80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

- Speaker Lang: "The House will be in order. Members will be in their chairs. We shall be led in prayer today by Wayne Padget, the Assistant Doorkeeper. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off cell phones and rise for the invocation and Pledge of Allegiance. Mr. Padget."
- Wayne Padget: "Let us pray. Dear Heavenly Father, let us thank You for all Your countless blessings and guide our eyes, Oh Lord, to see not the faults of others but the goodness they have in their hearts. Father, we ask that You help guide us to the path we should be on and help take away the burden of worry. And Father, may we forever be dependent on You for wisdom, guidance and direction. These things we ask in Your Son's name, Amen."
- Speaker Lang: "Be led in the Pledge by Mr. Turner."
- Turner et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Lang: "Roll Call for Attendance. Leader Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record show that Representative Yingling is excused today."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wheeler."
- Wheeler, K.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please let the record reflect that Representative Pritchard is excused today."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, please take the record. We have 116 Members answering the roll and we do have a quorum. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Committee Reports. Representative Mayfield,
 Chairperson from the Committee on Elementary & Secondary

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

Education: Licensing, Administration & Oversight reports the following committee action taken on October 25, 2017: do pass as amended Short Debate for Senate Bill 863. Representative Gabel, Chairperson from the Committee on Human Services reports the following committee action taken on October 25, 2017: recommends be adopted Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 1059, Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 1277, Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 2984, House Resolution 544, House Resolution 590, House Resolution 592, House Resolution 595, and House Resolution 605. Representative Thapedi, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary - Civil reports the following committee action taken on October 25, 2017: do pass as amended Short Debate for House Bill 4095. Representative Soto, Chairperson from the Committee on Health Care Licenses reports the following committee action taken on October 25, 2017: recommends be adopted Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill Amendment #1 to 1279, and Floor House Bill 1281. Representative Hoffman, Chairperson from the Committee on Labor & Commerce reports the following committee action taken on October 25, 2017: recommends be adopted Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 201 and Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1381. Representative Al Riley, Chairperson from the Committee on State Government Administration reports the committee action taken on October 25, 2017: recommends be adopted House Resolution 522, and House Resolution 602. Representative Lilly, Chairperson from the Committee on Museums, Arts, & Cultural Enhancement reports the following committee action taken on October 25, 2017: recommends be adopted House Resolution 610, and House Resolution 625.

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

Representative Welch, Chairperson from the Committee on Higher Education reports the following committee action taken on October 25, 2017: recommends be adopted House Joint Resolution 80. Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 655, offered by Representative Cassidy. And House Joint Resolution 83, offered by Representative Feigenholtz."

- Speaker Lang: "Chair recognizes Mr. Wehrli for a point of personal privilege. Not at the moment. Thank you, Sir. Mr. Cabello is recognized."
- Cabello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise on a point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."
- Cabello: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, could you please join me in wishing my seatmate and our friend, Representative Brian Stewart, for his 60th birthday today."
- Speaker Lang: "I see the cake. It must be around his desk somewhere. House Resolution 632, Mr. Costello."
- Costello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I'd like to recognize and honor Glenda Zanders, who's up in the Speaker's Gallery, with her husband, Herb. Glenda was inducted into the Illinois Outdoors Hall of Fame. Glenda got her start in childhood which was a childhood full of trapping, fishing, hunting and the shooting sports. She fished commercially on the Kaskaskia River with her father Glenn. This upbringing led her to have a passion for the outdoors. She's currently the Chief Procurement Officer and cofounder of Zanders Sporting Goods. She has supported the Illinois Department of Natural Resources Wingshooting Clinic Program, a program developed to teach Wingshooting enthusiasts of all

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

experiences and ages. And she's a major supporter of the Illinois Sportsmen's Caucus, the largest bipartisan caucus in the State of Illinois. Glenda also supports youth involvement in outdoor sports. She does this through organizations such as Ducks Unlimited, the Boy Scouts of America, and the National Wild Turkey Foundation, as well as the fact that she's a major contributor and supporter of the Illinois Conservation Foundation. Glenda has demonstrated that she has made a significant contribution to getting more people involved in the outdoor sports and is a very deserving inductee of the Illinois Outdoor Hall of Fame. She's a wonderful person; she does terrific things in the community and the State of Illinois. I would ask that we recognize her and I would ask that we give her a round of applause. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Chair recognizes the Clerk on the Resolution."

Clerk Hollman: "House Resolution 632, offered by Representative

Costello.

RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ONE HUNDREDTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that we recognize the induction of Glenda Zanders into the House Outdoor... Illinois Outdoor Hall of Fame; and be it further RESOLVED, that a suitable copy of this Resolution be presented to Glenda Zanders."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. Thank you, Representative. Mr. Welch is recognized."

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

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Sir."

Welch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to call your attention to the Speaker's Gallery. I have some friends here. I'd like to ask them to stand. Mr. Adrian Guerrero and then several of my friends from the Union Pacific Railroad are here today. The State of Illinois is the rail capital of the United States. And the Union Pacific Railroad has more than 2,300 miles of track in our state traversing hundreds of communities. Several of those communities are in my district and Representative Willis's district. Union Pacific maintains railroads throughout the United States located in cities like... throughout our state located in cities like Chicago, Bellwood, Berkley, Melrose Park, Northlake, Dolton, Chicago Heights, Rochelle, West Chicago, Dupo and Salem. Union Pacific Railroad has invested more than \$1 billion in our state's economy since 2010. Nothing is more important to these men and women who are up here in the Speaker's Gallery, to the nation's passenger and safety railroad than safety. In 2016, for a second consecutive year, Union Pacific was the top performing railroad in employee safety. Union Pacific commuter operations service unit was also recently awarded the Union Pacific Safety Bell, which many of you probably saw out in the corridor. This bell is a top prize. Union Pacific is one of the safest railroads in the country and has achieved its best annual employee safety performance in the company's 154-year history. And I think that is well deserving of a round of applause in recognition here today on the floor of the Illinois House of Representatives. We have unanimously approved previously House Resolution 398 and I ask that these

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

men and women from Union Pacific Railroad be given a round of applause."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Representative. Representative Ammons is recognized."

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

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

"Thank you. Today I am excited to introduce to the Illinois General Assembly our children from Campus Middle School for Girls, who are right above me. If they will stand up in the gallery. They have come to visit the Capitol today to learn about what we do as well as to visit the historic monuments of our great President Lincoln. I wanted to make sure that you all know what Campus Middle School for Girls is. It's a middle school in Champaign whose purpose is to challenge academically our young girls and nurture them in roles in science and exciting areas of study. It is an eigthgrade group that has traveled here today, the humanities class that's studying the U.S. Constitution. So, I had an opportunity to give them a tour and show them some of the great things in our Capitol. And we want to thank their escorts today, Ms. Judy Nolen and Anita Jung and Nina Yescus, and I hope I've said their names properly, who have brought the girls here to visit us at the Capitol. Please welcome them to their State Capitol."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome. Thank you for joining us today in the House chamber. The Chair recognizes Mr. Harris on a point of personal privilege."

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And if I may, I... permit me just to take a few moments to put some things into the record regarding the attempt of our state to get Amazon here. I think most of us are aware that Amazon is looking for a second headquarters somewhere in the United States. Two hundred and twenty localities around the nation have applied to be the Amazon 2 headquarters. You know for the past several weeks Tribune has editorialized that, well, the the... the Legislature is... is derelict and not doing what it should do to get businesses to come to Illinois. And they criticized us because we didn't get Foxconn which moved up to Wisconsin. Not recognizing the fact that Foxconn was given \$3 billion worth of tax credits to go there. Now, I'm glad to see that Illinois governments overall are offering Amazon \$2 billion in benefits. I think that's what we should do. I will observe that when we did the Sears deal we offered them 15 million and we were criticized. But I think it's necessary to get Amazon here. But here's my... my issue. When the Governor is sitting across the table from Jeff Bezos, the CEO of Amazon, or when he's sitting across the table from the Prime Minister of Japan, Shinzo Abe, and he visited Japan last year, what does he say to people to say to come to Illinois? Does he say come to Illinois because we are hostile to business? Does he say that we have a failed state? Those are his words, not mine. What does he tell them? Or maybe if the General Assembly had not passed a budget over his Veto he'd be able to say come to Illinois, the only state in the history of the United States to have its bonds rated as junk. Now, there's a selling point for Amazon, isn't it? Look, I'm not looking through

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

rose colored glasses. Illinois has problems. I admit that. Our workers' compensation costs are too high and they should come down. Our property taxes are high and they should come down. Every state has problems. But I will tell you this, there is no problem that we have in this state that cannot be solved with tough negotiation, good compromise and good cooperation. We can make it better. Now, I'm only one of 177 Legislators, but I am proud... I am proud to be an Illinoisan. I am proud to be an Illinois Legislator. And if I were pitching Amazon, it wouldn't just come down to money. This is what I'd say. Come to Illinois. Illinois has an intermodal transportation system: air, water, highways, rail that's second to none. Illinois has a university system, which although it's been weakened by two years of starvation diet, provides a deep source of talented and educated individuals. Most of all, Illinois has a workforce of willing, industrious and creative citizens. Folks who can build the buildings, folks who can lay the cables for the computers, folks who can write the code for the software, folks who can handle the billions of dollars of transactions that Amazon is going to engage in. So, I say to Amazon, come on down. Come to Illinois. Don't believe all the negative stuff you hear about Illinois. We are ready, willing and able to give you the best second headquarters of any business in the United States. Come to Illinois."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Representative. Page 2 of the Calendar, House Bills-Second Reading, House Bill 185. Mr. Sims. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 185, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Sims."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sims."

Sims: "Thank... thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Floor Amendment #1 merely extends the... extends the time frame for the current ban... or the current... extends the sunset on the current law... under current law from January 1, 2018 to January 1, 2020, the law enforcement exemption to Illinois's ban on recording private conversations using an eavesdropping device."

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: "House Bill 185, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sims."

Sims: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

I... as I just outlined, House Bill... the House Floor... the Floor

Amendment we just adopted merely extends the sunset date by
two years on the law enforcement exemption on the ban on
recording private conversations using an eavesdropping
device. I answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen. Ladies and Gentlemen, can we hold down the noise in the chamber, please? Ladies and Gentlemen..."

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

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

Speaker Lang: "Not yet. Ladies and Gentlemen. Ladies and Gentlemen. Mr. Breen."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Breen: "Representative, tell... I see on my analysis that the ACLU opposes your Bill. I'm wondering what is the basis for their opposition to... to this measure?"

Sims: "Well, Representative Breen, I think you have to ask the ACLU."

Breen: "Well, I... I did a bit and they had said there was some issue with the way that your exemption allows for folks to get around the Eavesdropping Act. I'm wondering... I'm assuming they came to your committee, but I... did anyone testify in committee against your Bill?"

Sims: "No, Sir."

Breen: "Okay. What is the process for this particular eavesdropping exemption? What are the... as I understand, there's some ability of the state's attorney to waive the requirements of the Eavesdropping Act? How does this work in practice?"

Sims: "Could you... could you read the last part of the question?

I couldn't hear you, Representative."

Breen: "How does this exemption work in practice?"

Sims: "So, the... the County State's Attorney has to determine there's probable cause. They move forward. And then for the... in order for the evidence that's obtained via the recording device to be admitted has to go to a judge for the judge to approve it."

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

- Breen: "And... and this is an exemption because normally you can't get... you cannot tap the or other... in otherwise... otherwise eavesdrop on a private conversation. Law enforcement can't do that normally, right?"
- Sims: "That's correct."
- Breen: "Okay. So, this is an exemption to that where the state's attorney without going to a judge can approve that exemption just on his own?"
- Sims: "Well, the state... well, they have to... have to determine there's probable cause. And then... then move forward with the... with the exemption, correct."
- Breen: "But then the... and then down the road after what they've collected if they want to use it in court there is another process to determine its admissibility. Is that..."
- Sims: "Correct. The judge would have to then make sure that the...
 the evidence that's obtained via the... via the recording is
 admissible. So that before the... before the... before the
 evidence could be admitted the judge has to approve."
- Breen: "But... and the judge... regardless of that though, does law enforcement get full access to the materials they collect just based on the state's attorney's decision... lone decision?"
- Sims: "Yeah. I think that... that would be up really to the state's attorney to make that determination."
- Breen: "Yeah. But they can... and I mean, there's no... there's no limit on the distribution of the private conversation amongst law enforcement?"

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

Sims: "Well, between the... the law enforcement and the... and the offenders... the accused counsel. I mean, that would be up to them to make that determination."

Breen: "Is there any limit on the state's attorney to release that tape or to have it subject to FOIA?"

Sims: "Released to whom?"

Breen: "Well, let's say to the public. So, if you've collected it, is that now going to be available to the public?"

Sims: "Yeah. They have to file... they would have to file a report with the court to be able to do that."

Breen: "It would have to go to the court? Is that... that's in the Act?"

Sims: "So, Representative, at the… annually the state's attorney has to file a report on how they've used that… how they use that… that data. And how they… how they've… what data they've collected. So, that happens on their annual basis with their… they have a reporting requirement where they will make sure that information is made available."

Breen: "Okay. And then I see that you are supported by the Chiefs of Police, looks like State's Attorneys Association, the Drug Enforcement Officers Association, the Illinois State Police, the MEG Directors and Task Force Commanders Associations. That... that is an accurate list of the proponents?"

Sims: "That..."

Breen: "Is there anyone else?"

Sims: "...that... that is an accurate list of proponents. And to be...

I mean, to be... Yes, that's an accurate list of proponents."

Breen: "All right. Anybody else that... that folks should know about who are proponents of your Bill?"

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

Sims: "Well, I... I hope to have 118 Members of this chamber be proponents."

Breen: "Sure. Well, I just... then I see, you know, it came out of committee not unanimously. And so that was another reason why it... it caught my eye. But it... the opponents that I've got here are the ACLU, the Cook County Public Defender opposes and the Illinois State Bar Association opposes. Is that an accurate list of the opponents as far as you know?"

Sims: "That... if that's what they told your staff, that's... that's all I... I don't have your analysis, Representative."

Breen: "Okay. But you don't have that on your analysis?"

Sims: "It's not on..."

Breen: "You don't have the opponents on your analysis?"

Sims: "No. I say if that's... if that's... if that's the list that you have, Representative, that's the list that you have."

Breen: "That's a good... I mean, is that a good list?"

Sims: "I... like I said, Representative, I don't have what... what's in your analysis. So, I can't speak to that."

Breen: "But is it in your analysis that... that those folks are opposing? I mean, it's..."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen, could you bring your remarks to a close, Sir?"

Breen: "I'd just like to get an answer to my question. And I'm assuming nobody else is going to speak."

Sims: "Representative, I answered the question. I said, I don't have your analysis. I told you what's in my... I told you what's in mine."

Breen: "You don't have any opponents in yours. I didn't hear that answer."

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

Sims: "I... I said... you said that the ACLU was... was listed as an opponent. I confirmed that it's in my analysis. I don't know what's in your analysis."

Breen: "Right. I just... I'm just trying to establish the record."

Sims: "Okay."

Breen: "It's hard to hear in here. So, I'm just trying to get that done."

Sims: "Agreed."

Breen: "So, thank you for the answers to the questions."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Wheeler."

Wheeler, B.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Sponsor."

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Wheeler, B.: "Representative, was this the Bill we were just talking about in the last committee and you told me you were going to hold the Bill for a while?"

Sims: "Well, as we talked... we were talking about the Bill in committee that was before I... I understood and looked at the game plan for how we need to pass the Bill so we can move it over to the other chamber because we are under a time crunch. So, what... what I think... what we have..."

Wheeler, B.: "So, just an hour ago..."

Sims: "...to do is, we're making sure that we get the Bill over to the other chamber because if we don't then we... we've run out of time."

Wheeler, B.: "So, you're saying you've called an audible and you're going to run the Bill even though you just told me you were going to hold the Bill to get some of the questions answered?"

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

Sims: "Well, I never made that... I never made that... I never made that statement in committee..."

Wheeler, B.: "To me."

Sims: "...yesterday."

Wheeler, B.: "No, you did not. You did it... just to me about an hour ago."

Sims: "It was... it was a private conversation between you and I."

Wheeler, B.: "Yes."

Sims: "And I..."

Wheeler, B.: "And I took you for your word."

Sims: "...again, I made a judgment call."

Wheeler, B.: "And I did talk to the ACLU this morning and they're vehemently against this Bill. And I had some questions for them because I don't think they were clearly answered yesterday in committee in regard to what the process is right now. The premise of this Bill and I understand it's an extension, but as it stands right now these exemptions start with law enforcement. So, essentially somebody from the sheriff's department can go to the state's attorney and say, I have probable cause that Barb Wheeler is selling drugs and we'll need to eavesdrop on her phone conversations. And there's no judge involved, correct? It's just basically law enforcement and the state's attorney. This exemption removes the Judicial Branch from the process of eavesdropping on a private conversation. Is that correct?"

Sims: "I'm... I'm sorry, could you repeat that last part of the question, Representative?"

Wheeler, B.: "The premise of this Bill... I know your Bill extends this exemption, but basically the ACLU is concerned because

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

what this... the premise of the Bill does is remove the Judicial Branch out of the decision for eavesdropping on private conversations. With what the... let's say the Sheriff's Department considers probable cause to the state's attorney, but there's no judge involved in the initial eavesdropping order. Is that correct?"

- Sims: "No. It... as I... as I mentioned earlier, the... the judge is not involved in the initial... in the initial phases. However, in order for that... that information to be used, the judge has to sign off and approve that."
- Wheeler, B.: "Right. I understand that. So, actually the answer to my question is, yes. There's no judge involved in the initial order for eavesdropping unless from probable cause there becomes something that's actionable. How long can this process of eavesdropping on private conversations go on?"
- Sims: "I think the operative word that you... the operative part of the statement you just made was that probable cause has to exist. So, as long as probable cause exists then the process can begin."
- Wheeler, B.: "Okay. So, let's say a sheriff's deputy goes to the state's attorney and say, I have probable cause to assume that Barb Wheeler is selling drugs. How long can they listen to my private conversations before a judgment is made? Is it two weeks? It is two hours? Is it two months? Is it two years?"
- Sims: "There's... Representative, there's no specific timeline but..."

Wheeler, B.: "No."

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

- Sims: "...it would have to be within the confines of the probable cause hearing."
- Wheeler, B.: "Right."
- Sims: "So, as long as there is... as long as there was... as long as probable cause exists, then that... they would have the ability to... to monitor that... to monitor the situation. But if... once probable cause no longer existed there would not be... that would not be the case."
- Wheeler, B.: "So, why do we need to remove the judge from the whole process? Why can't we say where there is probable cause, goes to a state's attorney, then a judge signs off? Why are we moving that Judicial Branch in this process if there's..."
- Sims: "I've been... I've been... I've been informed that it's... it's limited to 24 hours. So, it's not an indeterminate period of time. It's only 24 hours. So, I... let me clarify that. So, the time... time... the time limit is not indeterminate. It is a 24-hour period. It's limited to 24 hours."
- Wheeler, B.: "What happens if the information actually doesn't produce what it is that they were concerned about in the first place?"
- Sims: "Then it's not used, Representative."
- Wheeler, B.: "What happens with the... with the information? So, it's not used. Is there any record in regard to the state's attorney putting an eavesdropping on private conversations?"
- Sims: "Say that... say that question again?"
- Wheeler, B.: "Is there any record? If it's not used. Once they find out Barb Wheeler is not selling drugs, what do they do with that information? Is there any record that they actually requested to eavesdrop on my private conversations?"

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

Sims: "So, the... what happens is as I mentioned earlier, at the end of the year the state's attorneys will file a report on how they used the information. So, it... there's not a repository under... as my understanding, there's not some repository of information or data that's collected and then been kept against individuals who've been under surveillance."

Wheeler, B.: "Is it public information?"

Sims: "Yeah, I believe that... I believe it is."

Wheeler, B.: "Okay. Thank you. Thank you very much. Thank you for answering my questions."

Speaker Lang: "The Chair will begin to use the two minute timer on this Bill. Mr. Stewart is recognized for two minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Stewart: "Leader Sims, I heard from a respected colleague a couple of her challenges, but this exemption could be used if law enforcement needed to do eavesdropping in regards to a potential mass shooting or a... or a... or other acts of violence that they could use this for, correct?"

Sims: "That's correct."

Stewart: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ammons for two minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ammons: "Thank you. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to clarify what I heard in debate. So, this Bill removes judicial approval of eavesdropping first and foremost?"

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

Sims: "No. It does not remove judicial involvement. The... under the current process, the state's attorney when they determine there's probable cause can allow for the... the eavesdropping to occur. So, it does not remove judicial involvement in the process. That's..."

Ammons: "But it does... it doesn't require..."

Sims: "...that's not a fair and accurate description."

Ammons: "It does not require approval of a judge signed off before they go and execute this action of eavesdropping on whomever they think they should be eavesdropping on?"

Sims: "In order for the information to be used, it requires judicial approval. So, before the judge... before the information can be used, a judge has... does have to sign off."

Ammons: "So... Yeah, see, that's not what was just expressed here.

It says that state's attorney and the police officials... the state's attorney can determine whether this is executed under the eavesdropping laws that you're extending."

Sims: "Once... once the... to execute the eavesdropping process, but in order to use the information that is obtained it has... it requires a judge to approve it."

Ammons: "So, let me ask a different question. If... if I am a target of this kind of eavesdropping law, if I'm a target of that and there are others present in my same vicinity and that person who's not the target of the eavesdropping law may be caught or found doing something that might be considered illegal or prosecutable, can that information be used against another who may be in contact with a person you are eavesdropping on?"

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

Sims: "If the subject... if the subject... if there are other people who are involved or present when the subject has made their statements, if they're not the subject of the probable cause hearing it would not be used against them."

Speaker Lang: "Representative..."

Ammons: "Is... is that..."

Speaker Lang: "...Ammons can you bring your remarks to a close?"

Ammons: "Oh, thank... thank you, Mr. Chair. I just wanted to clarify that. I'm... I'm... this is a Bill of great concern for me because the scope is not clearly defined as to who can and cannot be in some way entrapped by this eavesdropping probable cause law. Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sims: "Correct."

Zalewski: "So, in a previous permutation of this law we had agreed on the parameters of the way this type of consent would work.

Am I correct?"

Sims: "That is correct, Representative."

Zalewski: "And to the Bill. I... I'm 98 percent assured this was my legislation. If it wasn't my legislation, it was a piece of legislation I worked on. And just to the Body's concerns about this Bill, this was a carefully crafted piece of legislation that took great pains to go above and beyond what was necessary to allow for this type of eavesdropping and in cases of very serious, forcible felonies and very serious instances

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

of narcotics being delivered. So, the Bill is an extension of a carefully crafted Bill. It's not anything new that we haven't already done. I would... I would urge an 'aye' vote."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ford: "Thank you. Chairman Sims, I have a few questions. One... the first question, since the law has been effective, do we have an account of the type of cases the law has been used to eavesdrop on certain offenses? Do... do we know if they've led to convictions or?"

Sims: "The... it's my understanding, Representative, that the use of the... the use of the law has been targeted mainly at violent offenses. Violent offenses that or... and/or offenses that will lead to violence. There were... there were several instances that were recounted to me relative to the use of... the use of this law protect... making sure that they were undercover... in one instance in particular that where law enforcement was surveilling a suspect and the su... during the course of the investigation, the undercover officer was... it was... his cover was blown. And because they had the individual... the individual under surveillance they were able to go in and save not only the lives of the... the officer, but also the individuals who were... who were involved, who were the subjects of the surveillance."

Ford: "So, once the eavesdropping is granted for the law enforcement when does it drop off? I mean, does... does it follow the person that's the subject of eavesdropping forever?"

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

Sims: "Wait. And Representative Ford, I'm sorry. I couldn't… I couldn't hear the question. I'm sorry."

Ford: "When... when will the eavesdropping... the ability to eavesdrop fall off of the individual that's being granted, you know, the privacy violation, I would call it?"

Sims: "Well, it would be... it would... if the information is then made part of the record, it will be... it will be moralized in writing as part of their record. But again, also the state's attorney has to sign off and to report how they are using the law yearly."

Ford: "So, instead... I'm sorry. I didn't ask the question properly.

So, the... my question is, is it a case by case?"

Sims: "I'm sorry, Representative?"

Ford: "Is it case by case or will the eavesdropping ability just follow the individual forever? Or will it fall off of the individual at some point? Or will the police have infinite time to eavesdrop on the person that's perceived to be a criminal?"

Sims: "And Representative Ford, again, I understand... I appreciate...

I appreciate that clarification. This... no, it's not... it's not an indefinite amount of time that the subject is under surveillance. It is limited to a 24-hour period. But again, this is not an indeterminate amount of time where the person who has probable cause established against them would always have... be under surveillance by law enforcement. That's not the case here."

Ford: "Okay."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Ford, can you bring your remarks..."

Ford: "Thank you."

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

Speaker Lang: "...to a close?"

Ford: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you. Mr. Sims to close."

Sims: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As... as has been previously stated, this is... this is an extension of current law. This is a process that has... that law enforcement uses to ensure that they are making sure that... to ensure that the most violent offenses are... are being... are being attacked and being stopped. I appreciate the concerns raised and I have them as well. But I... it's... we are seeing that... this does not remove the judge from the process. The judge is still... in order for any information to be used and utilized, the judge still has to sign off. So, I... I appreciate the questions. And I'd ask for its favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Burke, Lilly, Turner. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 97 voting 'yes', 12 voting 'no', 5 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill... Excuse me. Representative Hernan... Returning to page 2 of the Calendar, House Bill 201, Mr. Sims. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 201, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Sims."

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

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

Sims: "Thank... thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Floor Amendment #1 is a gut and replace Amendment that becomes the Bill. It does two... three things. It extends the Youth Unemployment Task Force by one year, from January 1, 2018 to January 1, 2019. It gives the task force until October 1 of 2018 to file a report. And it also requires that the Department of Human Services provide administrative support for the task force."

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: "House Bill 201, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sims."

Sims: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The... the underlying Bill, as we talked about, focuses on the Youth Unemployment Task Force, which was created by an Act of the 99th General Assembly. The intent of the law was to examine the statewide youth unemployment crisis and its particular affect on young people, particularly young people of color. At this time there... no Members have been appointed, so we'd like to extend the task force or... the... the task force has not met, so we'd like to extend the task force to give the task force an opportunity to meet and address this very critical issue facing... affecting... affecting our state."

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

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

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Breen: "Representative, how much does the provision of support services by the department... how much is that going to cost?"

Sims: "Well, Representative, that... I... I don't have it... I don't have a number on how much... how much it would cost. But that would be under the purview of the Department of Human Services who... the secretary or their designee would chair the task force. So, I don't... having the ability for the task force to meet to come with a report should the costs should be minimal."

Breen: "Right. But we... cause we're... we're specifically adding that the Department of Human Services is going to provide administrative support. Just wondering how much it's estimated even to cost? I mean, is it in the tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands?"

Sims: "There will certainly not be tens of thousands or a dollar cost to... to this initiative. The... the resources will be right there for the... for the department to... to outline a workable task... or workable game plan for the task force. There is a report that's been done by the Great cities Institute out of the University of Illinois at Chicago. So, a lot of this research has already been done."

Breen: "Okay."

Sims: "What... what needs to happen from here is having a... having a game plan that addresses youth unemployment across the state."

Breen: "Sure. And then, one other question I had was I noticed the original... this is a shell Bill... the original Act was the Employment of Strike Breakers Act. Is... are you at all worried

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

that maybe you've changed the subject matter of the Bill so much that your Bill might actually not be a proper Amendment? I know we do a lot of shell Bills, but it seems like the employment of strike breaker's seems a lot different than a Department of Human Services Youth Unemployment Task Force Act."

Sims: "I think the fact that it deals with unemployment and unemployment issues means that the subject... the underlying subject matter would be germane. But of course, I don't sit on a court and I don't believe neither do you. So, I feel... I figure we'll let the court decide that issue if they... if they so choose."

Breen: "Fair enough. Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sims to close."

Sims: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, we have over... nearly 200 thousand young people across this state, particularly young people of color, who are un... or underemployed. And I think it's far time... it's far past time for us to have a strategy to make sure that we are providing for opportunities for these young people. So, I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Jesiel. Please take the record. There are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1023, Mr. Moylan. Out of the record. House Bill 1059, Mr. Davis. Please read the Bill."

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1059, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Davis."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davis."

Davis: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 1059 represents cleanup language from House Bill 763 that was passed and ultimately signed into law by the Governor. It allows... 763 allowed for Maryville Academy to bring four more beds online to deal with very fragile, critically fragile young people. And what this Bill attempts to do is to give them an immediate effective date so that they can use those beds right away. Be more than happy to answer any questions."

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

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

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

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1059, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davis."

Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If there are any questions, I'll be more than happy to answer them. Otherwise, I 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? Martwick. Please take the record, Mr. Clerk. There are 116 voting 'yes', 0

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

- voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1281, Representative Kelly Burke. Out of the record. Mr. Wehrli is recognized on a point of personal privilege."
- Wehrli: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to introduce to the House today my two Pages for the day. We have Madelyne Lowe and Grace Davidson. They're both constituents from Naperville. They're seventh graders at Thayer J. Hill Middle School and they both play viola in the orchestra. Their fathers are up here as well; we have Alan Lowe and Ron Davidson. If we could give them a warm Springfield welcome, I'd appreciate it."
- Speaker Lang: "Welcome to all of you. Thank you for joining us in the House chamber today. Representative Jimenez is recognized."
- Jimenez: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege." Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."
- Jimenez: "I'm excited to introduce today my student advisory group. These are some shining stars from high schools in the 99th District. If we can give them a... a really great Springfield welcome, even though they're not from... far from here: Peyton, Benjamin, Rebekah, Jacob, Grace and Mallory. Please welcome them to the Capitol."
- Speaker Lang: "Welcome. Thanks for being here with us. We appreciate it. Representative Ammons is recognized."
- Ammons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege, please."
- Speaker Lang: "Proceed, please."

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

Ammons: "I also want to welcome to the chamber, we have University of Illinois students: Jared, Andrea, Julie, Isra and Jessica, who all interned in my office. They're in the gallery right above me. I'd like them to stand and welcome them to the Illinois General Assembly House chambers."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you. Enjoy yourselves here today. We appreciate you being here. Mr. Unes."

Unes: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege." Speaker Lang: "Proceed, Sir."

Unes: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to welcome my Page for the day today, Rafael Davis. He's a freshman at Dunlap High School. He's on the soccer team. He's been very involved with student government ever since he's been in sixth grade and continues to be very involved at Dunlap High School. He's here today with his mother, Sylvia, who's sitting right behind me in the… in the gallery. And they are here to see their government in action. So, please welcome the Davis' to the Capitol today."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome. Thank you. Mr. Butler is recognized."
Butler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege."
Speaker Lang: "Proceed, Sir."

Butler: "I would like to introduce my Page for today, Marley Blackledge, who lives in Mechanicsburg, just west... just east of Springfield here. She's in fifth grade at Tri-City Elementary. A couple years ago she won my summer reading program, so I got to take some Casey's pizza to her class. And she's a very good basketball player, I hear, as well. So, please welcome her to the State Capitol today."

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

Speaker Lang: "Welcome. We're glad you're here with us today.

Thank you. Representative Hernandez on a point of personal privilege."

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

Hernandez: "It's... well, Ladies and Gentlemen, Members of the Assembly, I would like to ask you if you could give a warm welcome to this young lady standing right next to me. Her name is Karina Espinosa. Karina works for the State of Illinois. Karina works for Do It. We're all familiar with the Do It Department, correct? She is a graduate public service intern and interesting, she is a DACA student. She is DACA. She came to this country when she was 11 years old, her mother brought her in at that age. She went to middle school in Chicago at an... and as well as high school. She was accepted to Illinois College in Jacksonville. And this is what I find very interesting too. She ... she was granted a scholarship from Illinois College. Absolutely. She then received her DACA at the age of 19. And mind you, when she got this scholarship, she was not DACA yet. Because of her DACA, she had the opportunity to go abroad to Germany. And now, she's working on her master's degree. Incredible. This, Members, is the example of why this program is working. And I hope... later today I will be proposing a Resolution requesting, urging the President of the United States and the Attorney General of the United States, Sessions, to preserve the DACA program. And I hope you will join me in that. Thank you very much."

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

- Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Representative. And welcome to the House chamber. House Bill 1464, Representative Cassidy. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1464, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Cassidy."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Cassidy on the Amendment."
- Cassidy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. The Amendment becomes the Bill. I'd like to adopt the Amendment and then debate it on Third. Is that appropriate?"
- 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: "House Bill 1464, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Cassidv."
- Cassidy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1464 is actually a pretty simple commonsense measure. Most of us who are parents have shared the... our children's birth stories with them. I know my boys ask about their birth story every year on their birthday. And what we're trying to do with House Bill 1464 is limit the number of children whose birth stories begin with, first I had to call for the guard. What this will do is create a... an opportunity for a hearing to determine if it is absolutely necessary for a pregnant defendant to remain in jail pretrial. This is, keep in mind, pretrial. This is when...

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

when a defendant is innocent until proven guilty. This is about granting some dignity, but also frankly some cost savings. The... you know, if you're not moved by the birth story then the idea that if it's not absolutely necessary for your county jail to absorb the cost of prenatal care and delivery for a defendant, that should be... that should be enough. Ultimately, this is not about creating greater risk. The factors to determine if someone should be held include whether there is a risk to... to the community, to the victim of the person's alleged crime. This is really about ensuring that we are only keeping folks who really need to be kept. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Breen: "Great. And Representative, I just want to make sure. So, this is for folks who are pregnant that we're going to try to get them out of custody if possible prior to the birth so that they are not... they're not going into labor while they are in a... in a jail facility?"

Cassidy: "Exactly."

Breen: "Okay. And I... I see here it says that they can be made subject to electronic monitoring and that would be at the cost of the pregnant person and not at the state's cost, right?"

Cassidy: "It depend... I think different counties have different approaches to EM, but it's..."

Breen: "Sure."

Cassidy: "...it is much cheaper than in custody."

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

Breen: "Sure. But we're... we're not..."

Cassidy: "Regardless, it's still cheaper."

Breen: "...doing anything to upset that with this Bill?"

Cassidy: "Exactly."

Breen: "Okay. So, no additional costs..."

Cassidy: "No."

Breen: "...on to to local governments?"

Cassidy: "No."

Breen: "Okay. Thank you. This is a.m. this is a pretty good Bill.

I... I... it's a wonderful sentiment and certainly something
that..."

Cassidy: "I think it's a mighty fine Bill, actually."

Breen: "...we ought to encourage. Well, sure."

Cassidy: "Not just pretty good."

Breen: "Well..."

Cassidy: "Thank you."

Breen: "...it's going to be a long day, Representative. So, yeah, thanks."

Cassidy: "Thank you."

Breen: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Wheeler for two minutes."

Wheeler, B.: "Very quickly, I'd like to... to the Bill. I'd like to stand in... in favor of this Bill. I think it's a great Bill. I also... the Representative had mentioned kind of creating that culture in which we need to respect the dignity of pregnant women and provide alternatives for... options for them when necessary. Thank you very much for bringing this Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Flowers for two minutes."

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

- Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, would like to commend you for bringing forth this legislation. It seemed like it was just only yesterday that we were having the debate about unshackling pregnant women because there was fear that they may run away during their labor. So, I want to commend you for bringing forth this legislation and please add me as a Sponsor. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Cassidy to close."
- Cassidy: "I ask for an 'aye' vote. There is no opposition to this Bill. And thank you for your support."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 106 voting 'yes', 8 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Page 3 of the Calendar, House Bills-Second Reading, House Bill 2394, Representative Hernandez. Representative Hernandez. Representative? Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. Page 4 of the Calendar, Senate Bills-Second Reading, Senate Bill 1381, Mr. Hoffman. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1381, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Hoffman."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you. Floor Amendment... Floor Amendment #2 is actually an agreed Bill regarding the unemployment insurance... Unemployment Insurance Act here in Illinois. It is agreed

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

between the business and labor communities. And what it does, it just extends what is called a 'speed bump'. In other words, a... an activity that would cause the parties to come back to the negotiating table. It extends that for two years. So, two years ago we came up with an agreement to make some changes to the Unemployment Insurance Act. They will then remain in effect and the 'speed bump', as they call it, which would have cost employer... employment taxes on employers to increase by 390 million and unemployment benefits to be decreased by 270 million shall... shall simply be extended for two more years."

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

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

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1381, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Yes. I explained it on Second Reading. And that explanation will suffice."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Wheeler, K.: "Thank you. Representative, we've had this in committee earlier and I just want to make sure it's clear for everyone involved. This was an agreed Bill process. I know that the sign up there says, telecom's IP-based services, this is about unemployment insurance. Following the same

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

agreed Bill process we've used in the past, it's been very successful. It brings both parties, labor and management, together and gets something worked out that actually works well for the whole state. We've had successes before. I say this is, yeah, this is exactly the process we used. Is that correct?"

Hoffman: "Yes, it is."

Wheeler, K.: "Thank you. With that, I just want to encourage an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record, Mr. Clerk. There are 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1345, Mr. Martwick. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1345, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Martwick."

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

Martwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment 2 to House Bill... or Senate Bill 1345 closes a... corrects a drafting error in Tier 3 pension legislation that could be interpreted to permit new members to opt back into Tier 1. We wanted to make sure that we close that provision. That's what this Amendment does. I move for its adoption."

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

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 1345, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this Senate Bill." Speaker Lang: "Mr. Martwick."

Martwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, again, this Bill simply corrects a drafting error in the Tier 3 language that we passed with the budget. It closes a potential loophole that could allow new employees to opt into Tier 1. We do not want that. We want to make sure we have that closed off. That's what this Bill does. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

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

Breen: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Breen: "And Representative, just to be clear. So, no matter what your position on Tier 3, its merits or demerit, the problem is the way that Tier 3 was drafted if we don't have that in place within six months of whenever that effective date was, all the new employees go back to Tier 1?"

Martwick: "Well, there is... there is the potential for that to happen, yes. That is one of the potential readings of how that language could be interpreted."

Breen: "Okay. So, no matter what your personal position is on Tier 3, we need to close that loophole very, very quickly or else we're going to be in deep... deep water?"

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

Martwick: "I... I would say that's an accurate assessment, yes."

Breen: "Okay. Thank you, Representative. It's a good Bill."

Martwick: "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, Mr. Clerk. There are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Page 4 of the Calendar, Senate Bill 1322, Representative Feigenholtz. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1322, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Amendment #2 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1322, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a trailer Bill to the Nurse Practice Act and the APRN Bill that we passed. It's a request of the podiatrists. There's no opposition. I'm happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "There being no debate, 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 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

- declared passed. Supplemental Calendar #1, House Bills-Second Reading, House Bill 4095, Mr. Harris. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4095, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill. Out of the record. Senate Bill 863, Representative Chapa LaVia. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 863, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Page 2 of the Calendar, House Bills-Second Reading, House Bill 1279, Representative Kelly Burke.

 Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1279, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Kelly Burke."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Burke."
- Burke, K.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Floor Amendment #1 is a technical change that allows Medicaid billing for physician assistants. It's a follow-up to a Bill we passed last spring. It just allows the physician assistants to bill Medicaid just by changing one word. And it was a request of the department so that that billing process would run smoothly."

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

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

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1279, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Burke."

Burke, K.: "Thank you. I think my explanation of the Motion explained the Bill. I ask for an 'aye' vote. I know of no opposition."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Breen: "It... Representative, I just want to make clear. So, currently, physician assistants can't provide because of the problems of the Act... they can't provide Medicaid services in the way that they get billed?"

Burke, K.: "Yes. And the issue was that there... the term used in the Bill... it just didn't allow them. And so, by just changing one term and making them the... the group that renders service and letting that be billable to Medicaid, it then allowed that service to be paid for by Medicaid. And then allows those physician's assistants to... to see Medicaid patients."

Breen: "Right. And... and they'll bill at less than the cost of a full... a full licensed physician, right?"

Burke, K.: "It... that's my understanding."

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

- Breen: "Well, then... okay. That's wonderful. It'll lower our costs.

 Thank you. It's a good Bill."
- Burke, K.: "You're welcome."
- 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 declared passed. House Bill 1281, Representative Kelly Burke. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1281, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Kelly Burke."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Burke."
- Burke, K.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is simply a 10-year extension on the Licensure Act for the nursing home administrators. Just simply an extension."
- 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: "House Bill 1281, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Burke."
- Burke, K.: "This is an extension of the Nursing Home Administrators Licensure Act for 10 years. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Feigenholtz. Please take the record. There are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Ladies and Gentlemen, moving to page 6 of the Calendar, under the Order of Total Vetoes... the Order of Total Vetoes. The first Bill on this Order is House Bill 688, Mr. Zalewski. Please proceed on your Motion."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to override the Governor's Veto on House Bill 688. This is a piece of legislation that we did in the spring related to allowing fire... firemen to transfer their credit to the Chicago Fund as long as they purchased their credit and as long as the unfunded liability was accounted for. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields. And you will have five minutes, Sir."

Breen: "Thank you. I... Representative, I... I see from the Governor's

Veto Message that the transfer of credit is going to be an

impact on... in his position, the transfer of credit will be an

impact on the underfunded local pension systems of the state.

What... what is your response to that critique?"

Zalewski: "That the fund is willing to accept that outcome and adjust accordingly. There's no impact according to them."

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

- Breen: "Well, I... how could there be no impact when you're actually shifting and creating new members and additional credit in the fund?"
- Zalewski: "Because... because we... as an Amendment, Peter, we said that the calculation had to be made by the actuaries, that that unfunded liability would be calculated as part of their purchase of their credit when they entered the system. So, that was an initiative... that was a request of the City of Chicago. We did it. And it ended up making, in our opinion, it made it... the systems satisfied with the request."
- Breen: "Now, it... with the actuaries making their calculations though they're making an expectations of 7 or 8 percent rate of return on the investments long-term. So, we're having... you know, we've had these problems where we've been underfunding even... even with the current status of calculations. So, I think that there is that critique that the amounts being transferred are not sufficient to cover the expense."
- Zalewski: "Yeah. I... I... again, to the extent that happens and the undervaluing happens, that's incumbent upon the systems' actuaries to recalculate the amount of purchase credit that will be needed to purchase the credit to enter the Chicago system."
- Breen: "Fair enough. And... and to the Bill. This is a... a Bill that, I mean, the Governor has properly vetoed this Bill. He has identified that we have a real problem with our pensions in this state. An issue that we used to talk about more frequently, but I think that some of us have put our heads in the sand and decided to ignore the issue until it bubbles over and takes us down. Our municipalities, our pension funds

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

for our first responders are in dangerous circumstance. And so, to do anything that would reduce their solvency, that would in any way now harm the benefits already earned and accrued by those who are in these systems by creating new benefits every time... every time we get an idea that, you know, we'll just create a new 6-month window to let all the new folks buy into the system even though the underfunded, and even though they're making estimates of rates of return that allow them to put in too little to cover the liabilities, it's irresponsible. And just because it might impact only Chicago, it's going to impact the whole state. And so, for those reasons, the Governor's Veto here was a good Veto. Certainly he is right, we should enact pension reforms that mitigate uncertainty in the reduced unfunded liabilities. So, for that reason, I would respectfully request the Members of this chamber think hard before voting on this one. And please look at a 'no' vote because we certainly do not want to do anything to further destabilize the pension systems in our state. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski to close."

Zalewski: "I just would argue that when this chamber looks at pension reform the fact that we've now begun to make these systems account for unfunded liabilities when they do these transact... when they do these transfer of credits is in and of itself the type of reform we want to make sure that these systems begin a corrective path towards sustainability. You know, this isn't probably earth-shattering, but it's important that these are the types of things we can do within

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

the current confines of the system to correct past problems. I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves that House Bill 688 pass, notwithstanding the Veto of the Governor. This Bill requires 71 votes. Those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 86 voting 'yes', 29 voting 'no'. And the Gentleman's Motion prevails. And House Bill 688 does pass, notwithstanding the Veto of the Governor. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 732, Mr. Burke."

Burke, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to override the Governor's Veto of House Bill 732. Ladies and Gentlemen, let me introduce you to the Fire Marshal of Springfield that's with us this afternoon, Chris Richmond. Chris, if you'd rise. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is the Fire Marshal of Springfield who has been working on this matter relentlessly. I'm bringing it to your attention again. We have previously considered the Governor's concern. If anyone would care to look at the Governor's Veto language, it does not articulate any particular reason that he would veto this legislation. Throughout the course of over 2 years, given the consideration that this matter has been given in... in committee, in floor debate, there has been no indication of opposition by any entity whatsoever in the State of Illinois. I have previously... previously said to you that every fire protection expert has supported this initiative to

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

preclude the opportunity for people who are not trained in the use of certain devices to do roofing work. And that device in particular that causes so much concern is the roof torch and certain other flammable materials. We have instances where certain employers would probably charge an employee who might be the dishwasher to go up on a roof and use a torch that would put not only that property in jeopardy but certainly the lives of individuals who exist in that property. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is the right thing to do. The Governor has no reason to veto this matter, that this Body and the Senate have considered overwhelmingly a very comfortable majority on previous consideration. I would ask that you support me and every fire protection expert in the State of Illinois and this country in supporting the override of the Governor's Veto. Be happy to answer any questions."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Breen: "Representative, I... I'm... just so that everyone's clear about what the Bill does. Currently, a... an employer can do any roofing or waterproofing work on their property without requiring those folks to be licensed as a roofing contractor as long as there's an employer/employee relationship. That's the current law, right?"

Burke, D.: "That is... that is correct."

Breen: "That's the current law. So, what we would be doing here is changing that so that you could no longer do roofing, but only roof repair, which is the reconstruction or renewal with

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

your employees. So, that... that's the change that you're making?"

Burke, D.: "That's right."

Breen: "So, that's the only change? Okay. Now, the Governor's Veto message had noted that none of our bordering states actually license commercial roofing contractors at the state level. Is that an accurate statement?"

Burke, D.: "I have... I'm not aware of that."

Breen: "We have no reason to doubt it though. And I'm not a roofing expert."

Burke, D.: "Neither am I."

Breen: "Okay."

Burke, D.: "Well, I'm beginning to feel like a roofing expert after having carried this matter for the last two years though."

Breen: "Fair enough. Fair enough. I'll go to the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, this... this is... looks like a small issue. But there are opponents to this and they're small employers. The NFIB, National Federation of Independent Businesses, is opposed to this Bill. And we currently have a system where we're... we're licensing folks that our neighboring states don't even license. And now we're going to further constrain employers in their ability to do repairs... well, are they going to... they can keep roof repair, but we're going to not let them do roofing to their own roofs, with their own employees, which is a right they have today. And it may look like a small thing, but it's yet another thing... another part of the Chinese water torture that we are performing on the employers of this state. And to that end, why would we continue... why would a

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

business continue in Illinois when at every turn we're continuing to make it harder and harder for them to do business, make it more and more costly for them to do business. And really at the end of the day, we're not being shown any particular instances where any problem has occurred. All we're hearing is, well, we need to do this. And the fire guys say we need to do this. And that's great, except that none of our neighboring states have any of these regulations at all, even partially. So, for that reason, I'd respectfully contend that despite the Sponsor's good work, the Bill itself is... is not something that we need as a state at this time and/or our current regulatory environment. And so, respectfully urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davidsmeyer for five minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Davidsmeyer: "So, currently the way this is written, if I go out...

if I run an insurance company, I go out and buy a house that

was a residence, but now it's a business. Am I under a

different rule because of me running a business out of it?"

Burke, D.: "Are you talk... are you suggesting that residential property be used for private enterprise?"

Davidsmeyer: "Yes. If you... if you go to Jacksonville, Illinois, there are some houses that were... that they used to be a residential house, but a business came along and purchased it and now is running their business out of it. For instance, an insurance company or something of that sort. Would they be limited on what they can do now that they are running a business out of it..."

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

Burke, D.: "All..."

Davidsmeyer: "...even though it's the same exact house?"

Burke, D.: "Current statute provides that any owner of a property, whether it be residential or commercial, the actual owner can do any roof repair that they want to do or that would need to be done."

Davidsmeyer: "So... so..."

Burke, D.: "This simply..."

Davidsmeyer: "...as... as a... if I lived in the house and I wanted some roofing work done, I could hire my buddy, Bob, down the street. He's done a lot of roof work, you know, construction work, things of that, but he may not be a licensed roofer. But as an individual citizen, I could hire that guy on my residential property, but as soon as I transfer that over to a guy running an insurance company, if he wants to hire Bob he cannot because Bob does not have a roofing license. Is that the case?"

Burke, D.: "Representative, I think... you're... you're expanding upon what we're attempting to do here. That... really what you just suggested has nothing to do with this particular measure. Currently, as I said to you, state statute provides that any owner of a property can themselves or their employee do work on a roof."

Davidsmeyer: "Yeah."

Burke, K.: "Our concern is with respect to the techniques and the equipment that is being used that is the use of a torch and flammable roofing material. And we're talking about flat roofs, not shingles."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. Have you... have you ever done..."

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

Burke, D.: "Have I?"

Davidsmeyer: "...this type of work or seen it?"

Burke, D.: "I have."

Davidsmeyer: "How's... what... what..."

Burke, D.: "I wasn't using a torch."

Davidsmeyer: "You say, you were not using a torch?"

Burke, D.: "I was not. No."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. I... I have employees that have actually done this work. They're not licensed roofers, but they actually have done the work."

Burke, D.: "Well, hopefully, they're experienced enough..."

Davidsmeyer: "Oh, they're very experienced."

Burke, D.: "...not to burn the building down."

Davidsmeyer: "Yep. They're... they're very experienced. Let's see.

Why... why is it necessary to restrict the business owner's choice? Why... why do we have to restrict who they can use?"

Burke, D.: "Representative, this is a public safety issue. If you're going to hire the dishwasher to use a torch and replace the roof of your building, there are great concerns. And that's what this legislation would address. You cannot take the dishwasher, put him on a roof with a torch in his hand and expect that you're not going to have problems. That's what this does."

Davidsmeyer: "But if he has experience doing that, what if he's your..."

Burke, D.: "That's an entirely different..."

Davidsmeyer: "...your dishwasher."

Burke, D.: "...situation. But the majority..."

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

Davidsmeyer: "But you're saying he has to be licensed. So, really quick... yeah, where did the dishwasher situation actually happen? Did somebody actually send a dishwasher on to a roof to do some torch work or are you being facetious?"

Burke, D.: "I... I am not..."

Davidsmeyer: "I assume you're being facetious."

Burke, D.: "...I am not being facetious. I am telling you that this is a public safety concern. When I introduced the Fire Marshal of Springfield, who's sitting in this chamber, who has relentlessly supported this initiative for the last two years, who in fact, told the story that of a commercial property in Springfield when the roof was being repaired the building started on fire. There are no smoke detectors or fire detection devices on the roof of a building. There were 300 people occupying that space. The Fire Marshal of Springfield is not playing games, wasting his time coming down here, testifying at every one of our committees and every hearing that this matter has been given. Do you think people are just fooling around?"

Davidsmeyer: "No, I don't."

Burke, D.: "This is a serious..."

Davidsmeyer: "I don't."

Burke, D.: "...public..."

Davidsmeyer: "I was actually..."

Burke, D.: "...safety concern."

Davidsmeyer: "...I was actually in... I was actually in committee

when he was... when he was testifying. So, I heard..."

Burke, D.: "Well, you should then..."

Davidsmeyer: "...his testimony."

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

Burke, D.: "...know what this issue is talking about, if you heard his testimony."

Davidsmeyer: "I... I also heard... so..."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davidsmeyer, could you bring your remarks to a close, Sir?"

Davidsmeyer: "Yes. I'll... I'll have somebody else yield me some time."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wheeler is going to give you five minutes."

Davidsmeyer: "Thank you. So, does the current state license specifically license torching? Do they train and license torch... the torch-style for roofing or is it just a license that says you can do roofing?"

Burke, D.: "Please give me that again?"

Davidsmeyer: "So..."

Burke, D.: "What is your question?"

Davidsmeyer: "...if I am a roofer and I do residential property and I get a roofing license from the State of Illinois, does it say that I am trained in torching?"

Burke, D.: "Yes."

Davidsmeyer: "It does?"

Burke, D.: "Yes. There are certain techniques and they have to meet certain qualifications in order to gain their state license."

Davidsmeyer: "I thought that was a federal license?"

Burke, D.: "It's state."

Davidsmeyer: "I... I don't believe... I don't believe you're correct.

I believe that's federal."

Burke, D.: "And municipalities license them as well."

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

- Davidsmeyer: "Okay. Why don't we allow municipalities that have these issues to do their own licensing on this specific style? For instance, the City of Jacksonville may not have this issue but the City of Springfield may. So, why don't we allow the City of Springfield to do their own licensing of roofers that... that won't affect business owners in Jacksonville or... or Pittsfield or wherever else they may be?"
- Burke, D.: "Frankly, Representative, I don't know where you're going with this."
- Davidsmeyer: "I'm saying that we don't license... we don't train torchers. It's a federal license that they get for... for torching."
- Burke, D.: "Whatever..."
- Davidsmeyer: "And it may be a local one as well, but is it... is it a money grab? What... what is this?"
- Burke, D.: "This is not a money grab. As you suggested a moment ago, you have been in committee when the Fire Marshal of Springfield has testified on behalf of this. Did you hear one opponent? Has there ever been one opponent to this initiative? The answer is, no. Until today, when your Floor Leader..."

Davidsmeyer: "I was ... I was sitting ... "

Burke, D.: "...decided to say that there was an opponent."

Davidsmeyer: "...I was..."

Burke, D.: "I have never heard from any opponents to this."

Davidsmeyer: "As a business owner, I'm an opponent."

Burke, D.: "And that revolving door Governor's administration, I don't know who even wrote the Governor's Veto, but it does not articulate any particular concerns."

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

Davidsmeyer: "And... and the... I was ... I was a 'no' before the Governor vetoed it. I... I just think we have to give private businesses the opportunity to make their own decisions."

Burke, D.: "They have that. We're not changing that."

Davidsmeyer: "Yes, you are. You're saying that..."

Burke, D.: "We're just saying that you don't..."

Davidsmeyer: "...you're limiting who they can use."

Burke, D.: "...you don't put a dishwasher on a roof with a torch."

Davidsmeyer: "Once again..."

Burke, D.: "That hasn't been trained."

Davidsmeyer: "...once again, well, who's the dishwasher? Was it a dishwasher on the roof of the building here in Springfield that..."

Burke, D.: "Well..."

Davidsmeyer: "...that lit it on fire?"

Burke, D.: "...no, it was a heater."

Davidsmeyer: "It was a heater?"

Burke, D.: "On the first floor."

Davidsmeyer: "On the first floor?"

Burke, D.: "Yeah. Room 108. Directly across the hall from my office."

Davidsmeyer: "What's... what's a heater?"

Burke, D.: "I could have said, it was Senator Oberweis blending some..."

Davidsmeyer: "No, I'm not talking about the fire in the Capitol.

I'm talking about the fire that they were discussing in... in committee on the roof of the building. I remember hearing about, you know, it's above the sprinkler system and things of that sort. But... but I'm... I'm asking who was doing that

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

roof repair and what made them not qualified to do it?
Accidents happen whether you have a license or not. We have
licensed drivers that get an accidents every day."

Burke, D.: "You're right."

Davidsmeyer: "So, I... I'm... I'm asking. Was it a... was it a dishwasher that was on the roof of that Springfield building?"

Burke, D.: "I wasn't there. I couldn't tell you."

Davidsmeyer: "I... I will venture to say it was not. I bet it was a maintenance individual, somebody who actually has some type of construction background or some type of construction ability to go through this. I think we're, once again, overburdening... overburdening our small business owners. And you know, this... this requirement is... is just completely ridiculous. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Batinick for five minutes."

Batinick: "I won't need that long. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Batinick: "Representative, I... I just want to clarify something.

You said this was about the torching, which I completely
understand. You said this wasn't about the asphalt shingle
roof, correct?"

Burke, D.: "Yes."

Batinick: "Okay. But the Bill includes the asphalt shingle roof?"

Burke, D.: "Do you have a specific cite with respect to that?"

Batinick: "Well, I'm just... it... it says..."

Burke, D.: "Well, I don't what you're... where you're going..."

Batinick: "...it amends the Roofing License Industry Act, providing that nothing in the Act shall contribute blah, blah, blah. It

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

just stops you if you can do repairs, but you can't do a reroof. It doesn't say, well you can't do reroof of a flat roof using a torch. The Bill... the Bill says you can't do your own roof... reroofing of a commercial property, correct?"

Burke, D.: "Commercial property."

Batinick: "Correct. Okay. To the Bill. That's exactly it. So, we have a problem here that's a tight problem. The problem is, is that the Representative doesn't want to... people using a torch on a commercial roof. And I understand that. That makes a lot of sense in Chicago where there's a lot of big commercial roofs with torches. We live in a very vast district with different type of things in Jacksonville, Illinois and Plainfield, Illinois. I have a lot of commercial properties that are converted houses that just have a household shingle roof on them. And I don't understand why we wouldn't let those business owners reroof their shingles. I'd be willing to work with the Representative on a compromise Bill that basically states... tries to address the issue that he's referring to. But we're... we're not shooting with the... at the target here. We're doing a big spray and we're catching everybody in. This is another regulation on a business as Representative... the Representative earlier said. We could keep doing this to small businesses. This isn't the end of the world, but this is just another... another one of those. So, for those reasons, I urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Phillips for five minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

Phillips: "I just have one question. You were talking about that single incident. Do you have any statistics? 'Cause I've been doing this I was 15, actually a roofer and doing flat roofs and doing torch roofs. And the hundreds that we've done in our particular area, I have never heard of anybody that's torched and burnt down a building. Is there a statistic that you have that's more than just this one or is this an isolated event or is there hundreds? Or you know... 'cause what percentage is there to create this need for just one building when the rest of us have done it and done it well without any issues or problems?"

Burke, D.: "Well, if you were in the committee to hear the Fire Marshal..."

Phillips: "I wasn't."

Burke, D.: "...of Springfield talk about the instance where a commercial property... where the roof was being repaired caused a fire, no one in the building was even aware that the building was on fire. And they were using a torch method to do the repair on that roof. Now, I can't give you national statistics or state statistics, but the fact is, our job in this Body is to protect the public in any way we see fit. And this, in my estimate, as I said for the last two years this matter has been in the Body's attention. And there is a risk to property and life as a result of using these tools that roofers commonly use to make repairs or replace commercial property roofs. If the chance exists that one who is not experienced, not trained, not licensed to cause a fire, to risk the property and the life of our society, then I think we should start to pay attention to it. And it does not

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

restrict private owners from doing their own work. But it would restrict that employee... that employer from assigning the dishwasher to go on the roof with a torch to replace the roof."

Phillips: "The... the incident that happened in Springfield. Was that done by a licensed company?"

Burke, D.: "I... you know, at this point I don't know."

Phillips: "Precisely. That's the problem. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Burke to close."

Burke, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, Ladies and Gentlemen, this matter has been considered for these last two years. As suggested in my opening remarks, there has been no opposition whatsoever from any business enterprise until this morning when Mr. Breen decided to announce that there was an opponent. I can only insist to you that this matter has been considered previously, has received overwhelming support. And I believe that if you would examine the Governor's Veto you would observe very quickly that there was no specific concern in general. It's a Veto, but not for a good reason. I would appeal to your good sense and certainly insist to you, if you think you know more than every fire protection expert in this country and this state, then you vote 'no'. I would ask and certainly rely on your experience to say the right thing to do would be to override the Governor's Veto. Please support the Governor's override on the Veto. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Burke moves that House Bill 732 pass, notwithstanding the Veto of the Governor. This Bill requires 71 votes. Those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish?

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Feigenholtz, Mayfield. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 77 voting 'yes', 34 voting 'no'. The Gentleman's Motion prevails. And House Bill 732 is declared passed, notwithstanding the Veto of the Governor. House Bill 1797, Mr. Davis. Please proceed, Sir."

Davis: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to override the Governor's Veto of House Bill 797... 1797. On Friday of this... of this past week, every Member of the House received a letter with a cover letter from me, but attached to it was a three page letter from Mr. Clayton Harris the Director of the Illinois International Port Authority. And I asked him to write that letter in response to the Governor's Veto message. What I recall of the message, the Governor speaks to, well, what is the path, what is the plan for the port? If you've not visited the port, we certainly would love to have you visit the port. But for those who have had the opportunity to visit, you can see that it is a true asset that we have in the continuum of moving goods and services from other countries into Illinois and through Illinois to other states, the United States. Its connection from the Great Lakes to the Mississippi River creates a fantastic pathway for... for agriculture products as well. The port itself is a job creator because again moving those goods and services when they come to the port, truck drivers and others will take advantage of the opportunity. Companies can thrive and then there are several businesses that are already at the port. So, while what we're asking here is kind of unorthodox in some respects and I can understand that. But

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

considering that this debt has been on its books for so long, the port has continued to languish. And under new leadership, they took a proactive approach to say that in order for the port to move, to grow, to develop, unfortunately, we need to ask permission of the General Assembly to relieve this debt. If any of you were in committee and remember before you understand that the Capital Development Board, which I think was the initiator of these dollars, are neutral with this. The Illinois Chamber of Commerce is in support of it. I was recently told, in all fairness to all of you, that the Manufacturing Association may be opposed to this. unfortunately, I've not talked to them so I don't know why. But when we talk about an opportunity to grow jobs and development here in the State of Illinois, here is a great opportunity for us to do so in a number of different ways. It currently does support some job opportunities, but forgiving this debt will give the Port Authority an opportunity to reinvest in itself with capital improvements so that it will have the opportunity to be self-sustaining and moving forward. Now, I'm not a business man in that respect, but unfortunately, this debt that exists on its books preventing it from being able to grow and to move forward. So, we have asked permission of the General Assembly to do so. A Bill that passed out of the House with 65 'yes' votes, went over to the Senate passed with 36 'yes' votes and of course, the Governor vetoed it. But today I seek to override that Veto to give the port, which is a natural asset that we have here in the State of Illinois, an opportunity to grow, an opportunity to be the productive port that we desire it to

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

be. So, I strongly ask that if you voted 'yes' for House Bill 1797 that you continue to stay with me and vote 'yes'. And hopefully, some of you after having read the letter that was provided by Mr. Harris, the executive director, in response to the Veto message you can see why moving forward to override this particular Veto is important. And... and allow the... a port to be, again, the natural asset that we want it to be here in the State of Illinois. With that, Mr. Speaker, I'd be more than happy to answer any questions."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Breen: "Thank you. Representative, if you would help us to walk through... I... I know you circulated a letter, but I know of the... I haven't seen the letter, but I saw the Veto message. And I was in support of the Bill the first time through, but I... I want to make sure that we get... get full information about why the Governor vetoed this particular Bill. He had pointed to some really serious issues identified by Auditor General Bill Holland back in 2013. And so, the Governor, I mean, it certainly sounds reasonable that we would want to demand certain changes prior to giving the Port Authority additional... have additional leeway as it were. So, how would you answer that charge on a substantive basis? What is your... your answer to that?"

Davis: "So, let me just... if I can read a little bit from the letter in response again to that portion of it. What Mr. Harris wrote is that, the letter and I believe he's referring to the Governor's Veto message, further references the 2013

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

Illinois Auditor General report, which has findings for limited profitability through indicating reasons financial and effective governance. What he further writes is that what this clause fails to take into account was that this audit was commissioned by the newest chairman of the board for that very stated reason. So, the new leadership wanted to make sure that they shed light on whatever the challenges were that the port had up until... up until this point. And that it also covers a period before the current chairman and executive director took office. And that ever since that audit, moves have been taken to address both the profitability and the Governor. So again, just like as the Governor's Veto message highlighted some things, this letter is in response to those things and speaks directly to the fact that they acknowledge the audit. But it's what about they're... what are they doing moving forward? The new board chair, the new executive director are working to try to rectify these kinds of things in order to move the port forward."

Breen: "And... and I know that in the Governor's Veto message he had mentioned the international public-private partnership models and that the Port Authority should undergo transformational changes. So, I guess what I would ask, maybe, for you to answer to us. Is the Port Authority undergoing those kinds of transformational changes and are they looking at those public-private partnership models going forward?"

Davis: "Well, I think what... the way I would answer that is that, whatever the board, now mind you board is comprised of appointees from various higher elected officials. So, I would

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

argue that if the Governor's making a recommendation to the board, I'm sure the board will take that recommendation under consideration among other recommendations to do what it can to make sure that the port is a viable entity. But that still doesn't change the need for what we're doing because again, as a fin... if a financier looks at that and says, well, what about this, that still may prevent even public-private partnerships from taking place. So, we're trying to create a clean slate here so that we can honestly look at all of those opportunities to make the port move forward."

Breen: "Okay. And... and again, the effect of the underlying Bill would be for us to forgive the \$15 million that this port owes the state, which I... it appears will never be paid. It's pretty much impossible for it ever to be paid."

Davis: "Based on the reason that the loan was given, under these current circumstances, you're absolutely correct."

Breen: "Okay. Thank you. And to the Bill. This is certainly an issue where people of good faith can come down on either side. The suggestion that transformational changes in the public-private partnership should be considered and dealt with by that Port Authority is certainly a very... a very good point. I hope that is something that will go forward. As I said to the Representative, I supported this the first time through just as a way to help clean the slate so that the port can succeed going forward. But again, people of good faith can disagree on this because that 15 million is... is certainly something that could be leveraged maybe to do more specific changes if the General Assembly so desired. Thank you."

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

Speaker Lang: "There are still seven people wishing to speak on this Bill. Mr. Harris for five minutes."

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this... this legislation to forgive the... the loan has been around for years. And I've had a... any number of discussions with the Representative, the Sponsor of this Motion and the Sponsor of the Bill, on the ... on the legislation. And I guess my basic question or my basic observation is this, a deal is a deal is a deal. We loaned them \$20 million. And we loaned them \$20 million and said, you got to pay it back. So, I mean, absent some overriding public policy issue, the loan should be paid back. The Governor makes a, in my mind, a good observation in his... in his Veto message that there is no clear plan by the Port Authority to get to profitability. So, if they don't have a clear plan to get to profitability, why are we forgiving the loan? And if they did have a plan to get to profitability, presumably any... any plan that they might have would include the fact that we have a \$20 million debt on our books that we have to pay back to the State of Illinois and as we generate the profits, those... that loan can be repaid. So, I certainly understand the Gentleman's intensity on the issue, but I just... Representative, I don't understand the logic. I mean, we made the loan. It's supposed to be repaid. It hasn't be repaid. We... we keep trying and trying and trying. As we know, nothing ever dies in Springfield. But there's a basic logic of a deal is a deal is a deal and they're supposed to repay the loan. So... so, that's ... that's my reason for the opposition. If they had a plan to say, hey, we have a plan to

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

get to profitability, we have a plan that might include repaying the loan, I could for... I could for... forgo all or part of it. But absent some overwhelming public policy issue, with all respect to the... to the Sponsor of the legislation, I urge a 'no' vote on the... on the override. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Evans for five minutes."

Evans: "Quickly, to the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, we have given hundreds of millions of dollars to corporations in this Assembly to locate, to stay open. We've given tax credits. I mean, Sears, I mean, you name it. We've given it. And we have Amazon, who's considering coming to the State of Illinois and we're promising to back up the Brinks truck. But we have assets already here that need to be analyzed and discussed. We have an international port on the southeast side of Chicago near my district in my community with vast opportunities. The City of Chicago is looking to develop this property. We have a new Port Authority executive director that's energized and looking to... to market this international port to Indiana, to all of our neighboring partners, so we can now get some of that Indiana money for a change. And for \$15 million, we're having a discussion. When, again, we've given away hundreds of millions of dollars. We're promising additional hundreds of millions of dollars for a maybe, but we have an asset here. So, I've supported this piece of legislation to forgive the intergovernmental \$15 million loan, so we can move forward with the property and make it marketable. Ladies and Gentlemen, I've been watching this property be dormant since the '80s. Again, we... we're allowing a state-owned asset to be dormant that could potentially be bringing in hundreds of

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

millions of dollars to our economy. So, we got the right energy. They have a plan once we remove some of these albatrosses and some of these distractions. This is that. So again, I urge your support, so we can move forward on this port and make this the greatest port in the nation. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Batinick for five minutes."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to go straight to the Bill. And I think the previous Representative said it pretty eloquent... eloquently when he said, it's a stale asset. You know, this isn't \$15 million we're giving away. This is \$15 million that was written off, I believe, 36 years ago. So, we have this asset that's stale that could do something. That's not going to take anything out of our budget, that's not going to take anything from current taxpayers. My understanding is, is this port is one, if not the only, or one of, if not the only, port that has access to the Saint Lawrence Seaway and access to the Mississippi River. We're either not going to get \$15 million or we're not going to get \$15 million and we're going to get some economic development in there... in an area where we... where we desperately need it. I think... when I look through the Roll Call of the last Bill, I think one of the interesting things that I saw is that some of the most fiscally conservative Members of this House voted for this Bill. This is not going to cost us any money. This is a small shot in the economic arm for the south side of Chicago and the state, upstate, downstate all around that depends on shipping. Let's do something good in a bipartisan way and let's get this over ... over the goal line. And I think

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

this process is right, that we passed it and I actually think it's right that the Governor vetoed it because we shouldn't be treating things like this lightly. We can't set some sort of precedent. But let's get this done for the good for the State of Illinois, for the good for the south side, for the good for this chamber. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative McDermed for five minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

McDermed: "Representative, isn't it true that this port is the only one that has access to highways, railroads, the lake and our inland transportation system, in other words, the Mississippi River?"

Davis: "Yes."

McDermed: "And isn't it like grossly underutilized?"

Davis: "Absolutely."

McDermed: "All right. Let me speak now to the Bill. I was the only Member of the House of Representatives that had a chance this summer to tour this port. We had some Senators there, but I was the only Representative. So, I want to speak to the Body about what an exciting and motivating trip that was. Here we have a port with a dynamic new director, I want to just give a shout out to Clayton Harris, the director of this port and his vision and his ideas for taking this port into the 21st century. They do have a plan to make this port everything that it should be. Getting rid of this stale liability on the books would allow the port and its director to grow and to develop in so many ways to handle intermodal, they want to handle passengers. And to go beyond... way beyond

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

the freight and other commodities that are being handled there and to move into more upscale type of activities, including even perhaps bringing an airport back to our Chicago lakefront. Wouldn't that be great? These are all the wonderful ideas that the port and their current director and their current leader have. I really urge this group to erase this ridiculous, ancient 40-year-old indebtedness so that we can move forward with this, have a great asset for our city and more importantly for the entire state. Please vote 'yes' on this Bill."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Andersson: "Will, I was in committee on this with you. And I want to make... I want to clarify something that's been said by a few people, particularly the Representative from Arlington Heights. He said that there is an obligation to repay our debts and we shouldn't lightly forgive that. But in this case, that's not actually true, is it?"

Davis: "Well..."

Andersson: "There's no... let... let me lead you where I want to go.

They don't have an obligation to pay back this debt unless they reach certain profitability levels, correct?"

Davis: "Correct."

Andersson: "So, they are not in default. And in fact, they don't owe a repayment until they reach those levels, correct?"

Davis: "That is correct."

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

Andersson: "So, what that means, because we've already talked about the fact that this is a stale asset, is they will never, ever be obligated to repay this debt, correct?"

Davis: "Correct."

Andersson: "So, we have two choices. Choice number one, never get paid back and have an asset that is stale. Or number two, forgive a loan that we're never going to get paid back on and allow this place to actually have a shot at growing. Is that correct?"

Davis: "Correct."

Andersson: "That math is easy for me, Ladies and Gentlemen. Makes perfect sense. Let's write this off the books and let's get this place moving. Thank you."

Davis: "Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Thapedi: "Thank you. Representative Davis, would you just explain to the Body exactly what happens at the port especially considering that Illinois is a global player in the international trade market and there are only a couple different ways to get stuff out to our partner countries that are trading with us, that's either by air, only rail is going to go so far and then we have the sea. So, could you explain a little bit more about what we're doing at the Port Authority especially considering that the Governor just went over to Asia to try to attract foreign direct investment for Illinois. So, clearly this is something that we're moving in that direction and we're going to have to get our products across

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

the world somehow, some way. So, if you could explain that, that'd be very helpful?"

Davis: "Well, thank you Representative. The... if you haven't visited, again, I encourage you to do so. The Port Authority is a true crossroads of America, in that, it intersects so many different ways for goods to come in and for those goods to exit and go in a number of other different directions: ship containers, rail, trucks, you name it. Everything intersects at the Port Authority and has the ability to then go in a bunch of different directions whether they be to other countries as a path... path through essentially the United States to say South America or what have you or coming in any other direction going to other parts of Europe and areas... areas like that. But the port is just that. There are so many opportunities for this port to grow and to continue to do just that. I mean, if we were to turn what was the old USX site into a very small airport, you know, there would an opportunity because of its connection to the port to have yet another way to move goods and services in or... in or out. But again, the port represents an opportunity for jobs. It represents an opportunity for economic growth development. And to the extent in which the Representative indicated that the Governor has gone to Asia to attract more investment here, much of that investment is going to come by way of cargo ship. And to have the opportunity for the port to now reinvest to make sure that its dock walls and other infrastructure are sound and up to par so that when those container ships come we can indeed receive them. And they're not being diverted to possibly somewhere in Canada. And then

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

to have those goods come from Canada into the United States. This is why or among the… are many reasons why we need to move forward with regard to this particular piece of legislation."

Thapedi: "So, would it be fair to say, Representative, that part of the reallocation, if you will, of this debt is the path to the transformational challenges and the transformational changes that the Governor wants to see. Is that accurate?"

Davis: "It certainly would be."

Thapedi: "So, essentially, the... the port is operating that they have this \$15 million albatross, I think is what Representative Evans said, around its neck putting it into a very difficult position to actually grow and do better and make those changes that the Governor is asking for without having these financial burdens on them. Is that accurate?"

Davis: "Yes, it is."

Thapedi: "So, what will be the next step? So, let's... let's both... let's suppose hypothetically that this Bill were to pass and it... and it... and it does in fact become law and that \$15 million allocation of financial debt is restructured otherwise. What would be the next step that the port would take?"

Davis: "Well, I think what you'll see the port do is I think, as many of you indicated in terms of creating that pathway forward, they've already started that conversation pending this piece of legislation. If nothing else, they'll be able to now go to the markets. One of the things that they want to do immediately is start capital improvements. And those organizations that would provide the resources for capital

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

improvements are looking for the disposition of this piece of legislation so they can then give them the resources to continue to rebuild their infrastructure so they can now attract business and continue to grow."

Thapedi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I urge an 'aye' vote."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Wheeler, K.: "Thank you, Representative. You and I talked about... last week about this Bill and I've been trying to do a little research here to follow up on it. I spoke this morning with Clayton Harris, the Executive Director of the Illinois International Port District, and I just asked him I said, in the simplest terms possible when I look at how we protect taxpayers, which I try to do every time we're on this floor together, I said, as a taxpayer am I taking money from or away from the taxpayer? He said, no. You're taking money from one pocket, effectively, that you owe the other pocket. There's no real liability here. Is that accurate?"

- Davis: "Well, yes. And again... and I'll close when we get to that point on the Representative from Arlington Heights position or about the deal, if I can say it that way, but under these circumstances, you are absolutely correct."
- Wheeler, K.: "Okay. I appreciate that because to me this just makes sense. We're not hurting taxpayers. We're helping an area that could use the development. This is smart legislation. So, thank you. I... I actually... to the Bill... or to the Motion. I'd urge a 'yes' vote to override the Governor's Veto. Thank you."

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davis to close."

Davis: "Thank you very much. So, the Representative from Arlington Heights talked about a deal being a deal being a deal. Well, the reality is that this deal that generated these resources to begin with was predicated on the growth and development that could come from increasing the cargo ship container traffic coming through the port. Well, through no fault of the port that never happened. So, to the extent in which the Gentleman talks about the deal, the port would have completed its part of the deal had the business come through the port the way it was indeed supposed to. So, with that being said, again, the port is in a position to be able to move forward and to grow in a way that I think the state will be pleased and happy with. The letter that the Executive Director provided talks about how there's been a lot of conversation in the past. So, the port is now under new leadership, new direction with a new Executive Director and a new board chairman. And the appointees for this board come from people that we all respect, like the Governor and like others. So, I would like to think that participation in what the pathway forward is will be influenced by the Governor through his appointees. So, he will be a part of helping to develop that path. So, what I would respectfully ask is that we override the Governor's Veto, eliminate this debt so that we can all be a part of what the pathway forward is for the Illinois International Port Authority. And that being said, I ask for a 'yes' vote on the Motion to override."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves that House Bill 1797 pass, notwithstanding the Veto of the Governor. This requires 71

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

votes. Those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Please record yourselves. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 79 voting 'yes', 36 voting 'no'. The Gentleman's Motion prevails. And House Bill 1797 is declared law, notwithstanding the Veto of the Governor. House Bill 2462, Representative Moeller. Please proceed on your Motion."

Moeller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that House Bill 2462 do pass, notwithstanding the Veto of the Governor. The chamber may recall that this is the Bill that would prohibit employers from asking for prior wage information during the hiring process. This Bill passed in the spring with a substantial bipartisan Majority. And would ask my colleagues to join me in overriding the Governor's Veto this afternoon. Would be happy to take any questions."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Breen: "And Representative, just so that we can clarify the state of the law today. We currently have a law that guarantees equal pay to folks based on factors of a constitute unlawful discrimination of the Human Rights Act, which includes sex among other factors, correct?"

Moeller: "Correct."

Breen: "Right. And... and that... for anyone who violates that... any employer that violates that provision an employee can sue

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

them and will actually get attorney's fees if they win a suit under the current Act today?"

Moeller: "That's correct, yes."

Breen: "Okay. In terms of the change to asking about wage history that... that struck me... that is... that was somewhere where there was a lot of talk, there was a lot of belief that there could be a compromise because there's a Massachusetts model that's... that some on our side of the aisle have been pushing for that. I know there's going to be other Representatives who will talk about asking about wage history, but what kind of data do you have on having the wage history... that whether having the wage history in place or not in place that that makes a difference in terms of the pay that then proceeds from the wage history?"

Moeller: "Well, you referenced that we had a law on the books for several decades that prohibits employers from paying women less than men for equal work. Yet despite the existence of our State Law that prohibits that as long... along with our... a Federal Statute that prohibits that, women still on average make less than men for equal work. The statistic is about 80 percent for white women, for African-American women it's 63 percent and for Hispanic women it's 48 percent. So, clearly..."

Breen: "Now, Representative..."

Moeller: "...the current statute is not fit... has not gone far enough to..."

Breen: "...hang on."

Moeller: "...ameliorate the problem."

Breen: "Well, Representative, though the... the... as I understand it when you control for work history, experience and those sorts

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

of factors, mutual factors, that the actual wage gap is somewhere between 3 to 5 percent. So, there's a wage gap, but it's..."

Moeller: "I've not seen that."

Breen: "...between 3 to 5..."

Moeller: "I've not seen that statistic."

Breen: "...percent. So, that's my understanding of the best data. So, that's... that's a reason to look and go, what is the cause of the 3 to 5 percent? And again, I think other Representatives are going to deal with the wage history issue. My real problem with this Bill was under the... your... your Amendment to Section 10(a) that talks about differences between pay of any two employees. And the current law says that you can differentiate in pay between any two employees based on a seniority system, a merit system, a system that measures earnings by quantity or quality of production or a differential based on any other factor other than sex or a factor that would constitute unlawful discrimination."

Moeller: "Right."

Breen: "That's our current system. And you're adding to that that final one, the differential factor. So, you could pay family members more. You could have a variety of other reasons why you could pay folks differently. But under your Bill, the factor could only apply if it is job-related with respect to the position, consistent with a business necessity and accounts for the entire differential. And unless the employee demonstrates an alternative employment practice that could serve the same business purpose without producing the differential. And my problem is when I combine that with the

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

fact that you can be sued and have attorney's fees hit you, I don't see how that in particular is going to reach your aim of equal pay because that is just... how do you justify that? Because that's not... has nothing to do with wage history or salary history."

Moeller: "I don't entirely understand your question? The... the Section that you're referencing informs employers that if you are paying your male employees more than your female employees who are in the exact same job, you have to justify that disparity in pay based on legitimate business reasons. The ones that you noted, merit, education, years of service. Those are legitimate business reasons for paying a woman less than her male counterpart for the exact same work. If there is another reason that you're paying your female employees less than your male employees for the exact same work, you need to be able to justify that with a legitimate business purpose. That's what this Section does."

Breen: "You know what? I... I'm going to go to the Bill. Here... here's the problem. First off, you're being told... like many Bills here in Springfield, we're being told it's about one thing and it's actually about another. The issue of wage history, salary history, there is a broad majority that... that would support the Representative in terms of preventing... preventing inquiry into that. Now that... that may not necessarily be the best public policy, the data is uncertain. I know others are going to address it. But the real danger of this Bill is that it is going to be trial lawyer's micromanaging the setting of salaries. And it's not just women versus men, it could be men being paid less than women. And

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

you may pay folks more or less because they're members of your family. There are other perfectly legitimate reasons where you may be paying Sally \$20 an hour, you may pay Jim 17, but it's 'cause Sally is your daughter. And Jim is not. Now, there are other reasons as well. And you're going to have that process micromanaged by a trial judge with a risk of attorney's fees being paid. And at the end of the day, the outcome is going to be much different than what you're intending. Again, there is already equal pay law in this state. There is a 3 to 5 percent wage gap we need to address, but this Bill... this incredibly invasive Bill that is opposed by every single business group in the state is not the way to address that disparity. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Six speakers left. Mr. Andersson for five minutes." Andersson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll speak to the Bill. So, it's clear that we have had an Equal Pay Law on the books for about 50 years, but the reality is what the Sponsor indicated. It's not a 3 to 5 percent wage gap, it's a 20 percent or greater wage gap. So, clearly the Bill or ... or the law on the books is not working. It's not working. We need to do more. And we need to do better. Apparently, the Governor actually agrees with that statement because his Veto message indicated that he does agree that wage history inquiry is inappropriate. But he prefers a different version, a version that adds one new exception. And that exception is voluntary disclosure. So that, if the employer says, well, I know I can't ask you for this, but if you want to voluntarily disclose it I'd certainly like to know what your... what your wages were in your last job. The problem with that argument is that exception eats

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

the rule because what employee or perspective employee is going to refuse it? They're going to want to tell because they hope to get the job. So, suddenly the whole point of the Bill goes away with that exception. And the claim is that the Massachusetts version of this Bill is better. But the reality is, is number one, Massachusetts Bill hasn't even come into effect yet. So, it's as new as our Bill. And number two, this concept of a voluntary disclosure doesn't exist as the Governor proposed it. It does not exist in the Massachusetts Bill. So, what we end up with is a situation where you have that exception added and we might as well not run this Bill. But more important to me is the question of what's the legitimacy of asking for the wage history? The only legitimate basis for doing that that I have ever heard is, well, we want to see if this person is a good performer and their previous salary would indicate whether or not people thought that they were a good performer. I would argue that that is completely false. That it's a very poor metric, in fact, for that. The ... the number of things that... that that doesn't take into account are... there's a lot of them. Their performance will not be reflected in their pay if they've been out of work for a period of time. We know that happens to women during the childbearing years. If they move markets. If you move from Kane County, where I live, and move into Chicago, the market for the jobs is markedly different. You might work for a smaller employer who didn't pay as much and you're looking to move up. Again, not a good indicator. And what if you were self-employed but decided to go back into the market? Again, none of these things are an indicator or a reliable indicator

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

of your ability to perform the job. And quite frankly, if that's what an employer is concerned about, which they should be, there are great ways to verify your ability to do the job that have nothing to do with your previous salary. If you're in sales, how many sales have you made? What quarter of the sales force were you in? The top quarter, the top half, the bottom half? You could find that out. Your actual skills, your actual grades. And of course, your references. People who have worked with you. So, there are plenty of ways, Ladies and Gentlemen, for employers to get to reliable metrics, but your previous salary history is not one of those. We have done this; we've tried the Equal Pay Act for 50 years. It's not working. We have to do more. This is a great opportunity to do more. So, I would urge a 'yes' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative McDermed for five minutes."

McDermed: "To the Bill. I was a 'yes' vote on this before. And I just want to speak super briefly to it again. This is a personal matter for me. I hate to admit in a room of people that I know so well and that I wouldn't necessarily want to have all this information but when I started my corporate career, all right I'm going to admit it in 1978, wage disparity was a big issue. Guess what, it's 2018, it's still a big issue. So, Ladies and Gentlemen here in the chamber, if you have a mother, a sister, a grandmother, a wife, a daughter, an auntie or a niece who's in the wage-earning private sector, you need to be a 'yes' on this vote. Vote 'yes'. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Batinick for five minutes."

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

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Batinick: "Representative, do you have any studies that show the effectiveness of your specific strategy?"

Moeller: "We have... as a prior speaker mentioned, we've had other states that have passed this legislation recently. This is a relatively new approach to getting at the systemic problems associated with the wage gap. And one would assume when women, in particular, are starting out their careers making less than their male counterparts, if you're basing future wages on those prior wages that that gap and disparity will be extended into the future. The AAUW, the Women's Law Center... National Women's Law Center, a number of nationally recognized, reputable organizations have identified this approach as a mechanism to eliminate that gap."

Batinick: "Okay. I'm going to go to the Bill. You know, when I spoke about this Bill previously, I talked about how the medicine may not... may not be the cure for the ill. So, we're... we're all agreeing that there's an issue here. We have no data. So... so, the issue is that there's a pay disparity and we're assume... I heard the word assume. I also heard the word, something was just passed. We're assuming that... that this is going to be the fix. Because making it illegal to do it wasn't enough, so we're going to do a bunch of other things. So, what was interesting is September 5 and I'm not reading from the Drudge Report, folks, I'm reading from the Harvard Business Review, the Harvard Business Review. The title of the article is, why banning questions about salary history may not improve pay equity. Now, I gave an example when I spoke on this Bill last time about how a woman could be hurt

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

by not having the salary discussion. Maybe she didn't look as good on paper, but she was a hard worker. She sold more than the other person. She deserved the higher salary and she was proud of her salary. So, we finally have an actual study with data from the Harvard Business Review that has study that says, the salary discussion hurt women, didn't help them. That not... Let me rephrase that. That talking about salary helped them, that not talking about salary hurt this issue. Why banning questions about salary history may not improve pay at all. Folks, we're a Legislator. We shouldn't be quessing at things. As the Representative said, Massachusetts just passed this law. I'll be interested in seeing 5 years from now whether this has the affect that we're all... that we're all expecting. But the only data... the only hard data that anybody has given me, that kind of matches some of the scenarios that I thought about in my head says it's not going to help, it's going to hurt. And I've seen this happen with other legislation. We're... it's a good name, I can't vote against that. Look at the name of that Bill. But you vote for it and then that Bill has the ... has the affect that's counterintuitive to what you're thinking about. So, I encourage you to read this article. I encourage you to do research. I don't believe that this is the solution to a problem that I admit exists. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Hammond for five minutes."

Hammond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. You know, we had some very lively discussion the first time that this Bill passed through this chamber prior to it being vetoed by the... by the Governor. I think the Governor in his Veto message

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

gave us some guidelines that perhaps we could implement and that many of the businesses in the State of Illinois could, in fact, wrap their arms around and implement for their employees. This Bill, in its current form, does not do that. In fact, it creates more of an onus on the businesses that we have here left in the State of Illinois. But particularly for our small business owners. There is absolutely no distinction in... in... in this Bill for a small business that would not be applic... this Bill would not be applicable to or a large business. In fact, the only difference is the amount of the fines. This opens our businesses in the State of Illinois to more and more litigation, more and more fines. And in fact, Representative Batinick spoke earlier, the Harvard Business Review has stated plainly, when they took a survey of 15 thousand job seekers that the woman who was asked about her salary history and refused to disclose was offered 1.8 percent less than the woman who was asked and did disclose. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives for five minutes."

Ives: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. The philosophy here down in Springfield is essentially that we know your business better than you know your business. And there's nothing that you do in your business that's beyond our realm to regulate. That's the philosophy. I hear it nearly every day when we have the Labor & Commerce Committee. That has got to change. If you really believe that the Illinois Chamber of Commerce, the IMA, IRMA, NFIB, the Technology and Management... Manufacturing Association, Associated Builders and Contractors, Illinois Bankers Association, Illinois CPA

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

Society, the Illinois Association of Aggregate Producers and many other business groups who are opposed to this Bill. If you believe they don't want to pay women equally in the workforce, I want you to stand up and say that. 'Cause I don't believe that that's what they think. I... this is an onerous Bill on business. And you know, they... we should be alarmed. We're losing businesses all the time. And when you look at the business votes in this chamber and you look across the last four years where these business groups have essentially rated our votes, most of you have failing grades on voting for pro-business Bills, failing grades. This is another one of those Bills that is going to go in and the businesses are going to say, you know what, they do not care about business down in Springfield. They think that they can tell us what to do in every facet of what we do. That's why you vote 'no' on this Bill. Enough is enough. It's time to stand up for business and not put them in a trick box with the excessive fines by them actually vetting employees the way that they always had for years. And I want you to come over there and I want you to tell these business groups that you think that they're against women. You can't do that. So, vote 'no' on this."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Moyler... Sorry. Representative Moeller to close."

Moeller: "Thank you, Speaker. The... the question as to whether or not to ask for salary history has been by and large widely adopted. The... the prohibition of asking for prior wages has been agreed to by the Governor in his Veto message and amongst the business groups that we met with. They... they agreed that

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

asking for prior wage information and ending that practice is not objectionable to them. So, some of the arguments I'm hearing from the opponents don't square with what we heard business community. They agreed that information is... should not be relevant to the hiring process and the wage offering process. Their concerns had more to do with the specifics of the Massachusetts Bill. As a prior Representative mentioned, we are not modeling our Bill on the Massachusetts Bill because we believe that there are loopholes in the Massachusetts Bill that would undermine the intent of what we're trying to do here in Illinois. And in fact, Illinois has a larger pay gap problem than Massachusetts does. It has a different regulatory environment than Massachusetts does. So, we've crafted a Bill that we believe is in the best interest of the State of Illinois. Crain's Chicago Business endorses this legislation. And wrote an editorial just a few weeks ago urging the General Assembly to override the Governor's Veto of this Bill. One can argue that Crain's is in tune with the business community here in Illinois and understands the challenges that the business community faces and endorsed this Bill. There is a pay gap. Women are still paid less than men for equal work despite having 50 years of regulations on the books to prohibit that. If we don't do something to address closing that gap, according to the Institute for Women's Policy Research if these trends continue in the same fashion as they have for the last few decades, Illinois is not expected to close the gender wage gap until 2065. That's unacceptable. We need to address this problem today. We need to bring equity to our...

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

our families, to our mothers, our daughters, our sisters, the women who work hard in this state to ensure that they're paid a fair wage, paid equitability to their male counterparts. And indeed, this Bill will help anybody who is seeking a job. Whether they've been in the workplace or out of the workplace or switching industries, this is a good Bill for all workers in Illinois. Thank you for your consideration. And again, I ask you for your override of the Governor's Veto."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Moeller moves that House Bill 2462 do pass, notwithstanding the Veto of the Governor. This Bill requires 71 votes. Those in favor of the Lady'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? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 80 voting 'yes', 33 voting 'no'. And the Lady's Motion prevails. And House Bill 2462 is declared passed, notwithstanding the Veto of the Governor. House Bill 2622, Representative Fine."

Fine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2622 is an employer friendly Bill that gives employers a choice. This Bill would create a Not-for-Profit State Workers' Comp Fund. Similar companies in other states, including our neighbors in Missouri and Kentucky, has successfully implemented these companies. And our legislation is modeled after these states. In all, 27 states have state workers' comp funds or state charter workers' comp insurance companies created through a public-private partnership. This gives our employers an additional choice when purchasing workers' comp insurance, as the goal is to provide insurance and not to make a profit."

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

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Thapedi: "Representative Fine, we've been hearing a lot from the Governor asking about reformation in the workers' compensation system, right?"

Fine: "Absolutely."

Thapedi: "So, what does this Bill do to help reform the workers' compensation system?"

Fine: "What we've seen happen in other states is the price that employers pay for workers' compensation insurance, it goes down. In 2011, the General Assembly made a set of cuts to benefits an injured workers receive under the workers' compensation laws. And these cuts were meant to lower workers' comp costs for Illinois employers. However, the insurance industry has not passed along the savings to those employers who buy those premiums for... for those policies. In all, since 2012 the amount of money that insurance companies have made on premiums from workers' comp has gone up 430 percent."

Thapedi: "So, would it be fair to say that one of the things that is wrong with the workers' compensation system is... is that the price that different employers are paying for these insurance policies are somewhat elevated. Isn't that true?"

Fine: "Absolutely. Like I said before, since 2011 the National Council of Compensation on Insurance has recommended a total decrease of 36.5 percent in the amount of premium paid by employers. And the employers are not seeing any of those savings."

Thapedi: "Why are the employers not seeing those savings? Because if one of the major issues is... is that the insurance companies

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

are charging a premium, if you will, on the amount of money that the businesses have to pay to have the insurance, if they need to operate a good business, why are they not... why are the businesses not seeing some of that relief?"

Fine: "We have no rate review in Illinois. So, the insurance companies can pretty much charge whatever they please. And we can't do anything to control that cost."

Thapedi: "And so, that's why you're bringing this Bill. Is that you're bringing a Bill that will allow the state to have some oversight and to have a separate insurance company, if you will, to give these businesses that desperately need that relief the opportunity to get relief under the workers' compensation system that so many people are complaining about. Is that accurate?"

Fine: "This would be an alternative."

Thapedi: "Okay."

Fine: "So, we wouldn't be doing anything to change the companies that already sell workers' comp insurance in the State of Illinois. But this would just give people another option of where to buy. And we see this work successfully right now in 27 other states. And most of those states are not blue states."

Thapedi: "Are any of those states in the Midwest?"

Fine: "Yes, quite a few of those states are in the Midwest. We have this taking place in Kentucky, Minnesota, Missouri, Idaho, which really isn't Midwest, but Ohio. You know, many states around the country. Like I said, it's in 27 other states."

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

- Thapedi: "So... so, some of the states that you've just identified are some of the states that the workers' compensation reform folks are saying we need to do our system like this state. We need to do our system like that state, so that we have more competitive environment for our businesses to come back to Illinois or to come to Illinois period, right?"
- Fine: "Absolutely. And like I said, we've seen profits increase since 2012 by 430 percent in Illinois. In Missouri, it's been by half of that. And in Kentucky by 55.4 percent."
- Thapedi: "Thank you very much, Representative, for this Bill.

 This is a path to looking to reform the workers' compensation system that's claimed to be broken by many. This will move us in that direction. Thank you very much for the Bill. And I urge an 'aye' vote, Mr. Speaker."

Fine: "Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Wheeler, K.: "Representative, are you aware that we already have 300 and roughly 30 workers' compensation insurance companies in Illinois right now?"

Fine: "Yes, we do. And they are all making quite a profit."

- Wheeler, K.: "And how much money are you intending to invest in this state-sponsored work comp insurance company?"
- Fine: "This begins with a \$10 million loan from the state that is to be paid back with interest over five years. And after that, the state is hands-off. And it's a not-for-profit company moving forward."

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

- Wheeler, K.: "So, in five years they've got to achieve a \$10 million surplus in order to pay the state back?"
- Fine: "Actually, what we've seen most other states in the Midwest is that loan is paid off within two years."
- Wheeler, K.: "And... that's fascinating. What's the current profit margin for a work comp insurance company in Illinois right now?"
- Fine: "I'm sorry. Can you repeat the question?"
- Wheeler, K.: "The current profit margin of the median workers' compensation insurance company in Illinois right now?"
- Fine: "In 2015, it was 17.2 percent."
- Wheeler, K.: "So, a quick question for you about the... the makeup of the composition of the board. Who appoints the board of directors for this company?"
- Fine: "I believe the Governor appoints the board of directors.

 And it's a seven-member board, appointed by the Governor, with Senate approval."
- Wheeler, K.: "And that will continue beyond the initial payback time?"
- Fine: "Yes."
- Wheeler, K.: "So, it really is a government run company then, not hands-off?"
- Fine: "Well, but we... no, it... except for appointing board members it is appointing people who are professionals in the insurance industry. And the state steps back and lets the professionals who know the industry run the company."
- Wheeler, K.: "Okay. So, the point is that you're going to say that the Governor's appointed board can find smarter officials to run this company than the ones that run the 303...

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

330 in this state right now 'cause they'll be on it more effectively, more efficiently. And then because there's no profit motive here..."

Fine: "Absolutely."

Wheeler: "...except that they have to pay back... \$10 million, so there is a profit motive. Then they'll actually be able to work it that way so much better than we do right now?"

Fine: "That's what we're seeing in 27 other states."

Wheeler, K.: "No, that's not what you're seeing in 27 other states. What you're seeing in the 27 other states is a different marketplace because we drive up the costs of workers' compensation by the rules we set here, in this Body, not in the other 27 other states."

Fine: "Well, according to the insurance experts, we have seen an increase in rates since we passed the legislation in 2011. However, the last numbers show us we should actually be seeing a 36.5 percent total decrease. So, what that tells me is we've got these companies running and they're making money off of the other businesses in our state. And we're giving these businesses another option by forming this not-for-profit group that is only going to focus on workers' compensation insurance."

Wheeler, K.: "Let's just assume for the moment that your idea would work, which I don't believe it will, but let's assume that it would. How much business could you absorb with a \$10 million loan to that company to actually help... how much business can they write with that? In other words, how many customers could they take on?"

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

Fine: "So, Illinois requires insurance companies to have one dollar in reserves for every three dollars in premiums sold.

And as a conservative estimate, if the company used \$3 million in startup costs we'd be able to sell \$21 million in premium."

Wheeler, K.: "Twenty one million dollars in premium? So, you're saying that they're going to make back the \$10 million dollars over five years, they'd have to have a pretty healthy profit margin in order to be able to do that. So, they wouldn't be competing that much directly against the other companies that already exist in the marketplace because they are already competing against everyone else, but they have to make a profit at the same time. So, does the company you're suggesting. For the first five years they have to make a profit in order to be able to pay back the state taxpayers of Illinois. The question is..."

Fine: "They're... they're not paying profits for shareholders though. Yes, they have to pay back their loan, but this company would really be owned by the companies that invest in it and purchased their workers' comp insurance. So, these are the companies that would benefit in the end."

Wheeler, K.: "So, you're saying that if I'm a premium payer to this company, I'm now actually buying in as a shareholder as well?"

Fine: "Yes."

Wheeler, K.: "Okay. That's..."

Fine: "It's... it's a mutual relationship."

Wheeler, K.: "Okay. I gotcha. I'm going to go to the Bill since
I have 20 seconds left here. If this Bill was really so
employer-friendly, everyone, then you'd see some employer

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

groups actually stating that they're for the Bill, but none of them are, none of them are. And I'll make a point I made before. If the Representative and anybody else in this Body thinks there's a collusion problem because 330 competing companies are actually working together to raise prices, call the U.S. Attorney."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Brady for five minutes."

Brady: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Brady: "Representative, just a quick question. If I understand this correctly, the 10 million that's in question to start this funding formula with the bank is coming out of the present workers' comp budget, is that correct?"

Fine: "That's correct."

Brady: "Okay. And so, let's say that the program... the idea, investment, you know, it all fails, it doesn't come to fruition. How does the Illinois Workers' Comp get their 10 million startup investment back?"

Fine: "Well, I'm... proceeding forward knowing that it has been so successful in 27 other states. And that many of those states, instead of paying it back in five years, has been able to pay it back in two years. And these are the models that we're following."

Brady: "Okay. But there's... there's nothing within the legislation that says if, in fact, two years, five years, whatever it might be, that if a problem occurs where it does not work out that there is some safeguard that the 10 million will be back there in the budget for the Illinois Workers' Comp Association?"

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

Fine: "No, it is not addressed, but we could address that with a trailer Bill."

Brady: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives for five minutes."

Ives: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I think there was just mention that there might be a trailer Bill. So, an interesting trailer Bill might be why don't we just go fullout socialism here in the State of Illinois? So, we can have a work comp insurance agency run by the state. We can have a health insurance agency run by the state. Maybe we should have a homeowner's insurance agency run by the state. Business liability insurance run by the state. Maybe we can put State Farm out of business. We'll also have an auto insurance business run by the state. Let's just do it all. Let's just have the state insert itself in every other insurance program that... that people have to deal with because obviously the state knows better how to run things than private businesses. I want to see that in the trailer Bill and see how far you get with that one. This is an attack on business once again. On top of it, it's very interesting on page 9 it says that the board shall reflect the ethnic, cultural and geographic diversity of the state. Now, I don't know how you get cultural diversity, but I have an idea here. Since we all agree on the Blackhawks and the Bulls, maybe cultural diversity actually comes in that you need one Cubs fan, one White Sox fan and one Cardinals fan. Maybe that's what defines our differences in culture here. Otherwise, this is completely undefined. What a total ridiculous proposal. Oh, and we're going to pay back \$10 million with interest. Would that be interest at the

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

rate that we're paying to people that we don't pay their bills on time for? So, are you talking about 12 percent interest after the first 90 days? Is that how much interest we're going to pay back on a \$10 million borrowing? I mean, honestly, you could not be... this Bill could not be more egregious and ridiculous in all facets. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davidsmeyer for five minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Davidsmeyer: "So, I... I believe last time we had this conversation

I asked you how many businesses are currently licensed to do

work comp in the State of Illinois?"

Fine: "About 300."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. How many of those actually sell work comp insurance?"

Fine: "I... I don't know of the 300 how many actually sell."

Davidsmeyer: "I believe the number that we got was actually under 100 of those 300 companies that are licensed to actually sell. So, if the profits are as good as you say they are, why would so few be actually participating?"

Fine: "These are the numbers that we were given from the Department of Insurance. I can't tell you why their businesses decide that they don't want to sell this type of insurance. But these are the facts and figures that we are getting from the experts. These are not coming from me."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. Well, I... I would argue that there'd be a lot more work comp insurers in the marketplace if the work comp profits were as high as you're saying they are. But I'll go back to a question I asked last time. Can you name... and you

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

- didn't give me an answer last time... can you name one thing that the State of Illinois is currently doing well?"
- Fine: "I can tell you it's not helping employers on workers' comp insurance."
- Davidsmeyer: "I know. We should be changing the work comp system.

 Name one thing that the State of Illinois is currently doing well?"
- Fine: "We are currently doing well in that we finally got a budget and we are funding our higher education, our schools and our human services, to say the least."
- Davidsmeyer: "You're... you're saying we're doing well at those things?"
- Fine: "No. I'm saying, it's about time we were able to work together and get that done."
- Davidsmeyer: "You know, I... that... that's a pretty far stretch. I would... I would argue that the State of Illinois is currently not doing anything well. We are spread too thin. We overpromise our... our citizens and we underdeliver. And I will say that if we do this, we will be doing the same thing. We'll be overpromising, underdelivering, competing with our... our constituents, competing with the businesses that actually pay the taxes that go to pay for... for schools and universities and all the things that you talked about in the budget. I would urge a 'no' vote. There's nothing that the State of Illinois can currently do better than private insurance. Thank you."

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

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

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

Wehrli: "In your opening remarks, you said that there were some reforms earlier and those savings have not passed along through the system by the companies. Is that correct?"

Fine: "That is correct."

Wehrli: "So, are those companies... either the 300 that are allowed to do business or the 100 that actually are doing business in this state, are you accusing them of collusion?"

Fine: "No, I'm not accusing them of collusion. What..."

Wehrli: "How about price fixing?"

Fine: "No. I'm not accusing... I'm not..."

Wehrli: "How about fraud?"

Fine: "They're making a profit. And all this legislation does is give our employers another option. We hear it from employers all the time and I know you do as well, that their workers' comp fund rates are out of hand."

Wehrli: "Okay. Agreed. Agreed."

Fine: "And this gives them an option."

Wehrli: "So... so we have... we have 300 businesses that are licensed to do work in this state and we have 100 that actually are. What skill sets can the State of Illinois bring to the market from a competiveness standpoint that those free market businesses can't do? How is the state going to do this better?"

Fine: "This is not the state. This is the state appointed experts to the board."

Wehrli: "It's state money. Is it not \$10 million of state money?"

Fine: "Right now, you have to understand that of all the premium our employers pay every year in workers' comp insurance, only 54 percent of that is being paid out."

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

Wehrli: "Is it 10 million dollars of state money?"

Fine: "It was 75.3 percent..."

Wehrli: "Is it 10 million dollars of state money?"

Fine: "That will be repaid. And actually, it's a loan."

Wehrli: "Is it \$10 million of state money, yes or no?"

Fine: "Coming from the insurance fund that all insurance companies..."

Wehrli: "So, yes, it's state money?"

Fine: "...pay into, as will this insurance company."

Wehrli: "I still don't believe you've answered that question. Is this state money?"

Fine: "It is state money that will be paid back."

Wehrli: "Okay. So, \$10 million of state money to enter into a business... To the Bill... \$10 million of state money going into a business that over 300 companies can do now, 100 are doing successfully, but somehow, this State of Illinois... the state that is fiscally in ruins... is going to do it bigger, faster and stronger than 100 current companies. This is a terrible Bill. This is gross overreach by this legislation. Please vote 'no'. This is... this is not how we should be doing things. Instead of shutting these businesses down, we need to be expanding them and opening up the market, not making it centralized in State Government. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Fine to close."

Fine: "You know, I've been listening to the conversation and the debate. I've heard totally ridiculous in offering employers an option. I've heard that \$10 million loan... what are we talking about giving to Amazon right now? What did we give to Sears that left? It was more than a \$10 million loan that did

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

not... to be repaid. In 2011, the General Assembly made a set of cuts to the benefits that injured workers receive under the Illinois Workers' Compensation Law. These cuts were meant to lower workers' comp costs for Illinois employers. However, the insurance industry has not passed along those savings to Illinois employers who pay premiums to insurance companies. Since we last considered this Bill, just months ago, even more data has come out that supports the idea that something needs to be done to force the insurance industry to pass along those savings to Illinois employers. The National Council on Compensation Insurance recommends another 10.9 percent decrease in premium rates from 2018. Since 2011 and those benefit cuts, they've recommended a total decrease of 36.5 percent. We've seen an increase in profits going up tremendously. The percentage of premiums collected by the insurance companies that is actually used to pay our benefits was calculated at 54.6... 54 percent in 2016. For the second year in a row, the industry is using ... using barely half of the money it charges Illinois employers to pay benefits to injured workers. Insurance company profits are up 400 percent since 2011. And because of these facts and figures that are not coming from me, but are coming from the National Association of Insurance Commissioners, we can see why. I ask for your 'yes' vote so we can help the employers in Illinois have another option and save money."

Speaker Lang: "Lady has moved that House Bill 2622 pass, notwithstanding the Veto of the Governor. This Motion requires 71 votes. Those in favor of the Lady's Motion will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Connor. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 65 voting 'yes', 50 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And the Lady's Motion fails. Page 7 of the Calendar, Senate Bill 1905, Mr. Moylan."

Moylan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the General Assembly. Today I am urging my colleagues to join with me in standing up for the middle-class family. We can send a clear and loud message that Illinois still cares about the proud, hardworking men and women of our state and believes in the rights or workers to stand together and negotiate as a group for fair wages and safe workplaces. By overriding Governor Rauner's Veto of Senate Bill 1905, we can protect the wages and safety of workers across the state. I respectfully request a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves that the House override the Governor's Veto. Mr. Breen is recognized for five minutes."

Breen: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Breen: "Representative, I... you know, there's a Supreme Court case going up right now called Janus vs ASFCME. And in that case there is the issue of whether a public employee can be forced to pay into a fair share dues. And the problem is, your Bill states that it is a Class A misdemeanor to even regulate union security agreements. And so what happens to a state... to a local unit of government... the State Government if Janus is successful in his suit at the Supreme Court? And therefore, units of government are not able, under the U.S. Constitution, to regulate or they're not able to... to withhold those dues.

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

But under your Bill, you would say that they are unable to even regulate union security agreements."

Moylan: "Could you please repeat that question... the question?"

Breen: "No. Under Janus, if Janus wins how do local units of government not pay into fair share without committing Class A misdemeanors under your Bill?"

Moylan: "Yeah. I plan on filing a trailer Bill to eliminate the penalty."

Breen: "To eliminate the who?"

Moylan: "Yes, the penalty."

Breen: "The penalty? But..."

Moylan: "Correct."

Breen: "...why wouldn't you just file a trailer Bill to do your Bill without the penalty altogether?"

Moylan: "Well, I plan on... I plan on overriding the Bill and then filing the trailer Bill."

Breen: "Okay. Well, I..."

Moylan: "As a compromise."

Breen: "...trailer Bills are... are... often die for whatever reason.

The... the problem is, why is there a Class A misdemeanor on this? That's the highest level of misdemeanor. You're one step below being a convicted felon at that point."

Moylan: "I plan on filing a trailer Bill to eliminate the penalty."

Breen: "Right. But this Bill is going to go into effect before your trailer Bill can even... can even get consideration."

Moylan: "No, I disagree."

Breen: "And why exactly is your Bill... why did you use the... you didn't just outright stop municipalities from doing a right

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

to work, you prevented them from regulating in any way at all, union security agreements. Why did you use that language in the Bill?"

Moylan: "In the town that you live in, you have policemen and firemen and do you respect the work they do?"

Breen: "Why did you use the word regulated instead of just going to the entire thing that... why... why did you even get down to even not even being able to regulate? Why did you use that word?"

Moylan: "I believe that our public employees have the right to collective bargaining... bargain. And this is..."

Breen: "So, you have no answer to that question?"

Moylan: "No, that is my answer."

Breen: "I'm going to go to the Bill. Yesterday, I... I saw a video and it was a video of the Governors of three of our neighboring states thanking the Speaker of this chamber for sending jobs to them, for continuing to reduce the... the economic climate of Illinois. And the problem with this Bill is there's... there's one municipality that has decided to attempt a right-to-work ordinance. They haven't even been allowed to do so by the District Court in Chicago, the issue's up before the 7th Circuit. So, they're not even allowed to do it. But at some point you have to look to particularly our border towns and ask the question, are they going to be able to do what they believe they need to do in order to compete with our neighboring states? Because truly those... those Governors of those neighboring states and... and particularly the Governor of Indiana, which of course is a right-to-work state, all three of the states that were in that ad were right

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

to work states. But the Governor of Indiana talked about how in their right-to-work state, they are generating more union jobs than we are here in Illinois. And the problem is for those downstate communities or you know communities on the border if they're looking at a factory that may be, you know, the difference between having that factory and those hundreds of jobs or not. Who are we to tell them how to do their business? If you believe in local control, this is a Bill that absolutely violates that local control. Moreover, I mean look the… we're not… this is a very limited measure. It's something that as we can see only one town in Illinois even wanted to do it so far. It's something that's a very... it's a very extreme measure with criminal penalties to solve what may not even be a problem and certainly is not something that will go statewide. We're not talking about statewide rightto-work here. And so, for that reason both in local control. The fact of these, you know, the terrible issues that you're going to run into and the fact that we needed to restrain ourselves from doing anything to hurt local communities and their ability to generate jobs and bring in factories and other interests that may... that may want to experiment with. We should vote 'no' on this. And move on and then let's have a negotiated solution down the road. Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Morrison: "Representative Moylan, I don't want to put words in your mouth and sometimes it's hard to hear in here. Could you just restate your... your opening statement in... in regards to

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

your belief that workers should be able to collectively bargain?"

Moylan: "Yeah. Well, I'm going to read a better statement."

Morrison: "Okay. Thanks."

Moylan: "Workers in right-to-work states earn less than those in states that preserve collective bargaining rights. Workers in right-to-work states receive fewer employer benefits than states that protect collective bargaining rights. Workers are less safe in right-to-work states compared to the states that protect collective bargaining rights. The frequency of workplace injuries include fatal injuries is significantly higher in areas that restrict working collective bargaining rights. But let me also mention in states of Wisconsin and Minnesota, the young college students that graduate college you know where they're coming? They're coming to Chicago and Illinois. You know why? 'Cause they can't make a decent living there. We have to do everything we can to preserve the middle-class and so they can earn a... a decent salary and that will also help us thrive in the State of Illinois."

Morrison: "Okay. Representative Moylan..."

Moylan: "Okay."

Morrison: "...can you just restate what you put in the record when you... when you introduced your Bill? Did... all right. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. Illinois is at a competitive disadvantage for drawing the employers that we absolutely need. Our residents across this state need an opportunity to work. And we continue to hurt ourselves as a state, our competiveness with these sort of policies. What I was hoping to hear, what I think the Representative said was that he

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

believes that workers have the right to collectively bargain. They can do that across all 50 states in this country. And they would still be able to do that if we were to give local jurisdictions greater freedom to decide what is best for their communities and for their constituents. So, I would urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."

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

Skillicorn: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Skillicorn: "Representative, yes or no, is Illinois a right-towork state?"

Moylan: "No."

Skillicorn: "And yes or no if this Bill passes or if it fails, does our status as a right-to-work cha... state change?"

Moylan: "We want to make sure that our status doesn't change."

Skillicorn: "So, that sounds like a no if... if this either passes or fails it doesn't change our right-to-work status. So, to the Bill. I love a lively debate; this is a tremendous honor to be in this... this forum here. It's a tremendous honor to speak in front of the Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. But one thing is, we can disagree about things. We can disagree about worker freedom or right-to-work or if people have the... the right under the First Amendment to assemble and be part of a collective bargaining agreement. Or if people want to have the freedom of association to opt out of being... be forced into a united condition of employment. We can have that debate. The key here to this Bill, it is not a clean Bill. So, we could... we could talk about that debate if you prefer worker freedom or if you prefer being forced into a union as

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

a condition of employment. We can talk about that, but this isn't the mechanism to do it. This isn't the vehicle to do it because this is not a clean Bill. So, I just wanted to read a quote here from the Bill. This is actual text of the Bill, Section 25. And it talks about, 'any officer, representative, director, elected official, or the like of any local government or political subdivision, or agent therefore willingly... knowingly or willfully violates this Act, or who knowing or willfully fails to comply with this Act, is quilty of a Class A misdemeanor'. So, precisely a 'yes' vote about this Bill is not about right-to-work versus worker freedom. It is also about locking up village trustees and local mayors. This is not a clean Bill, Ladies and Gentlemen. So, a 'yes' vote, just to make this perfectly clear, is a 'yes' to locking up village trustees and putting local mayors in jail. Let's just remember that and maybe we should demand a clean Bill on this. This is... this is something that I'm just going to ask that ... we're remind. We are responsible for how we vote. We are responsible for our voting records. So, I ask that we talk about a clean Bill and have a real debate on the issue, not something that's thrown together with two distinctly different problems in it. Thank you."

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

Wehrli: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Many of us in this chamber served in our local city councils, mayors, county board members before we came here. And what I would like you think about is take the underlying issue here of right-to-work away. And think about the Class A misdemeanor that we could be charging people with for simply proposing and voting

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

on local control ordinances and laws. I've spoken to a couple municipal attorneys and other attorneys about this and... and none of them can recall an instance where simply voting on a piece of legislation makes you a criminal. That's what this Bill does. If you... if your local city or county decides to run something like this and they vote on it, they're guilty of a crime. Think of the chilling affect that that has on those local units of government. Remove the issue of right-to-work, put in whatever other topic you want to put in there. And we're... we're... the icy fingers of Springfield are reaching down into local government and telling them what exactly they cannot and can do and still remain within the law. This is unique of any bit of legislation I've seen since... in my short time here. We're going to criminalize doing your job as an elected official. This is a bad Bill. The chilling affect should give us all pause and should have us all vote 'no'. Please vote 'no' on this. And Mr. Speaker, should this receive the requisite number of votes, I request a verification."

Speaker Lang: "Your request is acknowledged. Mr. Phillips for five minutes."

Phillips: "Yes, Sir. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. I guess what I'm going to say is simply this. Today I think you've seen a fair and balanced House of Republicans and House of Democrats today working together. We've overridden some of the Governor's Vetoes together, as... as the House of Representatives, as what we think was best for the State of Illinois. I think what I'm asking is, since we've been fair and balanced on this right side, this particular Bill is not a fair and balanced Bill.

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

No disrespect to the man that's brought this. This would be an opportunity for us to work together to redo some of these things that are not fair to the employers and be more balanced to them. So, I would urge a 'no' vote from both sides of the aisle. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hoffman for five minutes."

Hoffman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Hoffman: "Yes, prior to discussing your legislation, Representative Moylan, there's been some discussion regarding the whole issue of enforcement of this Bill and the fact that there is some criminal enforcement of a misdemeanor, if it is violated. What's your intention with regard to removal of that provision?"

Moylan: "In the art of compromise, I plan on filing a trailer Bill to eliminate the penalty, which I stated right away in the opening of my dissertation."

Hoffman: "So... and it was a brilliant dissertation. It was..."

Moylan: "Thank you."

Hoffman: "...absolutely brilliant. But let me just... let me just point out then to the individuals who raised it on the other side of the aisle, the concern regarding a criminal offense being part of enforcement, that it's going to be removed. However, this Bill is... is on a Veto Override Motion we can't amend it now. So, the... the Representative has indicated and given his word, and I know his word is good, and I think everybody believes that, that's he's going to follow up if this is overridden. If it is overridden in the Senate and becomes law, he's going to remove that misdemeanor provisions

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

in the Bill. Now, let me just talk to the Bill for a second. We can talk all we want about whether you're for right-towork or not. I'm not; I'm not. I can clearly tell you from experience and looking what right-to-work has done in states that wages go down, safety goes down, the ability to have health care for workers goes away or goes down. The ability to have a pension after you retire is decreased. There's no doubt about it. There's not one study that says workers are better off in right-to-work states. Not one. Not one. I tell you, there are workers in this nation who have died for their right to organize. They've band together to organize, so that they and their families can have a better... better life. That's what the right to organize is. But this is even worse. The idea that we'd have these local empowerment zones. Governor's idea is even worse than just a blanket right-towork. Because we would have a patchwork of right-to-work jurisdictions throughout Illinois. You could be building a road in one city that's a right-to-work city and the road goes into the county that isn't a right-to-work county. And all of the sudden I guess the ... the nonunion person gets off the job and the union person comes to work as you build the road. It makes no sense. We shouldn't even be talking about this, but the Governor over and over and over again keeps beating his fists on the desk saying he's demanding that he have right-to-work, in some form, in Illinois. So, he came up with this silly concept of empowerment zones and a patchwork of right-to-work jurisdictions. Makes absolutely no sense. Let's talk about the three Governors that were mentioned that are in this commercial: the Governor of Missouri, the Governor

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

of Wisconsin, the Governor of Indiana. All right-to-work states, you're right. And workers in those states make less. They have a higher injury rate at work. They have less health care. And their families suffer as a result of it. But why are they really doing these commercials? Because they really care about Illinois? Or could it be ... might it be or am I so cynical that the Governor gave them \$100,000 in campaign contributions when they ran? Could it be that? Could it be that? Shocked and appalled. Shocked and appalled. They do it because in their hearts they care about Illinois and want to make Illinois competitive. Bull. Let me just say this. The Gentleman has given his word. He has said he will follow up with a trailer Bill to address your concerns. It's time that we put this issue behind us. It's time that the Governor stop holding the budget hostage for these types of empowerment zones and right-to-work in Illinois. And taking away the rights of workers in Illinois. And it's time that we continue the business of governing. I ask ... I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Walsh for five minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Walsh: "Representative, in the U.S. Constitution there's the First Amendment has a Right to Assembly. Is that... would you say I'm correct in that?"

Moylan: "Correct."

Walsh: "And in that Right to Assembly it gives people the right to band together, to work on a common cause or work for a certain benefit. And isn't that what unionized labor does?"

Moylan: "Yes. It's called collective bargaining."

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

Walsh: "That's one of the aspects that they use it for. I'm very familiar with that. So, let me just... in... in this attempt to go right-to-work in Illinois or within a certain municipality, basically what we're doing is saying somebody can come to work and work that job, but doesn't have to pay the... the costs associated with that collective bargaining agreement. Is that correct?"

Moylan: "Correct."

Walsh: "So, let's just say Joe Smith wants to move into a condo association. And... and in a condo association or a townhome association you have to pay fees in that, correct? If there's a... if there's an association there."

Moylan: "That all depends. I can't answer that."

Walsh: "Well, I... if there's a neighborhood association or whatever you want to be in it, you have to be in it to live there you have to pay that fee?"

Moylan: "Could be."

Walsh: "It's the same thing in a job. If you go to Caterpillar and you want to get that job that pays 28, 30 dollars an hour, if you want to go to Nabisco bakery or if you want to work at the CTA, you basically are going into an organized union shop where the vote... where the members... the employees there grouped together, voted on making that place unionized. And they have to pay the dues or equivalent fees, correct?"

Moylan: "Correct."

Walsh: "When you take that right away or you take that ability for that cost to be paid, who suffers?"

Moylan: "Middle-class families suffer when you make less.

Remember... remember, we want to stop right for... right for less

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

Bills. This is a Bill that ensures that the middle-class families and... and public employees have the right to bargain collectively."

Walsh: "So, that... basically, what we're trying to do is keep the employees able to work together to negotiate with their companies for a betterment of wages and... and working conditions?"

Moylan: "Correct."

Walsh: "So, these right-to-work laws that go around all these states and now have infiltrated into Illinois and even into our local governments, would you say their attempt is to weaken that bargaining power of employees with their employers?"

Moylan: "Well, their... their plan is to weaken the middle class and right-to-work for... right-to-work for less. And that's why my Bill stops that."

Walsh: "All right."

Moylan: "And gives you them... the employees the right-to-work collectively. And bargain collectively."

Walsh: "All right. To... to the Motion. You know, I've... I've stood up here before and talked about this. You know, this attempt... this is just a blatant attempt to weaken worker rights. It's to weaken the rights of everyday people that go to their jobs, whether they're union or nonunion. Right now... right now in Illinois the union can put in a union security clause, does not force that person to join the union. They don't have to. But what they do have to do is pay for the cost of the benefits that they receive from that union contract. And that's only fair. That is only fair. I've got people that

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

work within my union, many of them live in Indiana. Why are they coming over here? 'Cause they can make 43, 46 dollars an hour versus 25 in Indiana. That's what they're doing. Because we have strong collective bargaining rights. That's what we stand on here in Illinois. That's why I'm proud to be an Illinoisan. And that's why I'm proud to stand up against this attempt to work... to weaken working families and their issues. As a former colleague from Madison County was stating, the only thing you do with right-to-work laws is weaken their economic stability, you weaken their health benefit packages and their benefits, their pensions, their 401(k)s and their bargaining power within their voice in the workplace. That's all this Bill's going to do, if it's put into place. That's why I'm standing here today recommending to each and every one of you, my side of the aisle, your side of the aisle, we need to stand up for working families here in Illinois. We need to stand up for them. We've had this discussion four or five times over the last two and a half years. Let's show, not only the Governor, but our constituents that we stand up for them. Vote 'yes'."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Willis for five minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Willis: "Mr. Moylan, can you give me a little bit of background?

When we're looking at unions and certainly when we're looking at collective bargaining wages are part of what they are discussing, but what else is discussed during that that would make it beneficial to be a union member?"

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

- Moylan: "Well, there are pensions, safety rights on jobs, anything that they can bargain collectively. As I mentioned earlier, that states that right... have right-to-work for less do not have the same degree of... of... of rights that we have. And it's a proven fact. That's why I mentioned that when students in our surrounding towns are graduating college, they're looking to Chicago and Illinois for jobs because they know we have... they have better opportunities here."
- Willis: "That... and as you know, much of my background comes from my husband's association with the Associated Fire Fighters of Illinois. And they were established over 100 years ago and their establishment was put in not necessarily for wage benefits, but for safety benefits. And it is because of the hard work of that union that we have less and less fire fighter deaths every year because of the safety standards they put in. One of the most important was the two in, two out, making sure that we had adequate protection as these gentlemen and women now worked in the fire field. You are a member of the electricians union, what safety measures was your union benefitted to the member throughout there?"
- Moylan: "We have OSHA... we send our members to OSHA classes. You... there's certain, different classifications. We also implemented drug testing for all our employees. These are some of the securities and some of the safety measures that being under a collective bargaining agreement provides their employees. One other thing I just want to mention while I thought of it, 8 of the 22 GOP Senators voted for this Bill. They obviously realized how important it is to them and their... their residents in their districts. Myself, I was a 46-year

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

member of the IBEW. It provided me and my family a decent wage and as part of the middle class. And that's what we're protecting. Some of the Members mentioned about how we're trying to protect jobs. Illinois isn't losing jobs because of our climate. Most of our factory jobs are being lost because of automation. We're still protecting and we're still making and creating jobs. That's why we have... have approximately 1 to 40 cranes in downtown Chicago, providing many, many jobs. It's not just the construction workers that work on those jobs, it's the places that they do to eat. It's the places that they... that they park, that they drive. It's all part of a working middle class that makes our... our state a great state."

"Thank you, Mr. Moylan. To the Bill. One of the most Willis: important things for us to realize is right-to-work means right-to-work under the right circumstances... circumstances, actually, which is what it is. So, I always say right-to-work is wrong for the State of Illinois. But unions make sure that you're working under the right conditions. You are working in an atmosphere that is safe. That you can make a living wage on. That you can go home and have health insurance coverage. That you can make sure that your family is taken care of. If, God forbid, that you are injured on the job, they have ... they will fight for your rights when it comes to workmen's comp claims, making sure that those things that might have been wrong by your employer are now corrected, so that others will not have the same thing. That is the important thing that we have to thank our unions for. Without our unions, you'd be working 70; 80-hour weeks and

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

coming home and... and not being able to actually enjoy your time at your home. You probably wouldn't even own your home, if you go back to why we had to make sure that we had that. Employers do not all do what's right for the employees. We need to have oversight. That is why the unions are there to fight for your rights as an employee, to make sure that you are working under safe conditions. Making sure at the end of the day you come home with a paycheck that is a living paycheck. Making sure that when you retire, you can retire and not have to reduce your standard of living that you can afford to stay in your home. These are all the benefits of our men and women that are in the unions. We owe it to them to make sure that we protect those rights. And that is why I urge this Body to vote 'yes' on this Bill. It is time to get rid of this request for right-to-work in the State of Illinois. I will repeat again, right-to-work for the State of Illinois is wrong. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Batinick for five minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Batinick: "Hi, Martin. Good to see you. I don't get to debate you very often, so I really appreciate this moment. And I want to tell you that I do... I do trust your word. You talked about there's a need... there's a technical fix, a need for a trailer Bill, correct?"

Moylan: "Correct."

Batinick: "You want to talk about that process? How does a trailer Bill work?"

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

Moylan: "Well, I plan on as soon as the debate is over, if not immediately, but by the end of the day, putting the language together to file a trailer Bill to correct the issue that was discussed by numerous Members on your side of the aisle to reasonably quell their fears."

Batinick: "Okay. And... so, this Bill if passes, has an immediate effective date is my understanding?"

Moylan: "No, it doesn't. The immediate effective date is when the Governor signs it."

Batinick: "Well, I... we're overriding the Governor here."

Moylan: "I know, I mean..."

Batinick: "So, this would immediate... this will immediately become law?"

Moylan: "No. It would not immediately become law because the Governor hasn't signed it. So, in that period... it'll come... I mean, I plan to file this as soon as I can. I should say that."

Batinick: "Okay. You plan to. Here's the issue. You say you're going to file it sometime. Last I checked it goes... are you the chairman of the Rules Committee?"

Movlan: "No."

Batinick: "Are you the chairman of the committee the Bill's going to go to?"

Moylan: "Not that I know of."

Batinick: "Okay."

Moylan: "It could."

Batinick: "All right. Are you the Senate President?"

Moylan: "No."

Batinick: "Okay."

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

Moylan: "And I don't intend to be either."

Batinick: "Are you the chair or the Sponsor in the Senate? Here's my issue."

Moylan: "Okay."

Batinick: "This is a Bill that has... I'm going to go to the Bill."

Moylan: "Okay."

Batinick: "This is a Bill that has a clear issue that the... that the Sponsor has admitted and identified along with our side."

Moylan: "Correct."

Batinick: "Technical issue. This is an important Bill that has an immediate effective date."

Movlan: "Yeah."

Batinick: "So, my issue is, I trust you that... at your word. But there are several people and there's a process on this trailer Bill that might not agree that they want to have the trailer Bill."

Moylan: "Right. Well, I'm going to get you an answer. I think I will have an answer. And I want to make sure that I try and quell your fears."

Batinick: "Yeah, to the Bill. To the Bill. There is a bunch of people that can... that can stop the issue from being addressed. You can address that in your close, Representative, 'cause we're... I'm... to the Bill. So, I... we should get the Bill right like this before we even consider voting on it. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mitchell for five minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Mitchell, C.: "So, I'll just start my questions, Marty, by just thanking the Gentleman from Naperville for his help in

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

prolonging this debate. But a couple of questions for you, Mr. Moylan. So, first of all, I know that you're a very proud union member yourself. Could you describe to this Body why this Bill is so important to you and what being in union has done for you and your family?"

Moylan: "Well, this... this Bill is... it's important to myself and my family... my family members, but it's also important to every person that works under a collective bargaining agreement. For some reason, they think that this is maybe talking about construction workers. This affects your policemen, your firemen, the people that cut your grass. A whole vast array of workers that are covered under collective bargaining agreements. Your people that work in factories in the districts. So, he wants a right-to-work zones, but generally people don't understand what a right-to-work zone is. You could have certain people from Naperville working different wages from certain people... from people from a different suburb because they have a different right-to-work zones. And people, we've fought for these rights for hundreds... over a hundred years. We've been on the picket lines to give people a decent wage. Pensions, annuities, safety regulations, that's all included. That's why we collective bargain... bargain. We had ... when we collective ... when we bargain collectively we reach agreements with your employers. We reach agreements with people in the community. This is all about keeping the middle class making a decent wage."

Mitchell, C.: "I... I appreciate that answer, Representative. The Gentleman from Lombard at the beginning of this debate also said that there were these Governors, he saw a..."

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

Moylan: "Right."

Mitchell, C.: "...piece of media yesterday where these Governors had come out and said, hey, thanks for the jobs to the Speaker of this chamber. Is... is it true or is it not true that Bruce Rauner also gave \$100 thousand to each of those Governors?"

Moylan: "Yes, that's true."

- Mitchell, C.: "So, while I would think that Scott Walker would be too busy not being President to be weighing in on Illinois politics, it appears that he might have had an ulterior motivation. Is it true, Representative, that the median wages in Illinois are higher in... or I'm sorry, are higher in Illinois than they are in Wisconsin or Indiana or Michigan?"
- Moylan: "That's correct. And that's why workers come to Illinois to work. As I mentioned, this would be the third time, that college students in Wisconsin and Minnesota are coming to Illinois to find good paying jobs. Wisconsin and Minnesota are trying to do programs to keep their graduates in their states, but because in Wisconsin they have right-to-work issues, it's not being effective."
- Mitchell, C.: "Thank you, Representative. I'm going to... I'm going to go to the Bill. Look, there are some good things I'm sure about Indiana and... and Wisconsin and some of our surrounding states. In fact, I know there are. We had auto plants sort of get their great start in Detroit in a lot of ways and that's incredibly important. But we don't want to have a race to the bottom. There are ways in which I don't want to be Indiana, I don't want to be Michigan, I don't want to be Wisconsin. I like the fact that wages in Illinois are \$10 thousand higher than they are in Indiana. I think that's a very good thing.

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

I think we want working people to have 10 thousand extra dollars in their pocket. I believe that unions are in fact the reason why for example I, as an African-American, am able to stand here. My grandfather was a union steel worker. He worked at Reynolds Metal Company right off the Stevenson Expressway. In being able to do that, he got the job that allowed him to put all of his kids into college. That allowed me to be standing here having a mother who had a... who has a BSN in nursing. Union jobs are what made that all possible. I will... I will leave this chamber and folks who are perhaps on the fence with the words of Martin Luther King who spoke about this in one of this last speeches. Who said, in our glorious fight for civil rights we must guard against being fooled by false slogans such as right-to-work. It is a law to rob of us of our civil rights and of our job rights. Its purpose is to destroy labor unions and the freedom of collective bargaining by which unions have improved wages and working conditions for everyone. Wherever these laws have been passed, wages are lower, job opportunities are fewer and there are no civil rights. We do not intend to let them do this to us. We demand that this fraud be stopped. Our weapon is our vote. Now, in this chamber today we have a chance to use our vote as a weapon to advance the lives and working conditions of our constituents. To say that as Representative Willis said, right-to-work is wrong for the State of Illinois. I ask that you all would join me in sending... sending that message by voting 'yes' to override the Governor's Veto. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

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

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Halpin: "Representative, you had answered this earlier, but is it correct that Illinois is not currently a right-to-work state?

Is that right?"

Moylan: "Correct."

Halpin: "But at least one community here in the State of Illinois has taken it upon themselves to try to pass a so called right-to-work zone, is that right?"

Moylan: "Correct."

Halpin: "And that's currently being... being debated through the
 courts, am I right?"

Moylan: "Yes."

Halpin: "And is it your belief that anti-union activists will continue to try to encourage communities to take actions like this in the future?"

Moylan: "Correct."

Halpin: "So, by this... bringing this Bill, am I correct that it is your intent to prevent any kind of confusion on this issue and to make it clear that the... the status of any right-to-work legislation is going to be statewide as opposed to this patchwork of laws that could result?"

Moylan: "Correct. I aim to prevent right-to-work for less."

Halpin: "I guess my next question would be, you have some personal experience with this, how have... how have you addressed this particular Bill to resolve those concerns about the middle class that you mentioned earlier?"

Moylan: "There were some concerns in this Bill about some penalties and I addressed that. This Bill's effective date

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

isn't to... does not have an effective date. So, it wouldn't be effective until June. So, I have plenty of time to file the proper trailer Bill to address those concerns."

Moylan: "Correct."

Halpin: "And so, I... you know, I haven't heard much objection beyond the issue of this... this misdemeanor penalty, have you?"

Moylan: "No. I have addressed... talking with people from both sides of the aisle. I have worked with Members of both Parties to address their concerns in this Bill."

Halpin: "And obviously to start over from scratch would seriously delay any efforts to... to try to establish this uniform rule for the entire State of Illinois?"

Movlan: "That's correct."

Halpin: "I'd go to the... to the Motion, Mr. Speaker. I think the Representative has acted in particularly good faith to try to address what I think are legitimate concerns. I don't think that a public official should be, you know, criminally held responsible if... if they conduct an act such as this. But I do think that our local governments have to know that a policy like this should be determined statewide. We can't have construction projects, road projects that are going to... to span over different... different communities where one has said we get to have free riders that don't want to pay their fair share for the benefits of getting these contracts in the first place. And then when they cross that jurisdictional line, all of the sudden the... you know, they need to participate. This is... this is the wrong direction. We don't need a patchwork

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

of... of laws here in the State of Illinois. As many Members of the opposite... of the other side of the aisle have mentioned, we can have the debate over whether or not Illinois is going to be a right-to-work state. I don't think it should. I don't think it will. But this is a way to make sure that the laws of the State of Illinois are uniform throughout the state so we don't have continued litigation. So we don't have continued confusion over what the... the responsibilities are of our local governments. This is a... a good Bill. It can easily be fixed. I believe the Representative has committed to... to fixing it. And I know of no objection. I've asked around... I hear of no objection that we're actually going to get this fixed. And so, I would encourage everyone to... to... to vote to override the Governor's Veto and let's get this settled once and for all."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives for five minutes."

Ives: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. You've heard a lot of discussion today about this Bill. And you've heard some really outrageous statements at the same time. Let's start with that there's no civil rights in state's that have... are right-to-work. I mean, I didn't know that they suspended the Constitution there in Indiana and Wisconsin and Iowa and Missouri, Kentucky, Tennessee. Oh, by the way, that's all the states that surround the State of Illinois are right-to-work. But apparently, you know, that's not very valuable information. It's not important to note that even though Indiana has less than half of our gross domestic product, they provided nearly four times as many jobs over the last 18 years than the State of Illinois. Four times as many jobs.

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

That's right. Jobs are growing in Indiana. They're decreasing here. But even regarding the fact that they've apparently suspended civil rights in Indiana, it's really probably not a good place to live. Except that, if you really talk to people... and I had an interesting conversation last year at a... one of the receptions dealing with I believe it was the construction industry. And a young guy was there just kind of starting out in that industry and admitted that, you know, he... he works in a unionized environment and that he's fine with unions, he likes it all. And I got to talking to him, well, where do you live? Well, I live in Indiana, but I work in Illinois. Well, why do you live in Indiana? Oh, you wouldn't believe it. I've got this incredible house, really big, three times larger than my house in... I could afford in... in Illinois. And the property taxes are about 25 percent. The reason people live in Indiana and work in Illinois is 'cause it's more affordable to live in Indiana. It has nothing to do with whether or not they're making more at the union job, it's 'cause their quality of life, based on the dollar for dollar difference... a dollar for dollar calculation, they get more bang for their buck in Indiana than in Illinois. That's why. So, it's interesting. This Bill does nothing about Illinois... making Illinois a right-to-work state. It says nothing about it. It says that particular communities can decide for themselves if they want to have... let's ... let's put it in a different way, enterprise zones. Free enterprise zones. And wouldn't you know it, we actually do have what another speaker referred to, a patchwork of laws in Illinois 'cause we do this all the time. With River Edge Enterprise

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

Zones and... and a TIF District and all these other things where we have a patchwork of laws for... for particular constituency. So, we're already doing it. Why not give these guys the choice? Let them choose. Another thing that you should be aware of is that, you know, when you talk about there being 40 construction cranes in Chicago, it doesn't mean a darn thing in Decatur. Not a darn thing. Places like Decatur actually need a right-to-work zone. They need to compete just across the border with Indiana and Kentucky for those jobs. I have a very good friend of mine, he runs a company and... actually his company is headquartered here. They do food processing, which is great. They actually have plants here that at this point are cash cows. But they have chosen not to expand here. They're not expanding here. They put one company in Kentucky, they brought... built a new plant in Kentucky about two years ago. They're looking at Wisconsin or Iowa for a second plant to build. They're not coming to Illinois. And we need that work. People in Illinois need to be put back to work. He also talked about... the other term I heard was 'race to the bottom'. As if we are not there already. As if we are not the outlier when it comes to anything financial. And I also hoped that Amazon would select us, but the reality is DCEO has said that 1100 companies have blacklisted Illinois and we are a flyover territory for them because we are not right-to-work. This is huge economic problems in the... in this state. They're a huge problems. And this Bill just makes it worse. And it doesn't change anything about us making us right-to-work. It does nothing about that statewide. This Bill sends the biggest signal to anybody, stay away from

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

Illinois. They are going to regulate you to death and they're... they're not listening to the business community. You have to vote 'no' on this. You have to vote 'no' on this Bill. If you fail to vote 'no' on this Bill, the signal you send to businesses is horrific. It is the nail in the coffin for Illinois business. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Moylan to close."

Moylan: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. I believe in working together. I have made some changes to my Bill. And I just want to address one thing. Research shows that right-to-work laws have no impact on job growth. Let's not make Illinois a right-to-work state... a right-to-work for less state. And I respectfully ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Moylan moves that Senate Bill 1905 pass, notwithstanding the Total Veto of the Governor. This requires 71 votes. And a reminder that Mr. Wehrli has asked for a verification. Members will be in their seats and vote their own switches. Those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves, Members. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 70 voting 'yes', 42 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And the Motion fails. Mr. Turner in the Chair."

Speaker Turner: "House Bill 2778, Representative Willis.

Representative Willis moves that the House... that House Bill 2778 do pass, non-withstanding the Veto of the Governor.

Representative Willis is recognized."

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

Willis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is a Bill that basically says that nobody gets a free ride in fire protection. We had passed a law a number of years ago that established the 9-1-1 board. And the 9-1-1 board is required to make sure that every part of the State of Illinois is covered by fire protection. That's a good thing. We're proud of our fire protection throughout the state. Unfortunately, what happened in this... there's a small loophole in it that there are sections of the state, most of it downstate, there's actually five different counties that this would affect. It'd be in Madison Fire Protection District, Bond, Lee Counties and Fox Lake Fire Protection District. That there are small parts that are not actually annexed into those fire protection districts. They are required by the 9-1-1 board to provide the fire protection coverage, but they are not given the opportunity to get the tax or the money that would come from an annexation. This requires them to be able to annex those properties after a hearing and a vote and therefore officially be paid for the fire protection that these districts are covering these few small, I would call them no... no man's land. We are proud of the fire protection throughout the State of Illinois, but it does come at a cost. There is a cost to maintaining equipment and there is a cost to maintaining of the adequate training of the personnel that do it, whether they be a volunteer fire department or a full-time paid fire department. Therefore, I strongly urge a 'yes' vote on this override. I'll be willing to take any questions. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Breen is recognized."

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

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

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

Breen: "Representative, I... I wanted you to walk us through the process of annexation. I... I see a... an adoption of an ordinance and there's notice by certified mail and there's a hearing, but then who... is there anything else after that? Or are you then just automatically annexed or what... what's next after that hearing?"

Willis: "It's voted on by those in the hearing as to whether they are going to annex those properties or not."

Breen: "Okay. But that's... that's in the... so, the fire protection body that wants to annex the property makes the vote?"

Willis: "Yes."

Breen: "Okay. So, the individuals being annexed do not get a vote at that..."

Willis: "No."

Breen: "...that hearing?"

Willis: "They have a right to put in a request... a reason why they would not want to be annexed to there. What the... basically what it would be is they could also appeal. If they wanted to say, no, I'd rather have fire protection and pay for fire protection and annex to a different fire protection district, they could do that."

Breen: "Now, there's no appeal right though found in the... the Bill that you put forward. I don't see any measure about appeal. It just..."

Willis: "No. It's not. It's part of the hearing process."

Breen: "Okay. To the Bill. The... the Governor's message here is... is a pretty good one. The... the process of ensuring that we've got the right people being covered under fire protection and

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

that folks have an input and say in their fire protection is ... is... is absolutely critical. The problem is the way that this has been set up right here the folks being annexed don't have any say over the process. There is no appeal right. They get notice and they get to go be heard at a hearing of a bunch of folks that do not represent them. And so, it is something that is a... I would say that the Governor's Veto is well-taken on this particular Bill. Particularly, when you're looking at all the property tax burden and other things like that. There should be some sort of an appeal right or some sort of objective third party observer that helps to mediate this ... this particular process of annexation with fire protection. And so for that reason, I would respectfully urge that the Governor's Veto be sustained, that... that a 'no' vote be done. Again, because the fire protection districts get too much discretion here. And it... both annexing the properties and then in subjecting those annexed property owners to pay fees at the discretion of the fire protection districts. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Willis to close."

Willis: "Thank you. One of the things that I'd like to point out is that this is actually taking care of a loophole that was set up when we put in the 9-1-1 board that allowed these no man lands to be assigned to a fire protection district... districts for coverage. And one of the things also as to the cost of the average person's property tax for fire protection in these areas is approximately \$65 a year. That's pretty good price for that protection that you need. We need to make sure that if we are going to require the fire coverage we

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

have a way to make sure that those districts that are required to bring this fire protection coverage to the area are compensated adequately for it and not wait until we have a tragedy and have a fire occur. We always want our men and women in the fire service to be prepared, trained and ready. I urge an 'aye' vote on this override. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2778 pass, the Veto of the Governor non-withstanding?' The Motion requires 71 votes. This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; opposed by voting '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. With 86 votes... voting 'yes, 29 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', this Motion, having received the Supermajority vote, House Bill 2778 is hereby declared notwithstanding the Veto of the Governor. House Bill 2977, Representative Welch."

Welch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that House Bill 2977 do pass, notwithstanding the Veto of the Governor. This Bill would bring cursive writing back to all of our elementary schools in the State of Illinois. In his Veto Message, Governor Rauner alleges that cursive writing does nothing for the health and safety of our children. I disagree with the Governor on so many things. And I could not disagree with the Governor more on his Veto Message on this Bill. The research on this Bill is clear. From a health perspective, cursive writing leads to cognitive brain development, higher selfesteem, and academic success in younger people. It also keeps our brain active as we age. It has been known to help those

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

with special needs, like dyslexia. From a safety perspective, we know that cursive writing helps a person create a unique signature which goes a long way to helping protect a person's identity just like that person's fingerprint. We also know that if a person can write cursive, they can read it. They can read historical documents like our U.S. Constitution, our Declaration of Independence. And they can read that handwritten note from grandma. I ask for a 'yes' vote on House Bill 2977 and we override the Governor's Veto of this great Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Breen is recognized."

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

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

Breen: "Representative, I... I was shocked when I... when I first heard about this Bill because I didn't realize that... that folks had stopped teaching cursive writing in our schools.

Can you tell us why did they stop teaching cursive writing?"

Welch: "Well, the folks I talked to and I've talked to several educators since filing the Bill. With the pressures of Common Core many of the districts chose that this was one of the easier things to just put by the wayside. But I think that was a bad decision. And the educators and... that I've spoken to agree with that and we should bring it back."

Breen: "Sure. Now, and... and the Governor... the Veto Message talked about this being a... an unfunded mandate. And I do want to give credence to that because certainly we don't want to be putting too many unfunded mandates on schools, I mean, you'd agree with that, right?"

Welch: "I would... I agree."

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

- Breen: "And... but I guess, you know, here's my thing. An unfunded mandate usually is something where it's going to increase costs to the schools. And so, I'm wondering, I mean... what... how do... how do schools pay for this? That... what we'll be mandating here."
- Welch: "Well, again, I've talked to several educators especially in my district. And we don't see where it's going to increase costs. Now, certainly if a school district chooses to go out and buy new materials, they can do that. But that's not something that they're forced to do. You can use a chalkboard. You can use... there's several different ways you can incorporate cursive in a unit of cursive into your curriculum."
- "I... I'm assuming there are materials that are at least Breen: several hundred years old that are probably in the public right... probably public domain that one could use for free on this one. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, I... I certainly respect the... the message. I do agree that we should avoid unfunded mandates that would increase costs to our schools. The problem is, this is one of those things that we kind of created the problem with this focus on Common Core because no incorporated it into the standards. And as the one Representative noted, the best studies out there show that brain development is improved with cursive writing. Certainly folks are able to then read the founding documents of the country. They're able to communicate in a more professional and effective manner. I think I had mentioned last time on debate, you know, if I get a... a note from someone that is fully printed and then I get a note from someone else that is

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

written in... in cursive writing, well, I'm going to just naturally say, well, that cursive writing one looks a little better. As well, I mean, certainly if you... I mean, I was in college debate. And so, I know that writing in cursive is a lot faster. It gets the job done more quickly. So, I... I just... I guess as much as I respect what the Governor says, and again I'm... I'm against most unfunded mandates. And I... I know we do a lot of things down there that cost money. This won't. But what it will do is improve children's abilities, it will continue a great tradition of our country. And certainly something that we created this problem and so I think it's perfectly good that we should fix it. And so, I would urge an 'aye' vote to ensure that our children are instructed in cursive writing the same way that we were. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Demmer is recognized."

Demmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please let the record reflect that Representative Parkhurst is excused for the day."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative. Representative Wehrli is recognized."

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

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

Wehrli: "So, do we currently mandate by law that our students be taught keyboarding or typing?"

Welch: "No, but we can talk about that."

Wehrli: "Wow, I'm kind of sorry I brought it up now. So, my... my point is, as well I understand the intent of what you're trying to do, it's... it's simply... it's overreach. Most schools are teaching this now, just as a matter of fact and it's not by law that they're doing it. They're just doing it because

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

they understand the educational benefits of... of cursive. Along the same lines as typing and keyboarding. Now, I'm probably showing my age by calling it typing, but that was a class that we could take as an elective and most people did it because we saw the increase use of computers in society. So, why does this have to be law? And why can we not just let the local jurisdictions, the teachers, teach the students the skills that they know they need? Why does this have to be a law?"

- Welch: "Well... it's our job to pass good policy. And... and the research behind cursive writing is sound and solid. And this is... this is good sound policy, Representative."
- Wehrli: "Would you say that... that mandating typing or keyboarding is good sound policy as well? So, should I really see that from you next? Are we... or do we just want to take the teacher's creativity out of the classroom and just have them do whatever we here in Springfield tell them to do?"
- Welch: "I think there's several things that we should talk about.

 I think we should talk about coding; I think we should talk about spelling. I think there's keyboarding and typing, some things that we should actually get back to talking about."
- Wehrli: "To the Bill. We have phenomenal teachers in this state and around the nation. And they are teaching this, as a matter of fact, in the classroom. It's... it's part of their curriculum in my school districts, in your school districts. The good teachers are giving the students of all ages the tools they need to succeed in the classroom. To make this a law is simply overreach by the state. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Scherer is recognized."

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

Scherer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I can speak to the Gentleman's just posed having taught cursive that was handwriting as a teacher. And I know there are many people in this room who were former teachers and we all appreciate that. One of the things spoken was, you said that we don't want to stifle teacher's creativity and without this law, that is exactly what is happening. So, just the opposite of what you're asking for is what's happening. Let me explain that. In my own district there was one administrator who never went anywhere without his cell phone and put everything he had on his cell phone. And I'm fine with that, I do that a lot myself. But because of that, he felt there was no need to ever teach cursive, ever, in any regard. And so, we now have an entire school district of teachers who would like to teach creatively... who would like to teach cursive, but were not allowed because that one person who carried a cell phone with them didn't see fit. And if ... you know, you can't go against your boss, so you can't really teach it. Now, if we can put a law in place so our teachers are allowed to cursive teach, we're not saying how many hours, how many days. We're just making it so that the youth of our future at least can read and write cursive. I just can't even believe there's been this discussion. If a person, as an adult or a young person, is handed a note in cursive and they've never been taught cursive, then they are illiterate. Now, think about that. Why are you so opposed to this? If you're a person that's thinking of voting 'no', why are you opposed to making our youth and our adults literate? It's... it's unbelievable that we're even having this discussion. It doesn't cost anything. It is not

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

an overreach. It's a willingness to provide literacy in our schools. I strongly urge an 'aye' vote. Strongly. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Flowers is recognized."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I just want to say that there are documents that most of us are circulating or having someone to circulate for us right now. And there is two things that's required on this particular document. One, for you to print. The other, for you to sign your name. That is required of you in order for this document to be authenticated. If you don't print your name properly or sign your name in your signature, we will knock you off the ballot. Now, you have to understand that we are encouraging young kids at the age of 17 to register to vote. And in doing so, part of them registering, we're teaching them what it is that they need to do. But the most important thing about this debate is that we are ... we're complaining and talking about the cost of teaching cursive writing, but we have to teach to print. Kids are not born learning how to print, they're taught that in school. So, they are taught to print and they are taught cursive writing. It's all taught in school. So, for the sake of the children, and no one stymied our education, I would appreciate that we would allow them when the line says this require your signature that they be able to just as we've done, sign their name on the dotted line. I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Keith Wheeler." Wheeler, K.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

- Wheeler, K.: "Representative, I just have a very quick question for you. And I'm just exploring this in my mind as we discuss this during debate, but have you explored whether or not there's a roll that Google translate could play in this process?"
- Welch: "I definitely think Google and other forms of technology are killing our brains. It's making things too easy. Cursive writing is going to help us use our brains again and help us develop. It's proven. The research says it."

Wheeler, K.: "Okay."

Welch: "And so, I'm all for advancement in technology, but some of the old fashioned ways of doing things are really good for us."

Wheeler, K.: "Perfect. Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Ammons."

Ammons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. This is a interesting Bill. When our great Representative Welch brought this to the floor, initially I... I just couldn't understand why we would have to pass a law to ensure that the children would learn cursive writing. But as my senior Member, Representative Flowers, just indicated it was very clear to me as I have been working in our community that not only have we missed several generations, but we require the society to do something that we don't even teach. And in some schools, perhaps, they do, but in most schools, they don't. And my son who just turned 16, he's driving, thank God, when he turned 16... When he was small, I taught him to cursive write. I bought a cursive writing program to teach him how to write in cursive because it is the signature that is required. For us to remove

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

things out of our educational system that we assume others should simply pay for or do on their own creates a disadvantage for the majority of the children in that school system. So, since this Body has passed legislation that increases revenue to our schools, I don't think it's a big stretch for us to pass an override on this Bill because we've provided the additional resources to have a teacher include in their grammar courses the instruction of cursive writing. And so, be it as I have demonstrated here, I would hope that we would vote 'yes' to reinstitute cursive instruction in our schools as well as to prepare the children to be able to at least sign their names on something as Democratic as a petition that we all have to circulate and most people don't know the difference between signature and print. And that is a demonstration of your society. So, I hope that we would vote 'yes'. I urge an 'aye' vote on this measure."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Leader Bellock."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I am in strong support of this Bill. And I think that it is not an unfunded mandate. Writing has been part of the English curriculum in the schools of Illinois for probably over a hundred years. So, it's not like we're adding something, you're taking it out. And I believe that it is a core part of the education in the schools and of people. So, people can say that their schools might do it. I know some schools are already saying they're not going to do it at all. They think it's extra. But it isn't that big of a part. Having been a teacher myself for a short period of time, I think it is part

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

of a core curriculum that is not an unfunded mandate. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Welch to close."

Welch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to thank all of the speakers on both sides. I truly appreciate the ... the discussion. But to close out, I just want to give you 10 sound reasons why this is great policy for the General Assembly to pass. Cursive writing helps people integrate their knowledge. Writing long form teaches us how to write. Our hands should be multilingual. We learn better when we write things down. Think about what we do here. Handwriting leads to cognitive development, greater self-esteem and academic success. It helps those with special needs. Many special education teachers will tell you it helps them when they're working with their students. It reduces distractions and inspires creativity. It keeps our brains active as we age. And we're all going to age. We need to be able to read cursive so that we can read our own historical documents. And knowing how to write cursive will help us create something beautiful and unique. Can read grandma's writing. Can sign your driver's license. Can sign your passport. Can sign a petition to run for office. I ask that we give our children a chance and bring cursive writing back to our schools. Please vote 'yes'."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2977 pass, the Veto of the Governor non-withstanding'? The Motion requires 71 votes. This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; opposed by voting '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.

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

With 77 voting 'yes, 36 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', this Motion, having received the required Three-fifths Majority, the Motion to Override prevails. And House Bill 2977 is declared passed, non-withstanding the Governor's Veto. House Bill 3143, Representative Gabel."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that House Bill 3143 do pass, notwithstanding the Veto of the Governor. This Bill adds community organizations that provide service... youth programs such as Teen REACH, Redeploy Illinois, Homeless Youth Services to the Prompt Pay Act. Originally, when we did the Prompt Pay Act, these youth services were inadvertently left out. Vendors with the state should be paid for the work they do. When there are delays, these are the organizations that then have to either borrow or take out lines of credit to... to bankroll the state's liabilities. So, they deserve to be part of the Prompt Pay Act. Being part of the Prompt Pay Act means that they will then get interest on the money that is due to them after 90 days. And it also gives them access to the Vendor Assistance Program so that they can actually have someone else buy their debt, but they can have the cash up front so they can continue their programs. So, I urge an 'aye' vote and open to questions."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Breen is recognized."

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

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

Breen: "Representative, just... with... with this Bill the... the Governor's Message was that the state's ongoing cash... cash flow problems and timeliness of payments would not be aided by adding to its mountain of liabilities through the higher

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

interest costs created by the Bill. What... what is your answer to that charge? Because it does seem true on its face. And anytime you'd add any group to the Prompt Pay Act we are increasing our liabilities."

Gabel: "Well, I... I think that it was unfair that some... some of these agencies were left out in the first place. I don't think that that's right. I think that... that the additional costs that these will... will cause is minimal, but I... I just do believe that providers cannot afford to subsidize the state. And that's not the way that the state should be doing business."

Breen: "Now, is your... I see... your Bill would be effective January

1. Is that right, if it were adopted?"

Gabel: "I believe so."

Breen: "Okay. Now, would that mean that any pending bill from any of these groups would then immediately have a bunch of prompt payment interest tacked on to it, looking back?"

Gabel: "You know, I'm not sure. I'm not sure if it would be just in the future or... or in the past. My guess is if it becomes effective on January 1 that it would be in the future."

Breen: "Okay. 'Cause I... I just... I don't see anything in here because it looks like it brings it right. I didn't see anything explicit in the Amendments that you're making to the Prompt Pay Act that... that make that explicit."

Gabel: "No."

Breen: "And so, I would..."

Gabel: "Nothing does."

Breen: "...I would worry that we've got bills that are already piling up."

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

Gabel: "Well, I... I..."

Breen: "Will they possibly be... will we have to pay interest on them back to when they were actually presented, if... if this were to be overridden."

Gabel: "Yeah. I mean, to my understanding usually bills are effective from that date going forward, but I'm not... I'm not positive."

Breen: "Well, fair enough. And to the… to the Motion. This Bill is well-intentioned. It certainly is something these folks need to be paid, they need to be paid on time. But the reason they're not being paid on time is because we, as a Body, didn't do our job. Now, I hope we're going to do our job going forward. And so… and the idea of adding more people to the Prompt Pay Act, again, I understand why folks want to do it, but this is not a great policy going forward to be adding people instead of taking the steps to make sure that we just pay everybody on time. And so for that reason, I respectfully, again, very much respect the intent of the Bill, I would urge that the… the Governor's Veto be sustained because of those reasons. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Batinick is recognized."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Batinick: "Thank you, Representative, for bringing this Bill. One of my concerns with what happened the last two and a half years is that there was kind of... of a perverse incentive to not pay social services and to pay other items because they were... you want to pay the high interest stuff before the stuff that's at zero interest. Is that correct?"

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

Gabel: "That's correct."

Batinick: "Is that one of the reasons why... why you brought the Bill?"

Gabel: "Yes."

Batinick: "Yeah. I'm... I'm going to go straight to the Bill 'cause this is... I think this is a tough one for someone that considers himself a... a strong fiscal conservative. I hope to God we never go through what we went through for a couple years with social services. But one thing people have to keep in mind is some of the people were able to stay in business because they could sell their debt on the secondary market and get their money because of the Prompt Pay Act that they were eventually going to get extra interest on their money. So, what happens is, if we ever have a situation like we had before again, the social services won't be able to do that. They won't be able to grab... to sell their debt to stay open to pay their workers, to pay their lease, to do everything else. And the destruction of that... the rebuilding of that could very well... could very well be more costly than the prompt payment interest. The Representative from... from Lombard, I believe, I completely agree. We need to pay our bills on time. My fiscal analysis shows it at a really small fiscal cost. But I think we should show support for our social services and we should also let them know that there is an alternative... a plan B, a lifeline, so that there is a crisis they have a way to access cash because they are part of that Prompt Payment Act. So, therefore, I urge an 'aye'. Thank vou."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Gabel to close."

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

- Gabel: "Thank you. So, if we want to be a business-friendly state, the state needs to be a good business partner. If we want to help small businesses, the state needs to be a good business partner. If we want to help job creators, the state needs to be a good business partner. And if we want to grow our economy, the state needs to be a good business partner. This is good business. This is the way the state should be doing its business. Let's include our youth programs into the Prompt Payment Act, so again, they can... they can access the Vendor Assistance Program and have the funds so they can continue to keep the services available in all of our districts. I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3143 pass, the Veto of the Governor non-withstanding'? The Motion requires 71 votes. This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 73 voting 'yes', 41 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', this Motion, having received the required Three-fifths Majority, the Motion to override prevails. And House Bill 3143 is declared passed, non-withstanding the Governor's Veto. House Bill 3216, Representative Wallace."
- Wallace: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to present to you a Bill that will help to safeguard the state from the overutilization of privatizing services and overpayment of services. I encourage an 'aye' vote on the override of the Governor's Veto."

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

Speaker Turner: "Representative Breen is recognized."

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

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

Breen: "Thank you. Representative, your Bill would require every third-party contract entered into by the State of Illinois to go through a pretty significant list of conditions including that the potential economic advantage of the contract is not outweighed by the public's interest in having those services provided by state employees. What... what is the public's interest in having a particular service provided by state employees? How do you measure that?"

Wallace: "That's a great question. I think that the best way to measure these five objectives that are listed in this legislation would be to make sure there's consensus around what that service or that product is. And management, I think, has some ability to do that."

Breen: "Okay. I'm just going to go to the Bill... to the Motion. Third party contracting allows us to get things done less expensively or with greater expertise provided by an outside service provider than we can do it ourselves. The problem of this Bill is it lists and prohibits us from third-party contracting unless we hit a lengthy set of criteria including that the contract results in a significant and measurable overall cost savings to the state. So, in other words, if we know something would save us money, but we couldn't measure it, we couldn't third-party contract. The... the savings shall be large enough to ensure that they will not be eliminated by the private sector and state cost fluctuations that could normally be expected during the third-party contracting

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

period. You could read that to say, well, as long as there could be some conceivable standard during which the cost will fluctuate that could make this... the contract not worthwhile, then we can't contract. There are a lot of these other ones, which is... well, here's another one under number four. The savings will not be achieved through diminishment in the quality or quantity of services. And the problem is, how do you measure the quality of services in certain places? That... that's not defined. The other is the quantity. It could be that there are services that we're providing, maybe we're... you know, we might be providing them inefficiently. We might be otherwise see... we might agree that, hey, you know, that we can't afford a certain quantity of services that we might want to provide. We just can't afford it. So, we wouldn't be able to third-party contract in that state... in that situation. You know, the other is that this issue of a prospective economic advantage has to be not outweighed by the public's interest in having a particular service performed directly by state employees. That's... that's undefined. You know, the problem with this is we don't third-party contract willynilly. Our... our branches of government take very careful consideration before we'd make those steps. And so, for that reason, to ... to tie the hands of our Executive Branch, no matter whether it's controlled by a Democrat or a Republican, is a really bad policy going forward particularly with all of these very vague ways of ... of doing ... that are ... that are put forward in this Bill, these nine factors. So, for that reason, with ... without knowing how much this is going to cost, with it

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

having the potential for a terrible impact on our state budget, I respectfully urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Keith Wheeler."

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

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

Wheeler, K.: "Representative, help me understand how this would affect any kind of emergency procurements?"

Wallace: "How would it affect emergency procurement?"

Wheeler, K.: "Yes."

Wallace: "Well, if we already have a standard in place, then we would be looking at these standards even if we have to do a contract within a week or two or three months."

Wheeler, K.: "Okay. I'm looking at... in an emergency situation where, for instance, I'm in the IT field. I deal with different vendors that I have to... to work with that I may not have a contract with but I have on... particularly, a relationship. So, if... like I say, if a cyber security incident occurs I can reach out to them and we can help... they can help us mitigate the problem. So, I'm trying to put my... my head on here to see if... if this would prevent or preclude the state from being able to take advantage of those type of services 'cause under one step analysis we've... we read it as that would be the case."

Wallace: "No, it would not prevent that. Especially if the cost that you would quote the state for providing your services is not drastically more than what it would cost for the state to provide that service to itself."

Wheeler, K.: "Okay. You're not in the realm of where I'm at. In the situation like that, you don't get to have a defined set

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

of parameters as to what you need. You're going to have to reach out to a vendor to mitigate a problem that you can't define before the problem occurs."

Wallace: "So, let's be really clear about what the legislation is proposing. And it is about ongoing third-party contracts for services."

Wheeler, K.: "Right."

Wallace: "All right. And so, you're talking... you did mention emergency procurement. And I do understand, in the world of IT, you're right. There's a specific skill set, there's a specific area of expertise and that's why you would be called in. But I think you also would know what fair market value is for the service you're providing. It wouldn't do something like what's happening with the Medicaid situation in which the state was being charged over \$2 million more than it could have been doing, you know, more than the cost it would have been for the state workers to do it themselves."

Wheeler, K.: "I understand. But you're talking about something that..."

Wallace: "We're trying to..."

Wheeler, K.: "...an unintended consequence of what you're trying to accomplish could be that in a situation where we find out that we have a... a breach of data. The longer we wait for that breach to be closed, the more exposure we have. The more it costs the state. The more people get harmed by that. We have to have the flexibility and the latitude in order to be able to... to choose the vendor at that moment that we have to just be able to select because they may be the only vendor who can actually help us."

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

Wallace: "That would be done with CPOs and under the Procurement Code."

Wheeler, K.: "I can't hear you. I'm sorry?"

Wallace: "That would be done under CPOs and under the Procurement Code, not this legislation."

Wheeler, K.: "So, you said this would be exempt from that? Cause
I have an analysis that says the exact opposite of it."

Wallace: "(unintelligible)"

Wheeler, K.: "Okay. With that, I'll just go to the Bill. I don't think our questions are being entirely answered here. And I think there's an unintended consequence I had mentioned earlier that... that we have to be able to address. This is overreaching. I understand that the... the intention of the Bill Sponsor, but at this point, there's just too many things that are upside down here to... to go with. So, I urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Wallace to close."

Wallace: "Thank you. I do want to encourage the Body to think about the fact that having a direct contract with a vendor versus completely outsourcing, if you will, a service that the state provides are two different things. If you've been paying attention, you will see that there are some terrible examples as to what happens when we have inexperienced third-party contractors providing services. Just two days ago or so, the *Tribune* ran an article about what's happening with DCFS and its third-party contracting with certain organizations. We have caseworkers who do not have the same area of expertise as our DCFS workers do. And that's just one example in which we actually have lost lives as a result of

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

outsourcing services. And I think that goes to the point of making sure that what we're doing is in the best interests of the public and of the citizens of Illinois. So, with that being said and with the couple other examples that I gave of how the state is now saving over \$24 million per year by not going through with this Medicaid contract with Maximus, we could potentially save lives by not outsourcing to inexperienced individuals. With those things in mind, I do encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3216 pass, the Veto of the Governor non-withstanding'? This Motion requires 71 votes. This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all opposed by voting '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 67 voting 'yes', 47 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', this Motion, having failed to receive the required Three-fifths Majority, the Motion to override fails. House Bill 3419, Representative Andrade."

Andrade: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that House Bill 3419 do pass, notwithstanding the Veto of the Governor. House Bill 3419, for a reminder, is the expatriate Bill. It prohibits the state from doing business with or investing in expatriated entities that incorporated foreign tax havens in an effort to avoid paying state and federal corporate income taxes and requires the Illinois Investment Policy Board to identify expatriated entities, so that the retirement systems can engage in shareholder activism and divest from expatriated entities and shareholder activism, if unsuccessful. I'm sure

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

there's questions, so I'd just move on to questions before I say anything else. If the Speaker will allow."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Breen is recognized."

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

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

Breen: "Representative, I want to there... there'd been a claim earlier... in the earlier debate that the Federal Government requires the same thing that is being required in your Bill.

I'm wondering if we had had that cleared up because I think I had new information on that... that it was not... that it was not actually true?"

Andrade: "Actually, I believe that the Federal Government is actually more than what is required on this Bill. This Bill was initially the general... Right now, the current government has zero exceptions..."

Breen: "Fine."

Andrade: "...that they cannot... we're... and I'm going to... I'm sure you're going to ask me another question, so I'll save that answer for a bit."

Breen: "Well, and so here's the problem, because I... it's now been pointed out to me because I... I believe I supported your Bill the first time through 'cause I thought we were merely codifying the federal requirements under statute. But it turned out, the only federal statute on this topic is for the Department of Homeland Security, so for items that are vital to our national security. And I'm told by folks at the federal level that there are numerous waivers to that requirement. And so, that... this is a much different provision than... than had initially... than I had initially understood it to be."

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

Andrade: "Right. So, you believe if there's waivers it makes it a good Bill?"

Breen: "What I'm saying is is that if we were told that we were merely codifying a federal requirement..."

Andrade: "Right."

Breen: "...and the federal requirement was only Homeland Security, which is only a very small part of what we would do at the state level. It's only in our... maybe the law enforcement purposes might be the translated. Because the problem is we're now imposing a much more radical and extreme requirement than the Federal Government requires. So, this is a very, very different Bill than what I had initially understood it to be."

Andrade: "As I understood, it's not just Homeland Security, it is further. Other departments have incorporated into their procurement services. As you know, this Bill provides actually two exceptions to make sure that we're almost... we have two exceptions that... for the first exception is the medical exceptions to make sure we don't accrue any companies that are... stayed here for medicine. Secondly, we allow the Chief Procurement Officer... the Chief Procurement Officer of the State of Illinois they have... can... an expert or entity or member of a unitary business group with an expatriated entity as a member, may bid for or enter a contract with the state agency if the Chief Procurement Officer determines it is a sole source contract. And the Chief Procurement Officer, one, provides a notice of intent to enter such a contract with an expatriated entity. And holds a public hearing justifying..."

Breen: "Representative..."

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

Andrade: "...the use of sole source."

Breen: "...Representative, Illinois companies could be barred from doing business with the State Government under your Bill, wouldn't they... couldn't they?"

Andrade: "There's may... there's a few companies that may, but I..."

Breen: "So, that is... that is correct. Now, here... here's the problem. You're not doing this on a go forward basis as for new companies doing this to say, hey, we don't want you to these inversions which are federal issues. You're saying everyone who's done them in the past and they did them... I mean, they did them in the past because our corporate tax policy in the federal level was... is crazy. Right? I mean, our corporate tax policy at the federal level is not... no one will defend that. Right? I mean, you don't defend it do you, Representative?"

Andrade: "The issue I have is that the... the companies that have decided to do the tax inversions and actually is looking at the Federal Government to go after these companies. So, even with the tax deductions that most of these corporations don't even pay the current taxes right now. So, it is..."

Breen: "But that's to the Federal Government, not to the state.

It's Federal Government."

Andrade: "Right. And we removed the state. We were actually... in the original Bill we were looking at... to change a state code.

And we actually removed that to remove some of the opposition."

Breen: "Right. Because, I mean, as I understand it we have Illinois companies that would be barred from doing business with the government... with our State Government. And not merely

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

that, but then the Treasurer's Office would have to divest any investments in them. So, and I... I... you know, I asked somebody, well, do we have a list or anything? And so, I just at least a partial list I had."

Andrade: "How many companies of those are based in Illinois?"

Breen: "Well... well, so let's just say, how about Johnson Controls which manufactures engine batteries in the western suburbs of Chicago. How about them? I mean, should they be barred for doing business with the State Government because of a... a federal tax issue that they went after?"

Andrade: "Do they currently do business with the State of Illinois?"

Breen: "I'm not sure. But we never could."

Andrade: "They don't."

Breen: "Are you sure? Because you didn't... I mean, you haven't accurately recounted Federal Law to me. How about Aon? The guys with the gigantic building in the City of Chicago. They're inverted. We couldn't do business with Aon. We couldn't invest in Aon. Even though they are a massive Illinois company."

Andrade: "So, we have the..."

Breen: "How about Pentair, PLC? They manufacture pumps in Aurora.

I know because Representative Wheeler, they're in his district or thereabouts. So, we're going to say that they are no good to do any business with the State of Illinois? I believe we had Accenture?"

Andrade: "Yes. Former Andersen Consulting."

Breen: "Kind of a big company, they did an inversion. We can no longer get accounting services from Accenture?"

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

Andrade: "Right. They have... Actually..."

Breen: "We can't invest in them?"

Andrade: "They don't even qualify for this Bill because they've moved to Ireland. So, Ireland is not included in this Bill. So, that is incorrect."

Breen: "Where... where does it say Ireland is not included in the Bill? It's an inversion as I understand it."

Andrade: "They no longer meet the definition of an inverted... diverted corporation."

Breen: "Well, it's... it's very convenient, but I... I mean, I don't see it necessarily. And... and with all due deference, you haven't given me an accurate answer on the federal."

Speaker Turner: "Representative."

Breen: "Yeah?"

Speaker Turner: "Representative Breen, can you please bring your remarks to a close?"

Breen: "Okay. One last one. Seagate, the hard drive manufacturer. They put a lot of hard drives in a lot of computers, which we need to buy. And so, I'm... I'm looking at this going... I supported this Bill the first time through 'cause I thought it was something very, very different than what I am learning that it actually is. This would severely harm our ability to procure from a state level. It would hurt Illinois companies and send a bad message about them and about their continued existence in this state. And it would restrict us in our investments. Instead of finding the investments that will get us the most money for all of our funds, it would instead cause us to look at a factor that has absolutely nothing to do with

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

the State of Illinois only with bad federal tax policy. Please vote 'no'."

Andrade: "So, the Bill..."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Guzzardi is recognized."

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

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

Guzzardi: "Representative Andrade, first a question pursuant to the preceding line of questioning. Does the Illinois Manufacturers Association have a position on your Bill?"

Andrade: "They actually support it. We received... we made changes in order to get the... their support."

Guzzardi: "Okay. So, I just want to clarify that for that record and then I'll go to the Bill. So, we were just talking about the manufacturers in Illinois and the positions that they might have pursuant to this Bill. But the Manufacturing Association in fact supports this legislation. And... and just, again, to the Bill here briefly. It seems to me like if companies in Illinois are engaging in tax evasion, if they're hiding their profits overseas, then, yes, the State of Illinois should... should spend our money elsewhere, right? We shouldn't support corporations that are hiding their profits overseas. We should support corporations that are engaging in responsible business practices, who are being good stewards of the Illinois economy, who are hiring people here in the state, putting people to work and paying their taxes here in Illinois so that we can use those dollars to fund important services in our communities. I think we should be investing our state dollars in good corporate citizens. And to that

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

end, I think this Bill is... that's why the business community supports this Bill because they understand that good corporate citizens are doing the right thing here. And I think this Bill is... is well considered and good legislation and I'm eager to support it."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Wehrli is recognized."

Wehrli: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Should this Bill receive the requisite number of votes, I request a verification."

Speaker Turner: "Members, a verification has been requested. All are required to be at their seats and hit their switch when the time comes. Representative Scherer is recognized."

Scherer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I urge an 'aye' vote. When we think of things like EDGE tax credits, which really help businesses, part of the place where we get our funding for EDGE tax credits come from our big businesses. If our big businesses are hiding their money so that they don't have to pay tax on it, it's really hurting the whole business climate. I'm not surprised at all that IMA is in support. And I would hope that you would also support any kind of business venture that helps rather than hurt our economy. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Willis."

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

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

Willis: "This is an initiative of the Treasurer's Office. Why would they want to put this type of legislation forward?"

Andrade: "I'm sorry. Can you repeat the question? I'm... I'm sorry, I apologize."

Willis: "Sure. I says, I know this is an initiation of the Treasurer's Office..."

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

Andrade: "Yes."

Willis: "...and obviously the Treasurer felt that there was a problem with some entities that we were investing in. Can you..."

Andrade: "Yes, I..."

Willis: "...give us a little bit more background on why the Treasurer felt that this was the time to address the situation and... and put an end to this bad business practice is the way I would look at it?"

Andrade: "Yes. He felt that companies that engage in elaborate restructuring schemes to avoid paying their fair share of state and federal taxes should not be rewarded. They should not be rewarded with lucrative state contracts and investments paid by Illinois taxpayers. This is an un... unfair to individuals and businesses that have worked hard, they play by the rules and pay their fair share of Illinois income taxes. The State of Illinois should be doing business with and making investments in companies that are good corporate citizens and pay their fair share of Illinois taxes. The Federal Government has prohibited federal agencies from entering into contracts with expatriated entities since 2003."

Willis: "Right. So, we..."

Andrade: "So, we're looking..."

Willis: "...so, we saw that the Federal Government does this. And I know that there was some news just recently of a couple of companies that had done... tried to find loopholes to work around it. And I think isn't the Treasurer just saying that we need to make sure that we don't allow those same type of

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

loopholes to exist in the State of Illinois? To the Bill. One of the things that I think ... one of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle said, well, won't this stop some Illinois companies from being able to bid with us in Illinois? Well, if they were truly Illinois companies they wouldn't put in a scheme that they could avoid having to pay Illinois taxes. And that's, I think, what this Bill is doing. It's saying, there are enough good players in the State of Illinois. We will find other companies that are in the State of Illinois that play by the right rules, that do it the right way, that are willing to pay their fair share of taxes. You and I, as citizens of the State of Illinois, pay our fair share of taxes. Why should we have corporations that are getting to work around that? And I think that's what this is exactly going for. This is what we want to make sure that we have not only all of our individuals paying the taxes they need to, but certainly our corporations doing that. And not having corporations that have learned to not play by the rules still get rewarded with state contracts. Back to the ... to the ... for the Sponsor, is there a particular company that we're concerned about or are we looking at this at all... all corporations throughout?"

Andrade: "We're looking through all corporations throughout. It's not... we don't want to single out one company, but we want to look at to see who are the best corporate citizens of Illinois and... and the country and want to make sure that we actually give them an advantage because they have decided to stay in Illinois. They have decided to be good U.S. corporate

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

companies, to be U.S. citizens and to be responsible and morally ethical to support their country."

Willis: "Well, and... and I would even venture to state that part of this is, if you are willing to take a contract from the State of Illinois, you should also be willing to invest in the State of Illinois and part of that investment is paying your fair share of taxes."

Andrade: "Absolutely."

Willis: "Yeah. And I think that's one of the main things on it. That we want to make sure that we follow those best practices making sure that we reward those that do the best practices. It's not saying let's cut anybody out, but it's saying let's reward those that deserve the rewards. Get them to where we need to be and maybe we can get everybody playing in the sandbox better together instead of having people that are trying and looking for... you know, one of the things that we've often said is, if... and actually this is actually come from the Governor's platform, I believe, to close corporate loopholes. Is that not oftentimes been what we've heard from there? Let's close these corporate loopholes. Well, this is a good way to do this. This is the Treasurer's initiative to do it. I think the Treasurer has proven to be very competent in his position. And I would go along with the Bill's Sponsor and urge all of my fellow Members of this... on both sides of the aisle to vote 'yes' for this. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Christian Mitchell is recognized."

Mitchell, C.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

- Mitchell, C.: "I will start again by dedicating my remarks to the good people of Naperville. So, Representative, we've had a lot of conversations about the mechanics of this Bill. I think it would be helpful before I get into questions for you to just tell us again what was the genesis of this Bill? Why is it so important to your constituents and to the people of the State of Illinois?"
- "Well, I believe that it's... it's a very important and Andrade: the genesis of this Bill is to reward companies that have ... still have faith in their country. Companies that want to be good corporate citizens and put in their fair share for the State of Illinois and for the United States of America. I... I believe this is important that they should not turn their back on their country. And they should stay faithful to their country. They should not decide that just because they can profit and abandon their flag, abandon their country, turn their back on the United States that... just so they can make more for their pockets. And turn away from their citizens and turn away from their employees of this country that they should look the other way. And we should not look the other way. We should reward the companies that decide to be true to our country."
- Mitchell, C.: "Thank you, Representative. And... and is this unprecedented in State Law? Are there other causes for which we say we're not going to contract with certain businesses, we're not going to have our pension funds invested in these types of businesses? Are there other places in State Law we already do this?"

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

- Andrade: "Right. This... this is not something new. The... currently the State of Illinois already does this with other situations."
- Mitchell, C.: "Can you give me a couple of examples, Representative?"
- Andrade: "I believe, Israel might be one of them. I... Companies that boycott Israel. Relations to Sudan and Iran are just a few."
- Mitchell, C.: "Okay. So, it sounds like this is not an unprecedented pieces of legislation. So, as I understand it, Representative, this legislation has two main parts. One is, it says companies that are doing inversions, that are not doing their fair share for the people of the State of Illinois, we are no longer going to doing contracts with them. But the second part says, that we encourage our pension funds to divest. But isn't it true, Representative, that the pension funds have another option other than divestiture..."

Andrade: "Yes."

Mitchell, C.: "...in this Bill?"

- Andrade: "We... yes they do. They... we... actually, it's shareholder activism we do. The pension boards have the ability to actually encourage these companies to change their ways and come back and be faithful to their country. So, they don't have to just divest immediately. There is an option to give them the opportunity to do the right thing."
- Mitchell, C.: "Thank you, Representative. To the Bill. We talk a lot in this chamber about needing to save money, needing to make sure that our tax dollars are fairly used. And I would argue that putting our tax dollars into companies that are

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

investing, not just in America, but specifically in the State of Illinois, is a good use of our resources. This is a good Bill that deserves an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Reick."

"Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think there's a little bit of bait and switch going on here. The companies that are based here in Illinois who are inverted, taking advantage of a perfectly legitimate provision in the Federal Tax Law to minimize their taxes, which is something the Supreme Court long ago said that it was not evasion to try to legitimately minimize your federal tax liability. They're still paying taxes here in Illinois. They're not paying one thin dime less by taking advantage of a federal provision when they file their Illinois State Income Tax returns and pay state taxes here. This is to the Bill. You're not paying one dime less in the State of Illinois. What you are doing is you're putting another banana peel under Illinois business and encouraging them to think twice about coming here. If they're sitting on billions of dollars of money overseas that they have not paid federal taxes upon, all you're doing is saying, oh, you know, maybe we ought to go to Ireland and move everything out of here so we don't have any kind of a liability to the State of Illinois. That's what you're doing. That's what you're doing. And then to say to our pension plans, which are... which are underwater to some fabulous... oh, by the way, those of who are members of the Tier 1 General Assembly Pension Plan latest... latest figures out, our plan is... or your plan, I'm not part of it. Your plan is funded now at 13.99 percent... 13.99 percent. By the time I get through with this speech, it's

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

probably going to be down another tenth of a point. To encourage or to say to our pension plans that you cannot invest in sound man... soundly managed companies that take full advantage of the law that they are entitled to live under, surely out of peak, what you're doing is you're telling them to rid themselves of part of their portfolio that's probably actually making money. I don't know what is going on in this building. But I'll tell you what, it's about damn time that people who understand the tax law actually start talking about the tax law. And those don't have... who have an idea of what's going on, learn a little bit before you say anything. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Butler is recognized."

Butler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move the previous question on the verification caucus."

Speaker Turner: "You're actually the final speaker,

Representative Representative Andrade to close."

Andrade: "Thank... thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to remind everyone that... what they did this morning. 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. This morning you pledged your allegiance to the United States of America, not to the United States... not to the United Nations. You are not here to represent the United Nations. You are here to represent the United States of America. I ask that the Democrats and Republicans that stood with me and stood with this Bill and stood with your country and this Bill, that you are a patriot when you voted 'yes'. I ask you not to become

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

an expatriot because you're going to support some foreign country. Do not support the interests of a foreign country over your pledge that you made this morning. You pledged this morning to the United States of America, not to the United Nations, not to Bermuda, not to another country that is profiting off of your citizens. These countries are profiting off of your citizens, your voters, your residents. Don't become an expatriot, if you voted 'yes'. Bring back America. Tell these companies to bring back America. Be proud of their country. These companies should not turn away from their country. These companies should not disrespect their flag by taking down the United States flag and carrying another flagship. So, I hope you stand with me and I hope you stand with the United States of America and with our United States flag. And I ask you to please make America great. Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "Members, a verification has been requested by Representative Wehrli. All Members are asked to be at their seats to vote their own switch. The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3419, pass the Veto of the Governor nonwithstanding?' This Motion requires 71 votes. This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed signify by voting '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. This Motion having receive... with 75 voting 'yes', 36 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', this Motion, having received the required Three-fifths Majority, the Motion to override prevails. And House Bill 3419 is declared passed, nonwithstanding the Governor's Veto. Excuse me. I'm

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

sorry. Representative Wehrli, would you like to persist with your..."

Wehrli: "Thank you.

Speaker Turner: "...with your verification?"

Wehrli: "Rep..."

Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, please read the votes in the affirmative."

Clerk Hollman: "A poll of those voting in the affirmative: Representative Ammons; Representative Representative Arroyo; Representative Beiser; Representative Burke, K.; Representative Carroll; Representative Cassidy; Representative Chapa LaVia; Representative Representative Conroy; Representative Conyears-Ervin; Representative Costello; Representative Representative Currie; Representative D'Amico; Representative Davis; Representative DeLuca; Representative Demmer; Representative Drury; Representative Evans; Representative Feigenholtz; Representative Representative Finnie; Representative Flowers; Representative Ford; Representative Fortner; Representative Gabel; Representative Gordon-Booth; Representative Greenwood; Representative Guzzardi; Representative Halpin; Representative Harper; Representative Harris, Harris, G.; Representative Representative Hays; Representative Hernandez; Representative Hoffman; Hurley; Representative Representative Jimenez; Representative Jones; Representative Kifowit; Representative Representative Lilly; Representative Manley; Representative Representative Martwick;

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

Mayfield; Representative Representative McAuliffe; Representative Mitchell, B.; Representative Mitchell, C.; Representative Moeller; Representative Representative Mussman; Representative Olsen; Representative Representative Rita; Representative Representative Sente; Representative Severin; Representative Representative Slaughter; Representative Representative Representative Stratton; Stuart, K.; Representative Tabares; Representative Representative Wallace; Representative Walsh; Representative Representative Welter; Representative Representative Willis; Representative Winger; Representative Zalewski, and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Wehrli."

Wehrli: "Representative Sente."

Speaker Turner: "Down front."

Wehrli: "Thank you. Representative Rita."

Speaker Turner: "Right in the back."

Wehrli: "Representative Hernandez. Representative Thapedi. Okay.

I withdraw all my Motion."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative. Again, with 75 voting 'yes', 36 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', this Motion, having received the required Three-fifths Majority, House Bill 3419 is declared passed, nonwithstanding the Governor's Veto. House Bill 3649, Representative Crespo."

Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. And I'd move to override the Governor's Veto of House Bill 3649. This is a Bill supported by Members of both sides of the aisle aimed at bringing transparency to our state debt. What the Bill

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

does is it asks that the get... we get a monthly disclosure of information from our state agencies that would include the aggregate total of bills for each agency, an estimate of prompt payment and whether or not an appropriation exists for those bills. Currently, the law only requires a report on October 1 for the aggregate of all of the bills as of June 30. This gives us an outdated information and fails to account for prompt payment penalties that the state is on the hook for. And today, we're looking at over \$900 million in delayed payments. I should add that the Better Government Association identified this bipartisan legislation as one of the 15 good government reform Bill's that passed the General Assembly this year. The Quad City Times wrote that it would be a bunk excuse, a dodge that neglects the Bills obvious links to good budgeting in either the public or private sector. The Quincy Herald Whig wrote, no successful business can be expected to run on such skimpy and outdated financial data and no government should operate that way either. The Moline Dispatch states, even in hopelessly divided Springfield issues of transparency and accountability should transcend politics. The local State Journal-Register states, it's dumbfounding to think such a policy isn't already in place, this is the best practice in any thriving business. Taxpayers need transparency about how the state dollars are spent. So, I ask you to please join me in supporting this override. I'll be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davidsmeyer for five minutes."

Davidsmeyer: "Thank you, Mr..."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Lang in the Chair."

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

- Davidsmeyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First, to the Bill. Actually, I had my light on before. I want to do a quick point of personal privilege. My... my wife and my kids are here and I just wanted to recognize them up there, the two little guys right there are Lennox and Pax. And my wife, Kristen, is right behind them."
- Speaker Lang: "Welcome to the House Chamber. You're out of order, Sir. That's it. We're sorry."
- Davidsmeyer: "I... I understand that. I also want to rise in support of this Bill. I think that in order to get out of the problems that we have right now, we have to know what those problems are and I think that this transparency Bill is a step in the right direction. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. McSweeney for five minutes."

McSweeney: "Mr. Speaker, to the Motion. This is a good government Bill. This is a Bill that promotes transparency. Until the bond issuances today and last week we had \$16 billion of unpaid bills in this state. We had an antiquated system that we can't tell exactly what our bills are. In fact, I worked long and hard... worked with the Comptroller's Office, worked a number of people and we couldn't even get a good number for what our unpaid bills are because there's a system that only requires reporting once a month. No unit of government. No corporation in this country. Only the State of Illinois would do something so ridiculous. There is absolutely no reason to oppose this Bill. We have \$2.8 billion of expenditures from Fiscal Year 2017 that haven't been appropriated. We didn't find that out because of their... the systems here in the State of Illinois. We found that out in the bond offering document.

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

We have \$900 million of late penalties that have accrued. This is a good Bill. Nobody should oppose this Bill. Stop the madness. Vote 'yes'."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Breen: "Thank you. Representative, I... I want to... in terms of your Bill that you're running here, I... I wondered is there any... are there any criminal penalties attached to not complying with the monthly reporting requirement?"

Crespo: "No, there's not."

Breen: "No. And... and there's no private cause of action where you can go and get attorney's fees in court if this doesn't get done?"

Crespo: "Correct."

Breen: "Okay. Now, I... I had understood that maybe there was some talk of doing a quarterly instead of monthly? Was... was... is that something that you guys had discussed at all? Or was it... was it... has it always been monthly?"

Crespo: "Well, actually, it's... it's currently done annually right?"

Breen: "Right. Annually, but..."

Crespo: "We get a report October 1st. Anything is better than what we're doing today."

Breen: "Sure."

Crespo: "But in terms of managing the cash flow, in terms of managing the debt we have felt that doing it on a monthly basis is the way to go."

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

Breen: "Fair enough. And... and I'm assuming as well that... I mean, look we... we all know we've got way too many different systems and we've got real issues on the information technology side. I'm assuming that if your Bill were to become law there would obviously be an effort... a collaborative effort between all the Executive Branch agencies to get to the place where they can report monthly? 'Cause obviously they couldn't do it today because we... we're not set up to do it, right?"

Crespo: "Well, actually that's a very good point, Representative.

I know we've talked about the ERP. And it's something that do it... the Department of Innovation and Technology has been working on. The Quinn administration has been working on that even prior to... to do it. And as we've been able to do it and they testified before my Appropriations Committee, that's like 2 or 3 years ahead. I would hope that once this is in place it can lay the foundation for the ERP moving forward."

Breen: "Okay. Because I... I do want to... I... give credence to the... I mean, there is a concern certainly between... we have separate, you know, we elect separate Executive Branch officials at the state level. And each of them has their own authority that they... that they want to remain within. And there was, you know, there's... there's certainly a concern when you've got folks on opposite sides of the aisle that there would be a concern about micromanagement. So, I... I did want to get on the record that this is not a, you know, tomorrow you must do all these things or else you're going to jail. So, for that reason I'm... again, I think out of concern for, you know, I think it's a... it's an honest concern to say, we want to provide transparency, but at the same time you...

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

you can't keep going the way that we're going with an annual reporting. You know, if there was some suggestion for quarterly, yeah, maybe that would be something we could look into. But for right now, I... I don't see how you could... could... in the current environment looking at things the way we do today, I'm... I'm really very much inclined to support your Bill at least on a personal basis. But again, I think it's a legit concern about you know, one Executive Branch official intervening with another. But again, thank you for bringing the Bill, Representative."

Crespo: "Thank you."

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

Skillicorn: "I rise to speak in support of this Bill. I'm excited to... to vote 'yes' for this. Illinois needs more transparency. Taxpayers, public officials and even us Legislators need to have a better grasp of where our bills are and what is being paid and what is not being paid. So, I'm very excited to vote for this. I think this could be a shining example of how we get things done, we can work together and we make our state a better place. And we can work on our problems together in a productive way. I urge a unanimous vote 'yes'."

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

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I'll be very brief. When we were negotiating the budget, it... a statement was made that there could be as much as 50 to 75 million dollars of invoices at the Department of Corrections that the Comptroller hasn't seen yet. And that's only the Department of Corrections. 50 to 75 million dollars of invoices at the Department of Corrections. In other words, those are hidden from view. When

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

the… in the Veto Message of the Governor he made the statement that the Bill more closely resembles an attempt by the Comptroller to micromanage executive agencies rather than an attempt to get the information most helpful to the monitoring of State Government. The Daily Herald in an editorial in August said this, in truth, micromanaging of the state's bills is precisely the job of the Comptroller. That's what the Comptroller is supposed to do. This Bill makes crystal clear sense, deserves a 'yes' vote. And I hope you'll vote 'yes'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hoffman for five minutes."

Hoffman: "Thank you. Real briefly, to the Bill. I understand that...
that House Republican Leader Durkin was against this Bill
initially, but I think... and I hear he has seen the light. I'm
with House Republican Leader Durkin and I am voting for this
Bill. Just like that, House Republican Leader Durkin."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives for five minutes."

Ives: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's hard to follow that show, but whatever. I'll try. I actually just had a few specific questions as to how this is actually going to work."

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ives: "Thank you. So, it's my understanding that we're kind of in a like 1980s world as we... as it pertains to our technology and putting in invoices. Which means that they're basically done paper and pencil and an invoice is really not even entered electronically, so to speak, but accumulated in a department and then sent over to the Comptroller for payment. Is... is that correct?"

Crespo: "Actually I would correct you. I think the technology dates back to 1898."

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

Ives: "Okay. Yeah. So, we're way behind technology wise."

Crespo: "But currently, just to let you know, even the former Comptroller did state that when she was in office she would make calls to the agencies to get those figures. So, it implies that those numbers were readily available on a monthly basis anyway."

Ives: "That's right. So, I had to... I did speak with the former Comptroller as well. And so, what they would do is they would literally make calls throughout the month so that they had a real idea of the running total. So now, if you have a monthly report and in some cases the invoices... these invoices are not, you know, \$50 at the hardware store. They can in some cases be a billion dollars' worth of Medicaid payment. So, let's say you do the report on, you know, the 25th of the month and then the next day an invoice comes in that's a billion dollars. Immediately the next day that invoice, done on paper and pencil, and sent to the Comptroller is off a billion dollars. There's... there's no way to correct for that. So, it's only good for that that day that report is done. Is that correct?"

Crespo: "It is a snapshot in time. To... to your example, even if they do have an invoice for a million dollars... or a billion dollars, that is part of the problem."

Ives: "Yeah."

Crespo: "That oftentimes they... they do enter into these contracts.

They have these costs and they're not relayed to the

Comptroller's Office right away. We just found out that

there's close to a billion dollars of money that has spent

without any authorization."

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

Ives: "Yeah, no. I mean, I think... I think the old Comptroller had a pretty good idea of calling, you know, every other week, what's your updated number rather than using a one snapshot report once a month to determine what the bills are sitting at the agencies. Now, the other part of this is and it's interesting is that we know that we need to come into the 2017 area where everything is electronically inputted. And so that everybody across every agency, whether you're the Governor, the Comptroller or the department, you can actually look in real time at the invoices that are sitting anywhere. We have to get to the point where all that stuff is done electronically. And I... I do understand that there were... that the current Comptroller withheld payments to the ERP system that was getting implemented. She delayed those payments and that's wrong too. The faster we get to the situation where we have fully automated system for invoicing and billing, so that everybody can see it in real time, the better off we are. And so, I'd like to know what... what compels the Comptroller to actually start releasing those payments so that the most important thing that we do is understand what our bill backlog looks like?"

Crespo: "Well, and I think that has been the... the method that they've been doing this, right, it's like a triage, trying to figure out what do they have to pay and look and see how much money they have. The problem herein though is that oftentimes or sometimes there'll be a bill that pops up for a million or a billion dollars that comes from nowhere. This will allow the Comptroller to at least know what's in the pipeline, that

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

they can manage the cash flow a lot better than what they're doing today."

Ives: "Okay. And again, I just go back to the... the report that we're asking her to do is a one... once-a-month snapshot. The better idea is what the old Comptroller did which was call the agency on a regular basis and get that update. Now, you are basically limiting her to only having to do this one-month snapshot. She could do what the old Comptroller was doing, which was make those phone calls and in real time get a better idea of where we stood more frequently than once a month. Meanwhile, I... I really urge this Body to... to... actually, to the Bill. I really urge this Body to pressure the Comptroller to... as soon as possible get a fully automated system in place across the board so all agencies are on the same system. And all the taxpayers know exactly how much money is going out. Thank you."

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

Morrison: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Representative... the comments Representative Ives just made make up largely what I was going to say. Representative Crespo and I served on the General Appropriations... General Services Appropriations Committee back in 2015. And I do recall that conversation being had that the... the Governor's new IT person was saying, we have to have all these agencies communicating with one other on the same platform rather than this very antiquated system. And so, the comment was made we... we're going to have to spend some money, but in the end there will be a great, great cost savings. And so, that's like a lot of things we do as families, we do as a business, we do it as

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

local units of government. Sometimes you have to spend a little bit of money up front in order to get a long tail of savings going forward. And I think that would be a better path for transparency. It's something that we all need. But we need to do that. So, we need to fund that. And thank you for your attention."

Speaker Lang: "Representative McCombie for five minutes."

McCombie: "To the Bill. I stand in support with everybody else on this Bill. It's kind of interesting when this Bill first came up I was surprised that it wasn't already the common practice. So, I was more than happy to vote 'yes' for it then and... and certainly proud to be a chief cosponsor on this with the others standing. So, I please urge an 'aye' vote and support this Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Crespo to close."

Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. I just want to reply to some of the comments that were made earlier. I think the end game is to have an automated process where we can get real time numbers at any time. We're not there yet. And... and this notion that the Comptroller's Office should be making calls on a monthly or daily basis, there's over 83 agencies that submitted their report October 1. We're still missing some reports. That does not... that seems like a logistical nightmare. I should add that and I think Representative Harris talked about the Governor's Veto Message, which says that this resembles an attempt by the Comptroller to macro manage executive agencies. Number one, the current report that we get today is not even enough to micromanage the agencies right now. That's not her role to micromanage anything or any of the agencies.

She needs to micromanage the bills coming in as the Daily

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

Herald pointed out. But to imply that this is an attempt by the Comptroller to micromanage agencies is far from the truth. That's not it. I should also add that we have almost every single editorial in the state supporting this. We have the Better Government Association, the Daily Herald, the Quincy Herald Whig, the Southern Illinoisan, Civic Federation, Rockford Register Star. And just recently we had the PJ Star wrote in their comments that, 'First, it seems to us that Mendoza is trying to do her job as Comptroller. And as she is quite right to say, it's insane you can't see your books. From this vantage point, it's the Governor who's, personalizing and politicizing this issue'. There is a time and place to play politics, this is not the day. This is definitely not the Bill. We should not let politics get in the way of transparency. We should not let politics get in the way of good governance. And we should not let politics cloud taxpayer dollars. So, I would ask you to please join me in overriding the Governor's Veto. There's no good reason not to support this Debt Transparency Act. Thank you, Speaker." Speaker Lang: "Gentleman has moved that this Bill pass, notwithstanding the Veto of the Governor. It requires 71 votes. Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Thapedi, Thapedi. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and the Motion prevails. And this Bill is declared passed, notwithstanding the Veto of

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

the Governor. Chair recognizes Representative Moeller, for what reason do you rise?"

Moeller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege." Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Moeller: "Thank you. I am pleased today to welcome to our State Capitol here in Springfield Gary Lucas, who has traveled all the way from Massachusetts to be here. And a good friend of mine, Mr. Ed Marth. He served in the Rhode Island State Senate in the early 80s and he's here to observe us today and visit our State Capitol. So, let's give them a warm Springfield welcome."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Representative. And welcome to the House chamber. Thank you for joining us. Representative Sente, for what reason do you rise?"

Sente: "I just wanted to remind everyone that immediately following Session the Illinois Green Caucus is going to meet in the Capitol Building, Room 100. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Representative. House Bill 3298, Representative Scherer. Please proceed."

Scherer: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I move that House Bill 3298, do pass notwithstanding the Veto of the Governor. This is the Substitute Teacher Bill. It addresses the huge problem we have with the shortage of substitute teachers. And I would appreciate an 'aye' vote. Answering any questions if you have any. Thank you."

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

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

Scherer: "Yes."

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

- Breen: "Okay. And Representative, I... I mean, I see that the Governor vetoed the Bill because it would cost say at least a million dollars and force the State Board of Education to eliminate Teacher Mentorship Programs. If we've got agency rules, which I... I think I remember seeing in JCAR that have come through and other previous legislation, I... is there some problem with the prior legislation and what about that cost estimate 'cause that does seem... that's a big number. I said, I think it's still a big number, yeah."
- Scherer: "I understand your concerns. Currently, there is \$4.5 million in the fund with ISBE. This is for mentoring and teacher licensures. As of now, the school districts that I asked have not been receiving the teacher mentor money and it's sitting in the fund. The \$1 million would be an absolute maximum and that is if every single person who applied would also then apply for the rebate and would also substitute teach 10 days. There are no opponents. Even ISBE is okay with it. And we have a serious, serious problem with substitute teachers."
- Breen: "Fair enough. And... okay. Well... All right. Does it wait that... so, the... the idea of forcing the state board to eliminate the Teacher Mentorship Program is not because of the lack of cost or is that the... or is that actually in the Bill itself?"
- Scherer: "Okay. Because of the revenue stream, it could possibly cut into it, but it is not a forced end to the mentorship.

 And many school districts aren't sure why, but they're not getting the mentor money right now."

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

Breen: "Ahh. Fair enough. Fair enough. Well, thank... thank you, Representative. Just to the Bill. Again, I think this is something where people of good faith can go and look at it both ways. On the one hand, the... the Bill would refund the license fees to substitute teacher applicants. But on the other, that is a reduction in revenue to the State Board of Education. And so, you could see some limitation on some of their programs that they're doing now. Although as the Representative pointed out, the programs are not necessarily being funded in the first place. So, again, that's a... it's an interesting... interesting quandary. I know most of us voted for this on the front end. So, I'll be interested to see how we go today. Thanks."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Scherer to close."

Scherer: "Yes. We had 99 'yes' votes on the front end. And I would just like to add a little personal story here that my niece who graduated from college and as most of us is dead broke when they graduate wanted to be a substitute teacher, but it was going to cost her \$350 just to go through all the regulations. So, she had to go find a different job. This is part of why we don't have substitute teachers because it's so expensive just to get started. I would most sincerely appreciate an 'aye' vote on this."

Speaker Lang: "The Lady has moved that this Bill pass, notwithstanding the Veto of the Governor. This requires 71 votes. 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. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

this question, there are 110 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the Lady's Motion prevails. And this Bill does pass, notwithstanding the Veto of the Governor. Page 8 of the Calendar, under Amendatory Vetoes, House Bill 302, Mr. Martwick. Please proceed on your Motion, Sir."

Martwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill... I move to override the Amendatory Veto of the Governor on House Bill 302. House Bill 302 is the unclaimed... it amends the Unclaimed Life Insurance Benefits Acts to compel life insurance companies to pay death benefits when they know or should have known that a policyholder has passed away. It achieves this by requiring life insurance companies to do four things. It ... it requires them to go back and evaluate lapsed or terminated policies going back to the year 2000, if they have electronically searchable files. And then once they find that there are policies that should have been paid, they must proactively seek out the beneficiaries of the policy and inform them that these benefits are available and do their best to get them to them... the... the benefits to them. The Governor in his Veto gutted this Bill. And this is very important. This ... there are ... the insurance companies that are responsible for 70 percent of the life insurance policies sold in Illinois are already voluntarily complying with this law. They are already doing this. There are a holdout number of insurance companies that decided that the law should allow them to keep money that was supposed to go to widows and orphans. This Amendatory Veto guts that ability of the Treasurer to use outside auditors to come in, find that money and get it back to the people who need it,

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

who have been counting on it and who have been denied it. So, I ask that we override the Governor's Veto. And I... I'd be happy to answer any questions."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Breen: "Thank you. Representative, I... I was glad that you... you gave me a letter that's... kind of critiques some of the points in the Amendatory Veto. I... I do have a question or maybe it's a concern. You... you're criticizing the requirement that... or the allowance that insurance companies be able to... they keep their records for 5 years and then they do not have to maintain them after that and that's our... as I understand it, we've got that in rule. So why... why is that a problem to have a 5 year record retention requirement for our insurance companies?"

Martwick: "So, that's actually not exactly entirely correct. So, the... the administrative rule in Illinois is... or regulation on records retention requires the insurance companies to keep records that have sufficient administrative, legal or fiscal value to warrant their further preservation. The 5 year record period only applies to records that have... no longer have such value. So, there is no 5 year hard rule. That is for policies where there is... there is no value to them whatsoever. So, if this is a lapsed policy where the insurance company is hanging on to the proceeds because beneficiaries have not come forward, well, then they are required to keep that. And in fact, they are running afoul of the law if... if they... if they do... if they destroy those records."

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

Breen: "Now... and your Bill actually distinguishes. So, if you've got electronic records as an insurance company, you've got to search back further than the 5 years for... for those who do not have the applicable electronic records. Is that correct?"

Martwick: "That is correct."

Breen: "Am I reading the Bill correctly?"

Martwick: "Under... under the language of the original Bill, before the Amend... Amendatory Veto, if they had searchable electronic records then they would be required to search back to the year 2000. There was a concession made that was put in there to distinguish between those companies that did not use electronic... did not have electronically searchable files that they would be subject to a 5-year provision... 5-year search back."

Breen: "And then, you know, the Amendatory Veto addressed an issue of contingency... contingent fees and... and apparently the... you know, it's a pretty extensive practice by the Treasurer's Office of using entities that charge contingency fees for money they recover. So, they get a cut of it when they recover the moneys. And the Governor struck or attempted to strike several of those provisions and it would prohibit contingency fees. What... what's the problem with striking contingency fees from, you know, the contingent fee practices from the State Treasurer's Office?"

Martwick: "Well, I... there... there are several problems with striking contingency fee arrangements with the Treasurer's Office. If outside auditors had not been utilized, those outside auditors have helped uncover more than \$550 million that was owed to Illinois residents. And without those outside

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

auditors, which charge a contingent fee for what they find, they charge a portion of... of what they find as a fee. Well, without that then the insurance companies would have kept 100 percent of those proceeds. So, they have been very effective. Illinois is not the only state. All other 49 states use contingent fee arrangements for finding unclaimed property. And... and so for... for his ban... and it would not just apply in this instance. The Governor's ban would apply to all contingent fee arrangements for outside auditors and that would really hamper the ability of the Treasurer to do anything. Understand that the only other option would be for the Treasurer to hire and train and staff a very expensive department of auditors..."

Breen: "Right. So, they... I mean..."

Martwick: "...which would be a big..."

Breen: "...I mean, the alternative is not... not doing it. It would be... that, there would be Treasurer's Office staff. They would have to develop a staff in order to do that work?"

Martwick: "Which I think might, given our... our recent set of budget cuts, might be impossible. And so, if the Treasurer's Office can't perform it internally and can't have outside auditors then there is... then the message that we're sending to the insurance companies is we'd rather you keep the money than the widows and orphans who are entitled to it."

Breen: "And then just... just to be clear, the insurance companies aren't doing anything wrong by not looking back to the year 2000 or what have you. I mean, they... they are... they are adhering to the contracts that were signed. You're not... you're not saying that they're doing anything illegal today?"

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

Martwick: "Yes. What... what I would say is that under the current law, they are not doing anything that amounts to anything illegal. But I would say that what they are doing is wrong."

Breen: "Fair enough."

Martwick: "What we are seeking to do is make..."

Breen: "If I may, to the Bill. 'Cause I've only got a minute left so."

Martwick: "Okay."

Breen: "I... Ladies and Gentlemen, this... this is... this is always a tough issue. As the Representative invoked, the widows and orphans and as we often will say that everything we do here in Springfield is for the children. You know, you get a... you get a difficult issue like this. The problem is we engage in contracts, we hold companies to be good to their contracts. We've changed the policy here in Illinois to ensure that going forward there are better practices for unclaimed life insurance benefits. The Governor's Amendatory Veto even said, hey, we're requiring folks to keep administrative records for 5 years, so let's... let's do a 5-year look back. But to punish those companies that... that use electronic recordkeeping, so that have been better, to force them to do a longer look back and do more work than the companies that on paper doesn't Не contends it's illegal any sense. unconstitutional, it's against the commerce... against the contracts clause rather. For those reasons, that... we're invading a private contractual relationship overregulating it in that way... in an unnecessary way. And one that we really ought to sustain this Amendatory Veto instead of overriding it entirely. Or we should start over with a new

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

Bill. Let's negotiate it. Get a 5-year look back, not a... a 17-year look back. That it really is a much more invasive than it needs to be. Please vote 'no'. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wheeler."

Wheeler, K.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please excuse Representative Sosnowski for the rest of today."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Sir."

Wheeler, K.: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Scherer for five minutes."

Scherer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The reason I've chosen to speak on this is because it's very near and dear to my heart. My parents have been through this exact issue. I had my little insurance booklets, but I... I took them out of my bag. I didn't know it was going to be called today. If we really care about the citizens of Illinois and we think of what sacrifices people went through to pay for insurance policies, it's very difficult for me to understand why anyone thinks that they don't deserve to be paid for what they sometimes would make that payment over feeding their family or getting their medications. And yet, for some reason it seems like some people think it's okay for them to not get their payment. And I just really it... it makes me very sad, just straight up sad to think that we here aren't really worried about people's best interests if we don't vote to do this. Because they deserve to have the money. They would have never bought an insurance policy if they thought that their loved ones would not get the payment. It all comes down to that. Think about that. They would have never bought that policy if the company would have been honest and said, and by the way when you die

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

we hope that we can't find your family 'cause we don't want to have to pay this out. We want to build another tall building instead. I really strongly encourage you to think with your heart on this one. And I hope for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Cassidy for five minutes."

Cassidy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Cassidy: "Representative Martwick, the Governor suggests that Illinois Administrative Rules only require insurance companies to keep lapsed or terminated policy records for the current year plus the 5 prior years. House Bill 302 allows records to be checked back to 2000. And he's suggesting that this is inequitable. Is he correct?"

Martwick: "Not at all. Again, that the... the provision that he relies on, he is... that is a completely inaccurate or improper reading of that regulation. As I said, these companies are required to keep these records, so they keep them much longer than 5 years. That is a requirement. It's only 5 years if there is no value to those records whatsoever and those then can be destroyed. And that was done by the Rauner administration. But here's the kicker. Is that under the terms of this settlement with life insurance companies that represent over 70 percent of the life insurance market, these companies have agreed to search their electronically searchable records back to 1992. So, the vast majority of good actors are already checking back to 1992. Why would we say to the bad actors that you only have to be checked back 5 years? That is unfair to the companies that are doing it

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

right. It is an un... it is not leveling the playing field in the insurance market to... to have good actors that come in voluntarily be required to go back 20 years longer than... than the bad actors."

- Cassidy: "And to that point, so... you know, as you've raised this.

 Do... does having these different standards violate due process
 when we have some that go back to 2000 and some only have to
 go back 5 years?"
- Martwick: "No, that is something that the... the... one of the prior speakers brought up. And that is not... in fact, the Governor relies on a case that, once again, he completely misinterprets. He relies on a Supreme Court case that... where he says that due process protects against arbitrary and discriminatory enforcement of legal standards. That's not what the case said. It had nothing to do with this. It was talking about first... the case that he cites was talking about First Amendment rights, not Fourteenth Amendment rights under this. And... and so, it's a complete misreading of that. And so, there is no due process violation whatsoever with this. The key here with this is that we are not seeking to interfere with the contracts that the insurance companies made. We're seeking to make them live up to the contracts that they made. And that's well within our rights, our police powers as a state."
- Cassidy: "Finally, you know, in the... in the Governor claims to prohibit the use of outside auditors with contingency fee arrangements. How do you answer his claim that these outside auditors reward private companies at the expense of state

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

taxpayers? And he's claiming that that money could have been used to pay down the unfunded pension liability?"

Martwick: "Yeah. Well, again, that... that, again, is... is really an overreach and a misinterpretation because again, over 550 million has been discovered. And again, if... if we weren't using outside auditors, well then, the insurance companies would have kept all of that. And the ones that are fighting compliance are already keeping 100 percent of this. The contingency fee auditors would only take a portion of that and they would get the rest of that money to the... the people that are entitled to it. Plus, if these companies came in and voluntary complied or did this check themselves then there would be no need for these outside auditors. Finally, you know, I... I want to note that these auditors only get paid when the insurance companies find the money and get it to a beneficiary. They... if they don't complete that they get nothing. So, the auditors made absolutely nothing on over \$350 million that insurance companies paid directly to beneficiaries through the due diligence process."

Cassidy: "Thank you very much. I urge an 'aye' vote."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Harris, D.: "Representative, just... I want to follow up for a second on the... the auditor issue that was mentioned here. And in the Governor's message it says that the legislation does nothing to stop the continuing overreach of private auditing firms that currently contract with the State Treasurer's Office. How do the private auditing firms... exactly what do

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

they do and how are they reimbursed? How are they compensated for their services? You want to stop the timer, Mr. Speaker?"

Martwick: "Sorry. Sorry, I was..."

Harris, D.: "It's all right."

Martwick: "...collecting the answer. I'm sorry. So, the... the contingency auditors are paid 10 percent. That is their... their fee is 10 percent. Additionally, in Senate Bill 9 which was passed here in the Legislature when we overrode the Governor's Veto there was a series of regulations that were in Senate Bill 9 that regulate... regulate the practice of these agreements with contingency fee auditors that include rules on... on transparency and creating the contracts become public records and a limit on statutory cap. And so on and so forth."

Harris, D.: "So, are you saying that the auditors get 10 percent of the… the life in… what the life insurance payout is?"

Martwick: "Only if the beneficiary..."

Harris, D.: "And... and..."

Martwick: "...cannot be found."

Harris, D.: "If the beneficiary cannot be found?"

Martwick: "Yes."

Harris, D.: "If the beneficiary cannot be found, then what happens to the money?"

Martwick: "It comes to the state."

Harris, D.: "It comes to the state."

Martwick: "Yeah."

Harris, D.: "So... and this is an initiative of the Treasurer's Office, correct? This Bill?"

Martwick: "That is correct."

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

Harris, D.: "And I... I venture to say that the Treasurer's Office is probably not looking to increase the... the reimbursement to these private auditing firms, but rather is looking to make sure that all of these policies get discovered and paid off, indeed, if they are supposed to be paid off. So, it seems reasonable to me that the intention of the Treasurer here is not to enrich the auditing firms, but rather to get the dollars to those people who deserve the dollars from the life insurance policies. In that case, I think it certainly makes sense. And while the President... excuse me, the Governor has said that since 2011 \$20 million has been paid to one firm, that's eight years. That's two and a half million dollars a year. He says that money could be used down to pay the state's desperately underfunded pension liability system. It could, but two and a half million dollars a year is not ... it's going to take a long time at that rate. So, it seems to me to make sense that the Treasurer is trying to do something here that is beneficial for those policyholders that have not gotten the dollars that they are entitled to under the policies that they paid for. Thank you."

Martwick: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Martwick to close."

Martwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, I... I urge an override of the Governor's Veto. And I am joined in urging that override by many, many of... major news outlets throughout this state. Many of the news outlets and the newspapers throughout this state have editorialized in favor of this and allow me to read a couple to you. The Freeport Journal Standard said, We agree with the State Treasurer. The

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

override is a must. Our fervent hope is that lawmakers muster the courage to help Frerichs' office do its job by properly tracking down unclaimed property and returning it to its rightful owners instead of allowing insurance companies to keep what at its essence is stolen property. The Rockford Register Star and Belleville News Democrat said, If you are tempted to think this is not a big problem, you're wrong. The Governor's partial Veto prevents the Treasurer's Office from searching bank and business records to look effectively at the books of large banks, such as Wells Fargo, to confirm it did not appropriately keep funds from bank customers. Or the ability to look at Sprint and Radio Shack to confirm each has paid out all rebate checks issued as an incentive to make a purchase. This is what will happen if we prohibit all contracts with contingence fee auditors. The Effingham Daily News stating that, Judy Baar Topinka was the one that started this whole practice. If the Governor's Veto were accepted, Illinois would be the only state in the nation to completely prohibit these types of audits. We're joined by edit ... editorials from the Quad Cities Online and the Chicago Tribune. This makes sense. Understand what your vote means. The vast majority of insurance policies in Illinois, the companies that hold those have voluntarily said, yeah, this was a bad practice. Yes, we're going to work with you Treasurer. Yes, we want to get the insurance proceeds to the widows and the orphans that were entitled to receive it. When you vote to uphold the Governor's Veto, you're saying that you think that insurance companies should be able to hold on to money that was supposed to go to loved ones in need. Please

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

- don't do that. Do the right thing. Have the courage. Vote 'yes'. Override the Governor's Veto. Let's get the money back to the people it belongs to."
- "Gentleman moves that House Bill 302 pass, Speaker Lang: notwithstanding the Governor's specific recommendations for change. This requires 71 votes. 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? Please record yourselves. Please record yourselves, Members. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 71 voting 'yes', 40 voting 'no'. And the Gentleman's Motion prevails. And House Bill 302 is declared passed, notwithstanding the Governor's specific recommendations for change. House Bill 3211, Representative Wallace. Representative Wallace. Out of the record. Mr. Clerk, Adjournment Resolution."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Joint Resolution #48, offered by Representative Currie.
 - RESOLVED, BY THE SENATE OF THE ONE HUNDREDTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CONCURRING HEREIN, that when the Senate adjourns on Wednesday, October 25, 2017, it stands adjourned until Tuesday, November 07, 2017, or until the call of the President; and when the House of Representatives adjourns on Thursday, October 26, 2017, it stands adjourned until Tuesday, November 07, 2017 at 12:00 o'clock noon, or until the call of the Speaker."
- Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie moves for the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

- 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Adjournment Resolution is adopted. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk Bolin: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 653, offered by Representative Riley. House Resolution 654, offered by Representative Davis."
- Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Mr. Clerk, please read the committees for this afternoon."
- Clerk Hollman: "The following committees will be meeting this afternoon: the Health Care Availability & Accessibility Committee is meeting in Room 114, the Elementary & Secondary Education: School Curriculum Policy Committee is meeting in Room 118, the recessed State Government Administration Committee is meeting in Room 115, and the Transportation Subcommittee of the Appropriations-Public Safety... once again, the Transportation Subcommittee of the Appropriations-Public Safety Committee is meeting in D-1."
- Speaker Lang: "And now, leaving perfunctory time for the Clerk, Leader Currie moves that the House stand adjourned 'til Thursday, October 26 at the hour of 10 a.m. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Committee Reports. Representative Crespo, Chairperson from the Committee on Elementary & Secondary Education: School Curriculum & Policies, reports the following committee action on October 25, 2017: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 1262. Representative Riley, Chairperson from

80th Legislative Day

10/25/2017

the Committee on State Government Administration reports the following committee action on October 25, 2017: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 1023, House Resolution 524. Introduction and First Reading of House Bills. House Bill 4135, offered by Representative Bourne, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 4136, offered by Representative Parkhurst, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 4137, offered Representative Zalewski, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 4138, offered by Representative Stewart, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 4139, offered by Representative Ford, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 4140, offered by Representative Mitchell, Bill, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. First Reading of these House Bills. Introduction and First Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 225, offered by Representative Mayfield, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. Bill 332, offered by Representative Mah, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 351, offered Representative Wallace, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Senate Bill 403, offered by Representative Yingling, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Senate Bill 1086, offered by Representative Durkin, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. First Reading of these Senate Bills. Introduction of Senate Joint Resolution #35, offered by Representative Spain. This is referred to the Rules Committee. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."