procedures in that department."
- Breen: "And then help me on the… you've got two ways of getting this… this path, the State Fire Marshal Basic Certification, Firefighter II, I mean, all of these other certifications. How prevalent are those certifications within our fire service?"
- Willis: "Almost anybody that's been in the fire... in the fire service for more than 5 years has a Firefighter II."
- Breen: "But now they, again, just by... they need a Firefighter II..."
- Willis: "And the firefighter... or the Fire Officer I and II. My husband had those done within the first 10 years, so most people that are... certainly looking to going up through there, they are doing it. The Fire Marshal's Office do... does that training on a regular basis."
- Breen: "And obviously, I... I know your husband well, being a retired member of my Lombard Fire Department. But... and then there's also a requirement for an associate's degree in fire science or a bachelor's degree. Is the bachelor's degree required to be in fire science or it's generally a bachelor's degree?"

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

- Willis: "I'm sorry. I didn't hear the full... thing of your question?"
- Breen: "And I'm sorry. I got... I got tapped on the shoulder just to start challenging your Bills. So, I just am kind of trying... figure out exactly what it does. So, is the requirement for the degree, is that an associate's degree in fire science or a bachelor's degree in fire science..."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative, please make your final remarks."
- Breen: "I'm sorry. And Mr. Speaker, not that I want to go long,
 I would just move for Standard Debate just so I can finish my
 questioning."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing the requisite number of hands, this Bill will be moved to Standard Debate."
- Breen: "Thank you."
- Willis: "It is an associate's degree in fire science or any bachelor's degree."
- Breen: "Okay. And then I see the opponents to this Bill include the Illinois Municipal League, DuPage... DuPage Mayors and Managers, Fire Chief, EMS, Committee and the Illinois Fire Chiefs themselves."
- Willis: "Actually, I do not have those opponents listed. And my understanding are the Fire Chiefs are neutral on it. They actually worked with the Bill Sponsors to come up with agreed language."
- Breen: "All right. And again, they're still listed as opposed along with all of the… I mean, we got Northwestern Municipal, South Suburban Municipal..."

Willis: "I do..."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Breen: "...St. Louis, Hillsdale, Frankfort, a bunch of folks opposed on our analysis."

Willis: "I don't have that on my list, so I am not familiar with what their opposition is."

Breen: "Fair enough."

Willis: "The... the fire chiefs... I said we went... we... they agreed to being no position on it, the fire chiefs."

Breen: "Okay. And to the Bill. Again, I appreciate the... the Gentlelady's desire to ensure that our fire chiefs are properly trained, but normally, if you're going to get that appointment, you're not getting that appointment because you are unqualified. So, and... and certainly, if you've got 10 years of experience at the Villa Park Fire Department, it would seem you'd be familiar enough with the Lombard Fire Department to be able to take over if... if the village decided to put you in that spot. And so, I would respect the opposition of the Municipal League and the other cogs that have all said, hey, we're not appointing incompetent fire chiefs. And so, for that reason, in order to allow them to do the good work of the fire service, I respectfully urge a 'no' vote and to continue to work on the Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative McCombie is recognized."

McCombie: "Thank you, Speaker. To the Bill. I think this is a great Bill. Actually, as also another wife of a firefighter, a couple of the questions that were previously asked about the jurisdiction. A big thing would hap... a big change would be if you're in rural districts compared to, let's say, a municipality of 30 thousand people, they run their fire departments very differently. So, I think the 10 years is a

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

very fair statement on that. And people... to, the Representative who spoke prior to me, there are people that do not have fire experience being appointed to these positions. As much as I love the IML, I get it as a mayor because I, as a mayor, appoint my fire chief and my police chief at my leisure. And they do not have to be necessarily have any sort of experience, but they are approved by the council. So, the council can, you know, vote me down. To the Bill. I think this is a great Bill. It's a... safety is a huge concern and I think that we need to support the... that somebody is put into... into these positions regardless if you have a department of 30 volunteers or 30 full-time folks. So, please, support this Bill and overall safety of our communities. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Willis to close."

Willis: "I couldn't have said it more eloquently than the previous speaker, so thank you very much. Bottom line is we want to make sure that we maintain the level of professionalism in the service. This is something that I think is not going to put anybody out of work and is going to make our men and women that are in the fire service safer. I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1304 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 85 voting 'yes', 25 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present',
Senate Bill 1304, having received the Constitutional

58th Legislative Day

- Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1319, Representative Spain. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1319, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third..."
- Speaker Turner: "Excuse me, Representative. Can we take this Bill out of the record really quick? Thank you. Representative Demmer is recognized."
- Demmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please excuse Representative Brady for the remainder of the day."
- Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative. Mr. Clerk, Senate Bill 1319, Representative Spain. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1319, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Spain."
- Spain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1319 is an initiative of the Department on Aging. And it simply allows courts the opportunity to use video conferencing for testimony for adult guardianship hearings. There are no opponents to the Bill. I urge an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1319 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', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1319, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Senate Bill 1449, can you please move that Bill back to the Order of Second Reading and read the Bill? Mr. Clerk,

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Senate Bill 1449. Senate Bill 1479, Representative Tabares. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1479, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Tabares."

Tabares: "This Bill is an initiative of the Illinois State Board of Election and it just allows election authorities to conduct grace-period registration and changes of address at nursing homes, hospitals and other facilities when they conduct voting the weekend before an election as required by the Election Code. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative McDermed is recognized."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

McDermed: "Representative, in committee, I believe it was... was it not pretty clear that this is to cover a gap in the current election law that doesn't currently permit election authorities to go into these certain specific named places of residence for some of our Illinois voters?"

Tabares: "Yes, that's correct. So, currently, if a person moves into a nursing home or a hospital or other facility during the 27 days prior to election, they must vote at their old address. And what this Bill does is that it allows the local election authority to register and/or update the addresses of persons who have moved to the facility within that 27-day window, so they can vote when the election authority comes to the facility the weekend before an election."

McDermed: "So, this is basically... to the Bill. This is basically filling in a gap that the Election Board realized exists in

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

our current law. We should provide this facility to folks who have recently moved into these particular homes. And I do urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Ives is recognized."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Ives: "So, currently, you have residency requirements to vote in a particular place and... but we also have same-day registration, same day voting. So, I don't know that we even need to do what this Bill's intending to do when you have same-day voter registration, same-day voting. Other than, are you clarifying a residency issue? Could you answer that guestion?"

Tabares: "Sorry. It's a little bit loud in here, Mr. Speaker.

Just wanted to..."

Speaker Turner: "Members, can we please bring the noise level down in the chamber. Thank you."

Ives: "Well, we've made it more than... we've made voting very easy to do in the State of Illinois. You can do same-day registration, same-day voting. So, I don't know why we need this particular Bill?"

Tabares: "So, the answer to your question is the Election Code requires election authorities go to nursing homes, hospitals, and other facilities. And what I mean by other facilities is, for example, veterans' homes, hospitals, nursing homes, mental health, rehabilitation facilities, intermediate..."

Ives: "Okay."

Tabares: "...care facilities for persons with developmental disabilities. So, what..."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Ives: "So, can't they register then to vote and vote all in the same day? Why do you need grace-period registration for them when you can same-day vote, same-day register?"

Tabares: "So... so, this is for people who are physically incapacitated who cannot..."

Ives: "I understand that, but I don't think that our law limited
 it to anybody who wasn't..."

Tabares: "Incapa..."

Ives: "...physically handicapped or were elderly. It didn't matter
 as long as you were a qualified voter, you could same-day
 register, same-day vote."

Tabares: "So, currently, right now the election authority cannot register people as of right now."

Ives: "Okay. Thanks."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Fortner."

Fortner: "Thank you, Speaker. To the Bill. In response to the debate that just preceded, what we heard in committee this is an initiative of the State Board of Election. And the issue is that we will have people who find themselves in the period, in the few weeks before an election, moving to a nursing home or veterans' care or some... or hospital, some other facility where because of their condition they would not be eligible for... to vote at their home address or their home precinct. We come in there; we offer grace-period voting. All this does, and it's really a very small number of people... 'cause it's really just people who have moved to a facility during the grace period... that we would need to make sure have the access to vote and this just gives them that ability. That's all it does. I urge an 'aye' vote."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Speaker Turner: "Representative Tabares to close."

Tabares: "Ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

- Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1479 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 103 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1479, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed.

 Representative Bryant, for what reason do you rise?"
- Bryant: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would you let the record reflect that it was my intention to vote 'yes' on Senate Bill 1304?"
- Speaker Turner: "The record will reflect your request,
 Representative. On page 10 of the Calendar, under Senate Bills
 on Second Reading, we have Senate Bill 58, Representative
 Stratton. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 58, a Bill for an Act concerning law enforcement officers. The Bill was read for a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Mr. Mr. Clerk, Senate Bill 58.

 Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 58, a Bill for an Act concerning law enforcement officers. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Stratton."
- Stratton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 58 clarifies that drug testing and alcohol testing would take place after an officer involved shooting causing injury or death to a person. The Bill unanimously passed out of the

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Senate. And there are no known opponents. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Breen."

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

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

Breen: "Representative, I see that this particular Bill came out of committee 8 to 5. So, it looks like it was on partisan lines. And it appears to be opposed by the Chiefs of Police. Now, what... what is the reason for their opposition?"

Stratton: "Thank you for that question. It was originally opposed by the Chiefs of Police, and after that, I had some of my colleagues from the other side of the aisle ask me to clarify that. I talked with John Milner from the Illinois Association of Chiefs of Police. They have removed their opposition and are neutral. They were concerned that the Bill applied under any type of officer involved shooting. I clarified that the Bill specifically states it's only relating to the shooting of a... or injury of a person. And they said because of that, they have removed their opposition."

Breen: "Okay. To... So, just to be clear, you as the Sponsor, that...
that is the meaning of this language here. We are not talking
about shooting on the range or shooting an injured animal.
Those do not count under this Bill?"

Stratton: "Correct."

Breen: "Okay. Just a human being?"

Stratton: "Just a human being and it says person or persons in the actual language of the Bill."

Breen: "Good deal. Thank you so much."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Stratton: "You're welcome."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Stratton to close."

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

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 58 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote '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 a count of 105 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', Senate Bill 58, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Senate Bill 262, Representative Davis. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 262, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. The Bill was read for a second time previously.

No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Davis."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Davis."

Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move for the adoption of House Floor Amendment #1. House Floor Amendment #1 is a page and line Amendment that a) clarifies that nonconstruction solicitations that include b) the participation goals must require bidders and offenders to include utilization plans instead of requiring the agency solicitation to include a utilization plan. Provides that CMS shall report to the BEP Council on all nonconstruction awards that exceed \$20 million instead of reporting prior... instead or reporting prior to contract award which would violate the Procurement Code. Allows a chief procurement officer to bar or allows him the ability to bar a telecom or communications company from bidding on state contracts for failure to file a supplier

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

diversity report instead of requiring an automatic bar for such failure and makes other technical changes to specify that when agencies and universities are reviewing their contracts to ensure that BEP goals are met. These are the contract goals and makes a grammatical... other grammatical and drafting corrections. I'd be more than try to happy... answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Breen."

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

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

Breen: "Representative, I just... I'm looking at the numerous changes here. What was the core impetus for the Bill itself?"

Davis: "For... you mean the... for the Bill?"

Breen: "Why was the Bill brought in the first place?"

Davis: "Well, I think, particularly in the telecom industry, the idea was to create some level of transparency as it relates to companies and them filing utilization plans. So, that way we would know exactly who actually they put on the contracts versus them saying I have participation and maybe even using a company initially as part of their bid, but actually never utilizing that company."

Breen: "Okay. And then do you know of any opposition now that the Bill has been amended?"

Davis: "Not that I'm aware of."

Breen: "Okay. And what did the Amendment do just to obviate the opposition?"

Davis: "Well, I think one of the challenges or one of the things that it did, maybe the... if there was opposition, is it monitored the CPOs. So, originally, the Bill would..."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Breen: "Oh..."

Davis: "I'm sorry. Originally, the Bill would suggest that if a company doesn't file a utilization plan within a specified period of time that they could be barred from participation or that they would be barred, excuse me. It was a 'shall'. They 'shall' be barred. So, I think there was a little conflict, if you will, there. And so, what the change does, is give that discretion to the CPO to be able to make that declaration that a company should or could be barred from participation in future contracts."

Breen: "Good deal. Thank you so much for the answers to the questions."

Davis: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Morrison is recognized."

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

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

Morrison: "Representative, we debated a Bill earlier this week, 1785. I mean, in your Bill, how do you define 'woman'?"

Davis: "Did you say it was my Bill we debated?"

Morrison: "No, no, no. I'm just saying that the question is now, in the chamber, and I would just ask, how do you define 'woman'?"

Davis: "Is that a loaded question?"

Morrison: "Can you answer that?"

Davis: "How do you define 'women'?"

Morrison: "Right."

Davis: "I guess however it's defined in BEP Act. It's the same definition we use in this case."

Morrison: "I know. But are you using sex or gender?"

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Davis: "Forgive me, Representative. What's the difference?"

Morrison: "What's the difference?"

Davis: "Explain it to me, please."

Morrison: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. This Body is creating a lot of unnecessary confusion. And I'll listen to the debate. It's interesting that the Sponsor could not answer the question."

Speaker Turner: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 262. All in favor say 'ayes'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

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

Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, Senate Bill 262."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 262, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Davis."

Davis: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. To the previous speaker, I'm told that we're not changing the definition. We're just changing the word from 'female' to 'women'. Not changing the definition of who or what that is. So, I'm not quite sure what the previous speaker was getting at. I asked him to explain it to me. And as much as he said I couldn't answer the question, apparently he couldn't either. So, thank you very much, Ladies and Gentlemen. I ask for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Breen is recognized."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor indicates he will yield."

Davis: "I thought I was closing?"

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Breen: "Representative, that is quite a suit, by the way. I was...

we were just commenting. It is a lovely suit on you. I

couldn't wear a suit like that, so kudos to you."

Davis: "Actually... actually you could."

Breen: "It would wash me out very terribly."

Davis: "It's just a suit. It's just a suit."

Breen: "It would wash me out pretty terribly."

Davis: "Put it on one pant leg at a time."

Breen: "Oh, no. Hey, that's all... No, it's the color. It's..."

Davis: "The vest, the jacket."

Breen: "You just... you..."

Davis: "It works."

Breen: "You're doing a very lovely job there sartorially. Thank you again for working with everybody on this. I know at a time when we're all kind of at each other's throats and we're coming to the end of the Session, it's good to know we can still engage regular order and do our business back and forth on kind of the regular Bills that are not... you know, they're not partisan ones, get that done. And then we can go back to beating each other over the head on the other Bills. So, thank you."

Davis: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Davis to close."

Davis: "I ask for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 262 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting
is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record.
On a count of 110 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting

58th Legislative Day

- 'present', Senate Bill 262, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Stratton, for what reason do you rise?"
- Stratton: "Point of personal privilege. In going back to Senate Bill 58, the Senate Sponsor, Senator Hunter, my Senator is also here. And in the excitement, I did not vote for Senate Bill 58. And I would like to be an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Turner: "The Journal will reflect your request.

 Representative Hays, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Hays: "It was my intention on Senate Bill 1304 to vote 'yes'."
- Speaker Turner: "The record will reflect your request. Senate Bill 266, Representative McAuliffe. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 266, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. The Bill was read for a second time previously.

 No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative McAuliffe."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative McAuliffe on Floor Amendment #1."

 McAuliffe: "Floor Amendment #1 is a technical change. It would

 provide that the Illinois Veterans' Home shall be known as

 the Veterans' Home Fund for... will be called the Veteran's

 Home Fund."
- Speaker Turner: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 266. 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 Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."

58th Legislative Day

- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read that Bill for a third time."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 266, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Senate... Representative McAuliffe."
- McAuliffe: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We're fortunate enough to have a Chicago Veterans' Home finally in the City of Chicago. There's four veterans' homes throughout the state. Now, all five of them will have... will be trusted into the same Fund Home. And I'd be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 266 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', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 266, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 315, Representative Conroy. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 315, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. The Bill was read for a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please Senate Bill 315."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 315, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Conroy."

58th Legislative Day

- Conroy: "Thank you, Speaker. This Bill would require an individual to have a FOID card in order to buy prepackaged explosive components. This is aimed to regulate the use of Tannerite, a compound that is most often used in target practice. An explosion is created when Tannerite targets... target is hit with a bullet. Ask for your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Members. Representative Breen is recognized."
- Breen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Turner: "Sponsor indicates that she will yield."
- Breen: "Thank you. Representative, I just... I know you mentioned Tannerite. Can you help us? What is Tannerite?"
- Conroy: "Representative, it's two components: aluminum and a magnesium-based compound. When they're combined together and then a bullet is shot at it, it creates a huge explosion and people have lost their lives because of it."
- Breen: "Okay, we're on the clock, so I'm not going to ask you the prevalence of Tannerite in Villa Park, but... we're not outlawing Tannerite with this Bill, correct?"
- Conroy: "No. You just are required to have a FOID card to possess it, legally."
- Breen: "Okay. And I know there had been some early concerns that your Bill may have inadvertently been banning fireworks or something like that. Can you speak to those concerns?"
- Conroy: "This... Representative, this is a very specific combination and is used for this purpose. It does not... it's not fireworks."
- Breen: "Okay. And just so that I'm clear though, you're... really, the only thing you're looking at that these are... as I

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

understand it, they are federally regulated substances that are explosive devices under Federal Law, not... not including things that are, again, like... like fireworks and other items like that?"

Conroy: "I'm sorry, Representative? Was that a question? I couldn't hear you."

Breen: "So, Representative, yeah. Here's what I'm trying to do.

I know there is somewhere in your Bill where you actually clarify this. And I believe you have a reference to federal statute. Can you point it out? Because there's a concern still. I know it's in there 'cause I think I checked it when we were going through committee."

Conroy: "Okay. Representative, page 21, line... starting at line 10. For the purpose of this Section, prepackaged explosive components means a prepackaged product containing two or more unmixed, chemically manufactured chemical substances that are not independently classified as explosives, but which are mixed or combined... but when are mixed or combined result in an explosive material subject to regulation by the Federal Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms... explosives."

Breen: "And as I understand it, as I reviewed 27 CFR Part 555 which you're specifically incorporating in the Bill, those are really, truly explosives not more innocent devices. And that's your intent, correct?"

Conroy: "Correct."

Breen: "Thank you. I believe there may be some other folks from districts where they actually use Tannerite, where it's legal, so I will yield to those folks at this time. Thank you for the answers to the questions."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Ives."

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

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

Ives: "Representative Conroy, in your discussion of this Bill you essentially said that you would use this Tannerite with the use of a weapon. You would fire the weapon at it and it explodes. Is that correct?"

Conroy: "The purpose of this Bill is because it has been being used in... during target practice to create a large explosive..."

Ives: "Okay. How..."

Conroy: "...explosion."

Ives: "...Is Tannerite used for any other thing other than... that you know of... that is inappropriate, is there any other use for it otherwise?"

Conroy: "Representative, when there's an oil spill, they will fill the oil with this component and then set it on fire."

Ives: "Okay."

Conroy: "To eliminate the oil spill."

Ives: "Okay. So, what you're most concerned about though is the fact that it may be used to... with a weapon?"

Conroy: "That it's being used without a FOID card during target practice to create a large explosion which has cost people their lives."

Ives: "Okay. But so... now, I'm a FOID card holder. I also..."

Conroy: "So, if you would like... if you would like to use

Ives: "I know."

Conroy: "...you can do it legally."

58th Legislative Day

- Ives: "So, and I also have a concealed carry license now. So, my point is, is that I can't buy a weapon, I can't buy bullets for that weapon unless I have an Illinois FOID card. So, I don't know why we need this Bill because if I'm firing a weapon, exploding a bullet through some Tannerite, I already have a FOID card otherwise I'm in violation of Illinois Law because the whole purpose of the FOID card is about the weapon and the bullet, which apparently your Bill is trying to say is a problem when used with Tanne... Tannerite. And the truth is, is that you have to have a FOID card for one to happen to two."
- Conroy: "Representative, I would argue that if you have a FOID card you can have this legally, so I don't understand what your opposition is."
- Ives: "Well, that's my point is that the Bill is meaningless 'cause if... if your concern is that somebody is using a weapon, firing a bullet at the Tannerite that person would be in violation of Illinois Law if they didn't already have a FOID card. So, I don't see the problem with... I don't see the necess... the need for this Bill. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. Just as I explained before, the concern here is that somebody is using a weapon to fire at the Tannerite. Well, if that person is getting the Tannerite, they... and they're using a weapon to explode it, then they... they would be out of compliance with Illinois Law if they didn't have a FOID card to begin with. So, more than likely, this is really a Bill that is unnecessary. I'd vote 'no'."
- Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognized Representative Chapa LaVia."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Chapa LaVia: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

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

Chapa LaVia: "Representative, who... who's the genesis of this Bill?"

Conroy: "Representative Morrison."

Chapa LaVia: "And... and who brought it to him, do you know?"

Conroy: "To her?"

Chapa LaVia: "Or her, I'm sorry."

Conroy: "This was her initiative because there have been deaths that she was aware of. And this is to try to prevent more deaths."

Chapa LaVia: "Okay. And I see... who's one of the main proponents of the legislation? Is it the Illinois Association of Chiefs of Police?"

Conroy: "Yes, it is. I'm sorry."

Chapa LaVia: "Okay. I think it's a fine piece of legislation. I think that law enforcement knows what they're doing. And I... I strongly urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Conroy to close."

Conroy: "Thank you, Speaker. I think this is an important Bill that will create more safety and regulations and prevent deaths. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 315 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 61 voting 'yes', 50 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 315, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed.

58th Legislative Day

- Representative Flowers, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Flowers: "Mr. Speaker, I was trying to get your attention to let you know that my button was stuck and I could not vote. And had I been able to do so, I would have voted 'yes'. And the Clerks in the well know that my button is stuck and they're going to fix it tomorrow. So, just in case, please wait until I say okay. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative, we'll get someone over there to help you with that. Thank you very much."
- Flowers: "Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Swanson, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Swanson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My button didn't stick; it's all on me. I meant to vote 'yes' on 266, Senate Bill 266."
- Speaker Turner: "The record will reflect your quest... request, Representative. Representative Moylan, for what reason do you seek recognition? Not seeking recognition. Thank you. Senate Bill 318, Representative Ammons. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 318, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. The Bill was read for a second time previously.

 No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, Senate Bill 318."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 318, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Ammons."

58th Legislative Day

- Ammons: "Thank you. Senate Bill 318 is a Bill to prevent employers from requiring employees to provide personal genetic information in relationship to employment. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 318 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 109 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 318, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Ford, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Ford: "Mr. Speaker, did Representative Flowers tell you that it was okay to call the vote?"
- Speaker Turner: "I did wait for her acknowledgement, Representative. Senate Bill 325, Representative Mussman. No running, Representative. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 325, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. The Bill was read for a second time previously.

 No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, Senate Bill 325."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 325, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Mussman."
- Mussman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. So, this Bill is identical to House Bill 1811, which you already voted on and passed unanimously earlier in the Session. It

58th Legislative Day

- simply extends the Deaf Licensure Act for another 10 years. I'm happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 325 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 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 325, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 326, Representative Feigenholtz. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 326, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. The Bill was read for a second time previously.

 No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Feigenholtz."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Feigenholtz."
- Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #1 is just a clarification about written documentation showing continuing education."
- Speaker Turner: "The Lady moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 326. 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 Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, Senate Bill 326. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 326, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Feigenholtz."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Feigenholtz: "Thank you. Ladies and Gentleman of the House, this is a Bill that increases professionalism and... of the interior designers. It makes technical changes. And I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Breen."

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

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

Breen: "Representative, it is... is it correct that the Interior Design Act is a mere title protection?"

Feigenholtz: "Correct, yes."

Breen: "And then is it correct that any interior designer currently can practice interior design without registering with the Department of Professional Regulation?"

Feigenholtz: "Interior Design Act is under the Architects Act.

And..."

Breen: "But currently, an interior designer can practice interior design without registering in Illinois?"

Feigenholtz: "I believe they can, yes."

Breen: "Okay. And then so, the only folks that are getting the...
the... there's only... the only benefit of registering with the
department now is that you get to call yourself a 'registered
interior designer', correct?"

Feigenholtz: "Well, this... this Bill involves... there are a few other elements to it, Representative Breen. In committee, we discussed their relationship with architects. Their desire to define their profession like many other professions in the state and be included in the Mechanics Lien Act. We had extensive conversations about that and to be taken seriously."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Breen: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move for Standard Debate."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing the requisite amount of hands, this move...
this Bill will be moved to the Order of Standard Debate."

Breen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just continuing, Representative, I know there... there are a couple of moving parts in this Bill, but IDFPR would now have to administer a continuing education requirement for those who wish to voluntarily come to them and be registered as... registered interior designers. Now, that's one part of your Bill, correct?"

Feigenholtz: "They do that with many other licensed professionals, Representative Breen."

Breen: "Right. But right now this is a title protection. It's not a... they call it a title protection. The idea is it's a mere piece of paper. They don't actually regulate the profession in terms of regulating standards like they do for many of those other areas of practice?"

Feigenholtz: "If... was that a question? I'm... I'm not sure."

Breen: "Well, I'll continue. So, the... but again, just if we pass this Bill, IDFPR is going to have to establish continuing education provider application approval process, regulation of providers. They're going to have to do random audits of licensees to make sure that they did their continuing education as they've certified. And actually, then, begin doing disciplinary cases and proceedings for continuing education violations. Is that... is that a correct assessment of this Bill?"

Feigenholtz: "Yeah. They do... they do this... they do auditing and it's very random. I believe that this is the license that will renew every two years. Unlike any other professional

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

license, every… every license ach… tries to achieve across neutrality at IDFPR. I think that that's just how they do business is how every license…"

Breen: "So, this will need a few increase, then?"

Feigenholtz: "The fees are established at IDFPR by administrative rule. I believe that there's only one profession with a codified fee in statute."

Breen: "Okay. But this will require a fee increase in order to cover these extra costs by the IDFPR, correct?"

Feigenholtz: "They were not clear on that. They weren't clear on many things, but it would be... it would be the profession trying to professionalize themselves. Ladies and Gentlemen, 90 percent of the interior designers are women-owned businesses trying to establish professionalism in their profession when they work in buildings, just like this, to... you know, they work with architects and they are trying to define their profession and pay for these licenses themselves."

Breen: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. The Department of Professional Regulation really was stuck with this Bill because on the one hand we want these folks to just merely have a piece of paper. We don't want the department to regulate the practice of interior design, but we turn around and we want the department to then become experts in providing continuing education, registration, and all these other things and then to start doing audits of professionals that they don't actually regulate. So, then do disciplinary proceedings on professionals they don't actually regulate on licenses that don't have to be obtained to do the actual practice. And

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

they've got no money for it. And so, at that point, the department had opposed this Bill merely because of the administrative burden and the fact there's going to be this uncertain fee increase. As the Sponsor has said, you know, and 90 percent of the practitioners of this... of this field are women and so, we're going to sit here and put another burden by an increased fee on those who want to be registered interior designers, an increased fee on these folks at this time, again, when we don't have the capability within the department to do this and we don't have the money to do it. And so, respectfully, we would oppose... urge an opposition here if only for the IDFPR's opposition. And then, I know there are others that are going to speak to the other parts of the Bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Wheeler."

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

- Wheeler, K.: "Representative, I know you mentioned in the earlier part of the debate that this fee will be set by rule. Is there a range that you would expect this fee to come in at?"
- Feigenholtz: "I think it depends on how many... I think it's determined on what the cost is and that cost is divided among the number of applicants that actually register just like any other profession at IDFPR. It pays... the fee pays for itself."
- Wheeler, K.: "Well, I understand. I'm... I'm just trying to get a sense of if I were a... an interior designer what would my... my situation be if I was just getting started."
- Feigenholtz: "Yeah. The... interior design profession is more than happy to pay it. That is what they have told me. They want to

58th Legislative Day

- define themselves in statute as a professional organi... organization. And they want to be part of... considered professional."
- Wheeler, K.: "Well, I... I'm sure that the association are the ones who are part of that may be interested in that, others may not... not agree with that. I was told the figure could be as high as four to five hundred dollars for this registration. That would be a pretty substantial fee. Would you agree?"
- Feigenholtz: "No, I won't, as a matter of fact. I don't know where you got that number from and that is... that never came up."
- Wheeler, K.: "I got that from the department under a very short discussion."
- Feigenholtz: "Like I said, the interior design profession is more than willing to pay a fee just like any other profession at IDFPR. And it will not be any additional burden on the department. They're already doing audits for landscapers, who are also protected title. It does not cost any additional money."
- Wheeler, K.: "Well, that's of issue at least of the word cost because someone's going to pay the fees. They're also going to pay for the administration and the regulation and the auditing of these particular interior designers. With that, I'm going to go to the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is another poor precedent that we set in Illinois by requiring a licensure, a fee. These are barriers to entry for people who want to get involved in a profession that they're interested, that they're probably very good at. Every time we do this we slow people down from getting involved in something

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

that's productive in this state. With that, I urge the Body to vote 'no'. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Reick."

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

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

Reick: "The IDFPR is tasked with protecting the public interest from unscrupulous contractors and practitioners of the fine, shall we say, legal arts. Is that correct?"

Feigenholtz: "I'm sorry. Can you repeat the question?"

Reick: "The IDFPR is tasked with protecting the public interest from unscrupulous practitioners of various groups and organizations and professions. Is that correct?"

Feigenholtz: "I'm not sure that that's the only thing they do, Representative."

Reick: "No, no, no. I'm not saying it's the only one, but it is one of them, isn't it?"

Feigenholtz: "I'm not sure that that's what I would... how I would categorize what they do."

Reick: "Well, professional regulation that entails training and all that kind of stuff. What entails... would appear to me to be something that would benefit the public. The reason I ask is that I'm looking at the proponents of this Bill: the Illinois Interior Design Coalition and the American Society of the Interior Designers."

Feigenholtz: "And the architects are also supportive of this."

Reick: "Oh, I'm sure they are. But my issue here is the fact that this is nothing more than a barrier to entry of people who can... I mean, what threat to the public wheel is there by interior designers? Good grief."

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

- Feigenholtz: "What was the question?"
- Reick: "What... what form of protection does the IDFPR... how are...
 how are they saving us from unscrupulous interior designers?"
- Feigenholtz: "So, I think we have to understand what this profession does and..."
- Reick: "It paints walls, places furniture and figures out whether you need gold or chrome bathroom fixtures."
- Feigenholtz: "Well, they... they design plans. They do part... they do layouts. They're basically the next step after an architect would file blueprints and get building permits."
- Reick: "To make everything look pretty. Again, I just see this as nothing more than a barrier to entry of people who have a maybe a really good idea of taste without the requirement of them going through state legislation and paying a fee and having to comp... and taking away competition from the members of the Inter... Illinois Interior Design Coalition and the American Society of Interior Designers."
- Feigenholtz: "Was that a question, Representative?"
- Reick: "Oh, that was a question. How is... how, again, are we to... are we to... to assess the danger that is... that is to the people of Illinois because interior designers are out there..."
- Feigenholtz: "These are not interior decorators. Let's not confuse the nuance here. These are people who work with the changes on Building Codes around the state, county, and local level. They concern themselves with Fire Code compliance and design compliance with State and Federal disability Laws. You know, it's... can we have some order in the chamber? You know, I feel..."

Speaker Turner: "Excuse me. Excuse me, Representative."

58th Legislative Day

- Feigenholtz: "I feel as though..."
- Speaker Turner: "Excuse me, Representative. Members, shhh. I know it's very late in the evening, but we have an important debate going on. Can we please take the conversations to the rear of the chamber? Representative Feigenholtz."
- Feigenholtz: "So many... they do many technical changes that keep our buildings safe, have to do Code compliance. It's... it's not just about making things look pretty, to quote you, Representative."
- Reick: "And our analysis says that this is going to cost IDFPR about a quarter of a million dollars annually, which is going to be assessed through the fees of people wanting to enter a profession that they really should not have to have come to state in order to do. To the Bill. This is just another indication of the state taking its heavy hand into places where it does not need to go. This is a barrier to entry of people who are... serve absolutely no harm to the public or anybody else. This is people wanting to keep other people from competing with them. Thank you. I vote... I... I urge a 'no' vote."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Ammons is recognized."
- Ammons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to... move the previous question."
- Speaker Turner: "Lady's moved the previous question. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the previous question is put. Representative Feigenholtz to close."
- Feigenholtz: "Ladies and Gentlemen, nine... as I said earlier, this is a growing profession. Ninety percent of these are small

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

businesses, which are the lifeblood of new jobs in our communities, entrepreneurs, designers, and women-owned businesses who want to define their profession and be taken seriously. I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 326 pass?'
 All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote '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 a count of 67 voting 'yes', 42 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', Senate Bill 326, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Members, we have some house... housekeeping measures to take care of on the Calendar. And then we will proceed to committees. Representative Currie has a Motion, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Hollman: "The following Motions have been filed to table Bills. A Motion has been filed for House Bill 260, House Bill 292, House Bill 2715."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Currie moves to table these Bills.

 All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Bills are tabled.

 Mr. Clerk for an additional Motion."
- Clerk Hollman: "Motions have been filed to discharge from committee for the following Bills: House Bill 304, House Bill 309, House Bill 408, House Bill 409, House Bill 410, House Bill 633, House Bill 652, House Bill 653, House Bill 747, House Bill 1801, House Bill 2414, House Bill 2487, House Bill 2552, House Bill 2821, House Bill 2822, House Bill 2934, House Bill 3003, House Bill 3028, House Bill 3256, House Bill 3398, House Bill 3496."

58th Legislative Day

- Speaker Turner: "Leader Currie moves to table the Bills. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And... excuse me. Leader Currie moves to Table the Motions that were read. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Motion... and the Bills are tabled... Motion is tabled. On Supplemental Calendar #1, we have Senate Bill 3, Representative Yingling. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Yingling and has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, please... Mr. Clerk, please hold this Bill on the Order of Second Reading. Senate Bill 321. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 321, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Please hold this Bill on the Order of Second Reading. Senate Bill 444, Representative Chapa LaVia. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 444, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Please hold this Bill on the Order of Second Reading. Senate Bill 446, Representative Soto. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

58th Legislative Day

- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 446, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment 2 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Please hold this Bill on the Order of Second Reading. Senate Bill 1417. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1417, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Floor Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Please hold this Bill on the Order of Second Reading. Senate Bill 1483, Mr. Skillicorn. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1483, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment 2 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Please hold this Bill on the Order of Second Reading. Senate Bill 1518, Representative Wheeler. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1518, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Please hold this Bill on the Order of Second Reading. Senate Bill 1648, Representative Fortner. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1648, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

58th Legislative Day

- Speaker Turner: "Please hold this Bill on the Order of Second Reading. Senate Bill 1839, Representative Phelps. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1839, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment 3 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment... No Floor Amendments approved for consideration. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Please hold this Bill on the Order of Second Reading. Senate Bill 1904. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1904, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #3 has been approved for consideration is offered by Representative Hoffman."
- Speaker Turner: "Please hold this Bill on the Order of Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, committee announcements."
- Clerk Hollman: "The following committees will be meeting after adjournment: Appropriations-Elementary & Secondary Education is meeting in C-1; Elementary & Secondary Education: School Curriculum & Policies in D-1; Environment in Room 114; the Executive Committee in Room 118; Human Services in Room 122; Consumer Protection in Room 115."
- Speaker Turner: "And now, allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, Leader Currie moved that the House adjourned until Wednesday, May 31 at 10 a.m., Wednesday, May 31 at 10 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.

 Committee Reports. Representative Daniel Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on Executive reports the following

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

committee action taken on May 30, 2017: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 6, Senate Bill 42; do pass as amended Short Debate is Senate Bill 652, Senate Bill 1663, Senate Bill 1833; recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 1839. Representative Crespo, Chairperson from the Committee on Elementary & Secondary Education: School Curriculum & Policies reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2017: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 453; recommends be adopted is a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 213. Representative Beiser, Chairperson from the Committee on Environment reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2017: recommends be adopted, a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 3922. Representative Hernandez, Chairperson from the Committee on Consumer Protection reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2017: recommends be adopted, a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to... and 2 to House Bill 1560; Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3741. Representative William Davis, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-Elementary & Secondary Education reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2017: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1. Second Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 6, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Senate Bill 42, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Senate Bill 453, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 652, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 1663, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 1833, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of these Senate Bills.

58th Legislative Day

5/30/2017

Introduction and First Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 32, offered by Representative Hernandez, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Senate Bill 482, offered by Representative Currie, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 484, offered by Representative Currie, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. First Reading of these Senate Bills. Introduction of Senate Joint Resolution 22, offered by Representative Costello, this is referred to the Rules Committee. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."