85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

- Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, reports the following committee action taken on November 07, 2017: recommends be adopted referred to the floor is Floor Amendment 4 to Senate Bill 402, Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 695, Floor Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 851, Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1936."
- Speaker Lang: "The House will be in order. Members shall be in their chairs. We shall be led in prayer today by Reverend Wayne Kuna who serves as President and Founder of Soul Priority NFP, a faith based organization dedicated to teaching men and women in the marketplace to transforming principles of shepherd leadership in a healthy culture, located in Elmhurst. Reverend Kuna is the guest of Representative Morrison. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off cell phones, and rise for the innovation and Pledge of Allegiance. Reverend Kuna."
- Reverend Kuna: "Well, I'm a survivor of a mass shooting, so I hope you don't mind if I start praying in Texas. Heavenly Father, please comfort and console the grief of the children who lost parents and the parents who lost children. Please hold them in Your everlasting arms until they are once again able to stand on their own. Please cause neighbor to love and care for neighbor in our country and in our state. Please protect us from evil. Father, I know the purpose of this Session is to work through the vetoed legislation and funding of the past year. And I do ask for discernment and wisdom, as

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

our Representatives work through their docket. I also want to lift up all the hands and the hearts who serve the Representatives behind the scenes with not much notice or fanfare. Please bless all of them. But Lord, our nation and our state are being gripped by a violent darkness. What happened in Sutherland Springs can and has happened in one weekend in Chicago. And I want to pray a special miracle for the women and the men who are standing here in front of You. Heavenly Father, I ask for the miracle of sight. Please open their eyes to be able to see the things that You see. Give their eyes the capacity to see through violent darkness that's plaquing our land. Help them to see how to take a stand against those that make a profit from selling the very violence that abhors us in the news as entertainment and movies and T.V. shows and video games and even sports. Please help them to see how to stem the tide of sexual violence, whether it's domestic or workplace harassment or trafficking. Please make them see that life is precious and must be protected from its first heartbeat to its last. Please help them to see that weapons of war don't belong on the street, and they're lethal whether they're legal or not. Father, how can we ask You to protect us from evil if we don't try to protect ourselves? Father, please 'cause these valiant men and women to see what You see, the importance of justice, loving mercy, and walking humbly. Please help them to craft legislation that promotes justice and mercy and humility. Against these three, no violence can long endure and with these threes, our nation and our state can be healed. Amen."

Speaker Lang: "We'll be led in the Pledge by Mr. DeLuca."

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

- DeLuca et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of American 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. Leader Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record show that there are no excused absences among House Democrats today."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davidsmeyer, are you taking the Republicans?"
- Davidsmeyer: "Yes, Sir. Let the record show that all Republicans are here and ready to do the work of the people."
- Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Sir. Mr. Clerk, please take the record.

 We have 117 Members answering the call. And we do have a
 quorum. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Committee Reports. Representative... Representative Zalewski, Chairperson from the Committee on Revenue and Finance, reports the following committee action taken on November 7, 2017: do pass Short Debate for House Bill 4118, do pass as amended Short Debate for Senate Bill 403, recommends be adopted Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 521, Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 868, and recommends be adopted as amended House Resolution 672. Representative Hoffman, Chairperson from the Committee on Labor & Commerce, reports the following committee action taken on November 7, 2017: recommends be adopted Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 770. Representative Martwick, Chairperson from the Committee on Personal & Pensions, reports the following committee action taken on November 7, 2017: do pass as amended Short Debate for Senate Bill 779, and recommends be adopted House

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

Joint Resolution 83. Representative Dan Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on Executive, reports the following committee action taken on November 7, 2017: do pass as amended Senate Bill 1103, and recommends be adopted Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 263. Representative Will Davis, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations - Elementary & Secondary Education, reports the following committee action taken on November 7, 2017: recommends be adopted Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 444. Representative Thapedi, Chairperson from the Committee on Public Utilities, reports the following committee action taken on November 7, 2017: recommends be adopted Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1451. Introduction Resolutions. House Resolution 660, offered Representative Bill Mitchell. House Resolution 677, offered by Representative Stratton. House Resolution 680, offered by Representative Meier. Correction to House Resolution 683, offered by Representative Olsen. House Resolution 684, offered by Representative Winger. House Resolution 687, offered by Representative Currie. And House Resolution 680, offered by Representative Meier."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davidsmeyer is recognized."

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

Speaker Lang: "Proceed, Sir."

Davidsmeyer: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I just want to introduce a friend of mine who's up in the gallery. Tess Drainer is up there with her parents. And she's up there waving. Tess has a rare disease known as bilateral... and I am not a doctor so if I mess up the pronunciation, I apologize,

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

but Bilateral Perisylvian Polymicrogyria, which is a rare neurological disorder that affects the cerebral cortex or the outside of the brain. Signs and symptoms include: partial paralysis of muscles on both sides of the face, tongue, jaws, and throat, difficulties in speaking, chewing, and swallowing and/or seizures. In most cases, mild to severe intellectual disabilities are also present. Tess is here today to bring awareness to rare diseases such as this. A couple years ago we were able to pass a Resolution in her honor. And I want everybody to look up here, if you need a bright spot to your day, look up here and look at Tess's smile. Thank you, Tess. Thank you for being here."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Representative. And welcome to the House chamber, we're glad you joined us today. Mr. Severin is recognized."

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

Speaker Lang: "Proceed, Sir."

Severin: "So on October 27, I had the privilege of visiting the third grade class at Hamilton County Grade School, Mrs. Dean's class. They taught me some new things about math for a third grader. I told them what goes on in the House Floor. So they're watching right now, so if all of you would say hello to the third grade class in McLeansboro, Mrs. Dean's class. They're watching for the first time ever in their smart board right now. So, hello to Mrs. Dean's class and third graders in math. We're proud of you. You're our future. And welcome to the House Floor."

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Representative. And welcome third graders, I hope you enjoy watching us today. Mr. Harris."

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Proceed, Sir."

Harris: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have a special guest in the gallery today. Mr. Andrew Johnson is with the National Newspaper Association that is spearheading an initiative that is sponsored... or that is supported by us here in the House and the Chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee to get a face to every name that is inscribed on the Vietnam War Memorial Wall in Washington D.C. And he is spearheading that initiative; however, I'd like to give him recognition for another reason. And if I can just have a moment of your attention. I'd like to give him recognition for another reason. Not only is he with the National Newspaper Association, but Mr. Johnson is also a Gold Star father. Mr. Johnson's son lost his life in Afghanistan fighting... answering the call of duty, and fighting for those freedoms that we hold dear. So, Mr. Johnson, thank you for being here and thank you for the sacrifices that you have made."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome to the House chamber, Sir. We're honored by your presence. Representative Jones is recognized."

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

Speaker Lang: "Proceed, Sir."

Jones: "Standing next to me, I have a Gentleman who is a Loyola Law School student. He's also by the way of Texas. Please help me welcome, Mr. Spiros Mantterose. He's down here today as my page, and he'll be going around talking to people and

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

also just give him a round of applause for coming to Springfield."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome. Thank you. Good to have you here.

Representative Hurley, please."

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

Speaker Lang: "Go right ahead."

Hurley: "Thank you. I want to welcome two people to the House of Representatives today. I have Taylor Cahill, who is my intern. She is finishing her final semester at ISU. She is from Bartlett. So she is not my constituent, but I wish she would move into my district. So as soon as Taylor gets through this semester, she will be a graduate with a political science degree. So welcome, Taylor. But also, I have my Chief of Staff, Heather Kazmark. She is in the back there, she's visiting as well. So, if we could give them both a round of applause."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome both of you. Thank you. Representative Finnie is recognized."

Finnie: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege, please."

Speaker Lang: "Proceed."

Finnie: "I would like to recognize in the gallery, to my right, my downstate staff, Robin Rister and Nick Davis. They do great work down there for me and I'm really honored to have them here today. Thank you both."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Representative. And thank you for joining us today. Representative Wallace is recognized."

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

Speaker Lang: "Proceed."

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

Wallace: "I just wanted to acknowledge the tragedy that fell upon the City of Rockford on Sunday, November 5, with the loss of Officer Jaimie Cox. He joined the Rockford Police Force in December of 2016. Was barely on the force for one year before, as we have now learned, died in... on duty. There was also another death on the scene, Eddie Patterson. And the details around this situation are still very confusing. We don't know exactly what happened, but I would like to send my sincerest and deepest condolences to Officer Cox's family, to the Rockford Police Department. And I would also like to extend my condolences and prayers to the family of Eddie Patterson. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Representative. Mr. Martwick."

Martwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise on a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Proceed, Sir."

Martwick: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, joining me in the gallery... or on the floor here is a Page that I have for today.

Ashley Keorkunian is here joining us, so please give her a warm Springfield welcome, and welcome her to the Capitol."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome. Glad you're here with us today. Mr. Clerk,

House Resolution 659. Representative Jimenez. Proceed,

Representative."

Jimenez: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ever since I was a little..."

Speaker Lang: "Excuse... excuse me, we'll read part of the Resolution."

Jimenez: "Okay."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "House Resolution 659,

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ONE HUNDREDTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that we recognize the 100th anniversary of Pease's Candy.

Speaker Lang: "Representative."

Jimenez: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the General Assembly. Ever since I was a little girl here in Springfield, I was excited to get a chance to go into Pease's Candy store to pick out a special sweet treat or fill a bag of candy for just a penny or ten cents. Now, my boys beg me to stop there to get a treat after church on our way home. Today I'm honored to present House Resolution 659 on the House Floor to celebrate Pease's Candy 100 years in Illinois this year. It has been a mainstay in Springfield since the Great Depression Era. It originally started in Bloomington, Illinois and then the owner's opened stores in Springfield and Decatur. It is said to keep the business afloat during the Great Depression, the owner and his family would eat the leftover candy they didn't sell for dinner. Pease's Candy continues to innovate in the marketplace by recently partnering with Bunn, also located in Springfield and known as a worldwide leader in the dispensed beverage equipment. Please welcome today in the gallery the great grandson of the founder of Pease's, Rob Flesher, who is the president now and his lovely wife, Kim, as well as Desiree Logsdon who are joining us. And please join me in thanking them for bringing Members of the Illinois House of Representatives a special Pease's treat that's on your desk, I think some of you have already been enjoying it, to help celebrate 100 years of this sweet goodness. Thank you

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

for your dedication to Springfield and our state. And cheers to 100 more years."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Representative. Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. Page 7 of the Calendar, under Agreed Resolutions, House Resolution 617, Leader Durkin. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "House Resolution 617,

RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ONE HUNDREDTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that we recognize Billy Lawless, a citizen of the United States of America, for his decision to come to Illinois, make it his home, and employ many of his fellow Illinoisans; and be it further

RESOLVED, that we commend Billy Lawless for his work of advocacy for Irish-American relations, and for his advocacy for the welfare of many people who, like his Irish-American predecessors and like him, have come from around the world to make America an even greater country; and be it further

RESOLVED, that copy of this resolution be presented to Billy Lawless as a symbol of our respect and esteem."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Durkin on the Resolution."

Durkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I enthusiastically present House Resolution 617. Now, over the years in this position I've had the good fortune of meeting many... and being aquatinted with many fascinating people. And many of those fascinating people are truly committed to the greater good of society. A person who fits that description has joined us today, and his name is Billy Lawless from Chicago. Billy is over... standing in the front over here. And all of you may have seen have seen Bill

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

over the years. And if we could have some quiet in the chamber, Mr. Speaker. Billy Lawless is a mainstay of the Chicago restaurant community, but he's also a leader in the Chicago Irish community. Bill was born in Galway, Ireland in 1951. For those of you who are not aware, Galway is the sister city of Chicago. Billy, since coming to the United States, built an empire since 1998. It was then when his youngest daughter was offered a rowing scholarship to Amherst College that he took a sign... took that as a sign to come to America to achieve the American dream. Billy did more than dream. He went to work. And I want to ask you, what do the following restaurants and taverns have in common: The Dearborn, The Oak, The Grafton, The Gage, Beacon Tavern, Henri, Acanto, and Coda di Volpe? They all opened under the strong will, vision, and the big shoulders of Billy Lawless and his family. Now he also happens to employ over 300 Chicagoans. So thank you, Bill. Thank you for doing that. Just as is important as his contribution to his... to the hospitality industry and the economy of Chicago, Billy is a strong advocate for improving the conditions and the rights of refugees, who, like him, seek the American dream. Bill, thank you for that as well. Now, Billy was just recently awarded last year the high order of his homeland by the Taoiseach, Enda Kenny. Now the Taoiseach, you've heard that before that is the Prime Minister. In May of 11 of 2016, Bill was appointed to the Irish Seanad that is the Irish Senate. Bill was appointed by Taoiseach Kenny to be the Senator for all global Irish. I'm not sure what that means Bill, but boy, the definition is large. Almost as large as you are, my friend. But anyway,

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

it's a big task and I know you're up for it congratulations for that. But I do know that Billy does travel back and forth, between Chicago and Ireland to attend session. And it begs the questions for me is, Bill, when do you sleep? But if you guys... if any of you guys know Billy, Billy Lawless, you'd probably think the words that'll come out of my mouth is that I'll sleep when I'm dead. I think that's an accurate answer, Bill, wouldn't you agree? But on any given day, you'll see Bill Lawless walking the halls of the Capitol advocating for the downtrodden, and also for his deeply-rooted humanitarian beliefs. Now, if you meet Billy like I have, and I've known him for the years, you'll never forget him. He has an infectious smile, a hearty laugh, a brogue thick as pea soup, the frame of an NFL lineman, and a heart larger than the man himself. For that we honor Bill Lawless for his contributions to our great diverse society. Also as a side note, Senator John Curran is cousins with Billy Lawless. So, Bill has deep connections and roots with the Illinois Legislature. Billy is also joined today with his wife, Kate. Thank you for joining us. And also his longtime friend, Donna Fitz. So thank you both for joining us today. And Billy, I want to thank you again for your friendship, but also for your advocacy in the State of Illinois on behalf of refugee rights. And also thank you for your contribution to the City of Chicago, to our small business community, but also for achieving the American dream which brought you here many years ago. So, Bill, thank you so much for joining us today."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Feigenholtz on the Resolution."

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Leader Durkin, you're a hard act to follow. I don't know that there's anything that you have omitted from your remarks. But I, too, stand in awe and honor of Billy Lawless, who never says no. He is a fighter for immigrant rights. He has a very deep footprint in the City of Chicago when it comes to the culinary and hospitality industry. We are very, very grateful to have many of his restaurants and establishments in our community that we meet at frequently. And it's always great to see him, his son. Billy Lawless is a constituent of mine and a great member of our community. And I'd like to also extend a congratulations, and thank you for everything you do that's not in your job description. Thank you, Billy."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

Harris, G.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. And I'd like to thank Leader Durkin for bringing us this Resolution. And in particular, just want to add my congratulations to Senator Billy Lawless for his tiresome work on immigrants and refugees. But also to understanding that you have to work to build coalitions against... across many different populations. Billy has been a fighter for so many issues that are good, as Representative Feigenholtz and Leader Durkin said, he never says no. He is a truly generous man and a generous spirit. Thank you, Leader Durkin, for honoring him."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Burke."

Burke, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Is Mr. Lawless in the chamber by any chance?"

Speaker Lang: "In front of the Republican side, Sir."

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

- Burke, D.: "Oh, okay. Generally he's the biggest guy in the room. You can't miss him. Billy, how are you, Sir? I'd be remised if I didn't offer my congratulations to you on the fine work that you've done. You're a great, great asset to the Irish community and to the entire State of Illinois. Congratulations. Keep up your wonderful work. God bless you."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted.

 Congratulations, Billy. Thank you for joining us here today.

 Mr. Clerk, Rules Report."
- Clerk Bolin: "Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, reports the following committee action taken on November 07, 2017: recommends be adopted Floor Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 402, and recommends be adopted and referred to the Order of Resolutions is House Joint Resolution 86."
- Speaker Lang: "Ladies and Gentlemen, we're preparing to adjourn... or recess for party caucuses. Recess for party caucuses. The Democrats will caucus immediately in Room 114. The Republicans will caucus immediately in Room 118. We estimate about an hour. However, rather than a time, the House will be in recess to the call of the Chair."
- Speaker Lang: "The House will be in Order. The Chair recognizes the Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Committee Reports. Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, reports the following committee action taken on November 07, 2017: recommends be adopted Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 for House Bill 137, and recommends be adopted Floor

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

Amendment #2 for Senate Bill 403, Floor Amendment #3 for Senate Bill 444, and Floor Amendment #1 for House Resolution 530."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie on a Motion."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. I move to suspend the posting requirements so that Senate Bill 752 can be heard in the Counties Committee; House Bill 726 in Elementary Curriculum; Senate Bill 351, House Resolution 75, House Resolution 662 and 668 in Human Services; House Joint Resolution 86 in Personnel & Pensions; Senate Bill 872 and Senate Bill 1086 in Revenue and Finance; and in the Rules Committee House Bill 726, 752, this doesn't make sense... 872... House Joint Resolution 84 and Senate Joint Resolution 36 in Transportation Regulation."

Speaker Lang: "You heard the Lady's Motion. Is there leave? Leave is granted. And the Lady's Motion is granted. Page 4 of the Calendar, Senate Bills-Second Reading, there appears Senate Bill 770, Mr. Moylan. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 770, 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 has been approved for consideration."

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

Moylan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Floor Amendment #2 is a gut and replace Amendment that becomes the Bill. The Amendment would be a trailer Bill to Senate Bill 1905 and provides that Senate Bill 1905 become law... and that should 1905 become law, Senate Bill 770 as amended would remove the portion of the original Bill which imposed a Class A misdemeanor upon any

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

officer, representative, director, or elected official or the like of any local government or political subdivision or any agent thereaft... thereafter, who knowingly or willfully violates or fails to apply with the Collective Bargaining Freedom Information Act."

Speaker Lang: "There being no debate, 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 770, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of the Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Moylan, have you already explained the Bill?"

Moylan: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen is recognized."

Breen: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Breen: "Actually, just inquiry of the Chair. How many votes are required to pass this particular piece of legislation?

Speaker Lang: "60 votes, Sir."

Breen: "Just 60. So, there is not an immediate effective date?

Interesting. So, Representative Moylan, then when is your
Bill effective?"

Moylan: "It is effective as soon as I get all of the votes."

Breen: "No, when is your Bill effective? It's... so if it's... so if it's a 60 voter..."

Moylan: "June 1, 2018."

Breen: "June 1, 2018. And then when is... when would SB1905 be effective if it was overridden?"

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

Moylan: "Same day."

Breen: "Okay. Is that after the 7th Circuit will decide the issue before it then?"

Moylan: "That's a date that... that's a... issue that's not determined yet."

Breen: "And the Supreme Court will have decided the Janus case possibly by then?"

Moylan: "I can't predict what the Supreme Court is going to do."

Breen: "Interesting. So, to the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is just more... bad process, this is poor government. We shouldn't be rushing these things through. This issue of... first off, it was a terrible idea to think that you're going to put people under Class A misdemeanor for taking legislative action. And this then just becomes, kind of, a bad fix to a very, very poor underlying Bill. And so, I would respectfully urge a 'no' vote on this, for the same reasons that the underlying Bill should not be overridden by this chamber. Again, this is the sort of thing that... we are better than this. We're better than this sort of gamesmanship back and forth. If this is really something that should be adopted as policy of the State of Illinois, it should start over as a proper Bill go through the regular process. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ives: "Representative Moylan, I was just wondering, I know you used to be the Mayor of Des Plaines. Is that right?"

Moylan: "Correct."

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

Ives: "And in Des Plaines did you guys have TIF Districts while
 you were mayor?"

Moylan: "Yes, we did."

Ives: "Okay. And did you ever vote in the... this House for enterprise zones?"

Moylan: "I'm not sure."

Ives: "Did you vote for the extension of the EDGE credit? I think
 you did, 'cause there was only five of us who voted... opposed
 it."

Moylan: "Okay."

Ives: "Okay. Have you voted here to extend TIF Districts in the past?

Moylan: "I'm not sure."

Ives: "Okay. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. Here's my point, my point is that the mayor himself, the former mayor, actually participated in special carve out districts that gave special incentives to businesses to do what they need to do and provide for economic development. He more than likely voted for the EDGE credit extension. I know that a number of people on that side has voted for every single enterprise zone that you could imagine from riverfront enterprise zones to other special enterprise zones that we have in legislation. Let's face it, this state has a number of different types of zones where we have decided that we want the business community to come in and be productive and we're going to give them special deals to do so. In this case, local right-to-work is no different than those same votes. So, it is extremely hypocritical for you to sit here and pass legislation like this that will prevent particular units... units of government...

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

sub units of government below the state level to actually do what they think they need to do to attract businesses in their neighborhood. You... you have ... you yourself participated in that stuff as a mayor to do that and now you're preventing other districts from doing that. And in some cases they feel that right-to-work legislation would be the best thing and the best incentive for them to grow their economy. So... I... you know, this is typical of the floor where we propose legislation for certain people but oppose it in other situations when it is exactly the same deal. So, look, here's the truth. The truth is that Illinois has two and a half times the economy of Indiana and yet, Indiana has had three times the job growth from 2000 to 2017. And the truth is that we are surrounded by right-to-work states, and in every case we are bleeding mainly manufacturing jobs to other states. In the case of Indiana, it is categorically true that union jobs are growing in Indiana, a right-to-work state. Why is that? Because jobs are growing in Indiana. And when you're rightto-work, it does not prevent unionization, it simply says you have a choice whether or not to join. So, on that basis, if we're all about bringing business to Illinois, which is the only way we're going to grow ourselves out of this fiscal disaster that is the state, \$250 billion of debt, \$16 billion in unpaid bills. I mean, we can't be honest with anybody, and once again we are telling businesses to take a hike. Anybody looking at this from abroad and saying... deciding whether or not they should move into Illinois, will essentially say Illinois is not open for business, and this Bill just solidifies that fact. So, go ahead, vote for this legislation

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

or don't vote for this legislation. But understand the message you are sending to Amazon and all the other potential people that are looking to come to Illinois. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andersson."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Andersson: "Thank you. Hey, Marty, how are you?"

Moylan: "Everything is wonderful."

Andersson: "Good."

Moylan: "And thank you for your help today on this Bill. I really appreciate it."

Andersson: "Well, I don't know if you're going to think I'm helpful, but we'll see. So on this particular Bill, if I recall last... two weeks ago on Senate Bill 1905, you received a lot of criticism about the fact that there is a criminal provision in it, correct?"

Moylan: "That's correct."

Andersson: "And this Bill, Senate Bill 770, removes that provision, correct?"

Moylan: "Correct. This is a compromise Bill."

Andersson: "So, would you... and, and this Bill isn't it. I mean, you still have to pass 1905, correct?"

Moylan: "Correct."

Andersson: "Okay. So, but wouldn't you agree though that anyone who had an objection to the criminal provisions, even if they don't like the rest of the Bill, it would make sense to remove this from the Bill, right?"

Moylan: "Correct. They should vote for this."

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

Andersson: "So... so you are attempting to... you may not be able to answer all the Republicans' objections, but you are trying to answer one of them which was the criminality provision, correct?"

Moylan: "That's correct."

Andersson: "So, I heard the word hypocritical used a little while ago. Wouldn't it be a little hypocritical to say that 1905 is bad because it has a criminal provision, and then vote against this Bill which removes it? The answer's, yes, Marty. Thank you."

Moylan: "Yes, thank you. Prompting is always good."

Andersson: "Thank you. I yield back my time."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Demmer."

Demmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. You know, over the course of the last several months one of the big stories about Illinois' economic development situation centered around the potential Toyota-Mazda manufacturing facility for which Illinois was a contender. In fact, a couple of sites in my district were prime locations that were being considered by executives at Toyota-Mazda to locate a plant here in Illinois that would have brought with it 4 thousand jobs. Four thousand jobs to a state that is desperately in need of jobs and certainly to communities that I represent that are in desperate need of jobs. Opportunities like that don't come around very much. The opportunity to attract a major manufacturing plant that employs that many people is not an opportunity we get every day. During the course of the evaluation of Illinois and other states, we heard from... from site selectors, from executives, from folks who were watching

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

this process play out, and it just so happened that the time that people were evaluating this... the various sites across the United States, the United States... many states were dealing with a series of significant natural disasters in the form of hurricanes that hit, battered many of the states in the southern United States. And during that course it was reported back that Toyota executives... that site selectors were talking about the very real challenge that poses to people to make investments in areas that could be hit, could be pounded by natural disasters such as hurricanes. Yet, when Illinois was informed that we were no longer in the running for the Toyota-Mazda manufacturing plant and that instead three southern states were the only three states who remained on the list, its... the message that I received was that businesses would rather deal with natural disasters than with Illinois' labor That businesses would rather deal with natural disasters than with the climate that we've created for businesses in the State of Illinois. That's a regrettable mistake that we've made, an opportunity that we won't get back. Today... today, we're talking not about making changes to Illinois' labor laws, but whether or not it's a criminal offense to even have that conversation in the first place. That's what this Bill does. It's... it determines whether or not it's a criminal offense to even have that conversation in the first place. Let's have the conversations that we know are being had in boardrooms, across the country and around the world, about whether or not Illinois is a place where people feel confident making investments. Today, the message they're sending us is Illinois is... is not on their list. We

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

need to make the kind of changes to put ourselves back on that list to bring jobs back to the State of Illinois. We cannot criminalize the conversation... we cannot have a debate about criminalizing the conversation. We need to take action today before the next opportunity passes us by as well. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wehrli."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Wehrli: "Wow, it just got really quiet in here. That's kind of unique for this chamber. So... so, Representative remind me again, were you a mayor of your local community?"

Moylan: "Pardon me?"

Wehrli: "Were you a mayor of your community?"

Moylan: "Yes, I was."

Wehrli: "Was there any activity that you could undertake as mayor for when you sponsored legislation that was a criminal activity?"

Moylan: "When I was mayor, I was happy to report that I was a supporter of non-right-to-work language."

Wehrli: "I don't believe that answers the question. Was there any legislation that you could introduce as a mayor in your community that would have been criminal in nature? That would have criminalized the act of governance?"

Moylan: "To be clear, this Bill does not criminalize anything."

Wehrli: "All right. Okay. We'll get to that in a little bit. But did you ever do that?"

Moylan: "Well, I want to make sure you know. To be clear this removes the penalty, which is some... what some Members on this

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

side or the other wanted. This is a compromise Bill and that's what we're all about."

Wehrli: "So, this Bill removes... it being a Class A misdemeanor, one notch from being a felon, if a local unit of government were even to introduce these local right-to-work zones. Is that... is that correct?"

Moylan: "This Bill removes any criminal pen... penalty if you vote for that Senate Bill 1905."

Wehrli: "Okay. And what's the effective date of Senate Bill 1905?"

Moylan: "We already explained that."

Wehrli: "Well I was, I was distracted in a sidebar conversation perhaps you could enlighten me with that information again."

Moylan: "June 1, 2018."

Wehrli: "June 1 of 2018, huh? And what's the effective date of this Bill?"

Moylan: "June 1, 2018."

Wehrli: "And what kind of insurances can you give us that if this Bill passes that it will even get called in the Senate?"

Moylan: "I have insurance from the Senate President."

Wehrli: "Did you have that in writing?"

Moylan: "I have insurance from... insurances from the President...

Senate... the President of the Senate... he gave me his word."

Wehrli: "Okay. So, this is... to the Bill. This is how typical Springfield shenanigans happen. There's an obvious problem with the law, my colleague proposes a trailer Bill or parallel language that is supposed to cure that problem, but we all know that this Bill is never going to see the light of day in the Senate. The underlying issue here is truly 19... Bill 1905,

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

I urge a 'no' vote on this Bill and I urge a 'no' vote on 1905."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reick."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Reick: "Representative, there is an old saying that students don't lose their right to First Amendment... their First Amendment rights when they cross the school house gate. Are you saying that in the case of public officials, they lose their First Amendment rights when they cross the school... when cross the gate to their local boards or... or community organizations?"

Moylan: "No, I am not saying that at all."

Reick: "Well, it seems to me that you lose your First Amendment right if you're threatened with any kind of... of incarceration or... or misdemeanor for having spoken in... in a way that is fully protected under the First Amendment.

Moylan: "This Bill removes any penalties."

Reick: "It removes any penalties, however it... there's no guarantee of course that this Bill will follow along with 1905 and then thus be passed in the Senate. We will end up with 1905 without the... without the misdemeanor provisions having been removed. Unless this trailer Bill is filed. Is that correct?"

Moylan: "Representative Reick, we're... we're calling the Bill... the Bill is being called right now in the Senate."

Reick: "Will it be called?"

Moylan: "House Bill 3452 does the same thing."

Reick: "This Bill is... 190... let's talk about 1905, which is what this Bill is about. 1905, I believe is in response to a court case that is working its way through the 7th Circuit Court of

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

Appeals. Don't you think it would be better... and if... the Village of Lincolnshire wins in that case, this Bill will become totally moot. Don't you agree?"

Moylan: "No, I do not. I don't think that we should pass any kind of right-to-work for less Bills."

Reick: "But if in fact the right-to-work is... is determined by the Supreme Court, it's going to happen anyway. To the Bill. I would strongly urge everyone here to understand the fact that this Bill is not connected to 1905 and will in fact die a very certain death and will end up with what we've got, what we're trying to pass in 1905. I urge a strong 'no' vote on both Bills. Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wheeler."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Wheeler, K.: "Representative, we've gone through this a couple times before, but I would look at this a different way just for the moment. This is a trailer Bill to a Bill that hasn't been passed yet or overridden, I should say. Correct?"

Moylan: "Correct."

Wheeler, K.: "So we're going to look at this and say that, yes, this is going to solve something that doesn't exist yet. On top of that, you're telling us that this Bill is being heard in the Senate at the same time, obviously it's a different vehicle, correct?"

Moylan: "Correct."

Wheeler, K.: "And, we've done this before where we've seen legislation come from both chambers, be passed, but not picked up in the other chamber. Is that a possibility here?"

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

Moylan: "I don't think so."

Wheeler, K.: "Is it a possibility though?"

Moylan: "I don't think so."

Wheeler, K.: "Does the possibility exist that this Bill will not be called in the Senate?"

Moylan: "They're calling it right now."

Wheeler, K.: "Say that again?"

Moylan: "They are calling the Bill right now."

Wheeler, K.: "This Bill... we are looking at this Bill, Senate Bill 770, they can't be calling that right now in the Senate we're hearing it here."

Moylan: "They're calling a trailer Bill similar to this Bill right now."

Wheeler, K.: "A trailer Bill to this Bill or a trailer Bill to 1905?"

Moylan: "3452 has identical language."

Wheeler, K.: "That's my point, Marty. They can call the Bill, the same language there and we call the same language here, different vehicles, neither one gets picked up in the other chamber and nothing ever happens. There is no certainty by doing this action right now that we can actually accomplish what you think you're trying to do."

Moylan: "If they pass it over here, I am committed to do it, right now. And I'm... I'm counting on you to support me 'cause I answered questions from your... our side of the aisle. I made a compromise, and that's why we're doing a trailer Bill. We removed the penalty... this Bill... let's make sure we know it does. It removes any penalty."

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

Wheeler, K.: "Okay, first of all, let's take the fact that you put a penalty in the Bill in the first place is terrible legislation. Second of all... second of all this doesn't solve the whole mystery because the Governor may not sign the Bill."

Moylan: "It doesn't happen if we override it."

"This... we're back to process again. To the Bill. Wheeler, K.: Ladies and Gentlemen, this is typical Springfield in action. We take an idea, don't use a thoughtful process to get it to the floor, to get it through committee. We don't have discussions ahead of time. We put something on the board that has a terrible mechanism in it. And the idea that... that a legislative Body in this state, a local unit of government could be prosecuted for passing something that they think will help their own community, no matter what it is. It doesn't have to be related to this issue at all. The precedent is terrible, it is terrible. Do I applaud the Representative for bringing forward something to maybe correct it? Sure. But this is the wrong mechanism for it. This Bill should be scrapped, the original Bill should be scrapped. Marty, can we get this right, start this whole thing over again in the correct process. Go through the committee process, hear from the stakeholders. Get it right, then bring it to the floor and go through the legislative process. What we're doing today is just trying to fix something that is already broken with another bad fix. There's no guarantee this actually solves the problem, because there's not guarantee this Bill is going to be heard in the Senate. There's no guarantee we're going to hear the Senate's version in this chamber. And again, there's no guarantee the Governor is going to hear any of it

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

or sign any of it. So, don't buy into this situation, don't buy into this false narrative that this solves a thing. Ladies and Gentlemen, we need to start in this Body with a legislative process that is thoughtful and balanced rather than being knee jerk reactions to the moment of the day. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Skillicorn."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Skillicorn: "Representative, I just wanted to ask you a couple questions about your Bill here. And what's the process and a little bit more of how we work here on the chamber. Have you ever voted for a Bill and it passed the House chamber, but it was never called in the Senate?"

Moylan: "Let me tell you how the process works. There's a great Bill, it's staging... you can pick it up anyway, how to pass a Bill in Springfield. That's how the process works."

Skillicorn: "But have you ever voted for anything, and it passed this chamber, but it didn't move forward? It just kind of... went to nowhere and died?"

Moylan: "I don't have an answer for that."

Skillicorn: "Okay, I can remember quite a few Bills like that. I can... I can think of the... our colleague from Schaumberg that had a tax... property tax Bill and it passed here in the House and it didn't go anywhere. And I can think of numerous Bills that's happened to where they don't get called in the Senate and they don't seem to move. But I have another question here, and are you familiar with the First Amendment to the Constitution and The Bill of Rights?"

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

Moylan: "Yes."

Skillicorn: "All right. Are you familiar that Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion? I'm sure you are. And prohibited the free exercise... thereof or abridging the freedom of speech, and the press, and the right for people to peaceably assemble, and the petition of the government to redress of grievances. Are you familiar with that?"

Moylan: "That was a lot, but yes."

Skillicorn: "But do you also think that it might be un-American to go against the First Amendment?"

Moylan: "What I think is that when you have a Bill, you present a Bill, and there is some objections to a certain part of the Bill and then you agree to file a trailer Bill to address those sessions. That's what the process is all about and that's what we're discussing today."

Skillicorn: "But would you agree that we shouldn't be challenging the right of free speech and we shouldn't be challenging the right to peaceably assemble and to choose to not assemble?"

Moylan: "That's why I removed the penalty from the Bill."

Skillicorn: "But I was getting to the key point here is that the...

the freedom to assemble is also the choice not to assemble."

Moylan: "Keep going."

Skillicorn: "Well I... I just... I just think that if we have the freedom to assemble, that individuals should also have the freedom to not assemble."

Moylan: "You have the right..."

Skillicorn: "And that's where the crux of this issue... go ahead."

Moylan: "You... there is a green button and a red button. You have the right to vote for either one."

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

Skillicorn: "All right. Thank you, thank you, Sir."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Moylan to close."

Moylan: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to say that this is a compromise Bill. I've listened to what concerns were being spoken about on this side of the aisle. I filed a trailer Bill that removed the penalties, and I respectfully ask for an 'aye' vote."

'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 73 voting 'yes', 38 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having receiving the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Supplemental Calendar #2 on Order of Resolutions, HJR86, Mr. Thapedi. Please proceed, Sir."

Thapedi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I present House Joint Resolution 86. Essentially, Mr. Speaker, we know that no one wants to talk about racial tension in a public place. It just seems to be taboo. But a few recent incidents demand that we step up as a unit and address this disease in government today. Recently, an investigator for the Workers' Compensation Commission sent emails out proudly to government employees saying the most putrid and disgusting things about black people and Latino people in Chicago. He talked about fake Chicago safari tours where participants could see kills, and crime scenes, and animals in their natural habitat. And by animals, he actually meant black people and Latino people. Yet, another one of his emails was called 'Watermelon

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

Protection', and the individual depicted as providing such protection in this watermelon patch was clad in classic KKK gear with the white hood and all the associated garb. Again, a state employee doing this and sharing this with other governmental employees. Then, Ladies and Gentlemen, we all remember the infamous cartoon of the black child begging on the streets for money to be educated. Then on this very House Floor one of our Members, during debate, thought it was okay to say without pause that even the best, the brightest, and the highest achieving black kids in East St. Louis were too dumb and undeserving of a college education. To follow up, Mr. Speaker, the policies and cuts that we saw advanced during the budget hearings and the budget discussions also had an odd smell. This Resolution brings to light what no one wants to really talk about. Something that black and Latino Legislators, lobbyists, and staff under this dome deal with every single day in some form or another either directly or indirectly. I ask that we work together to change the culture of racism under this dome. Our plan, Mr. Speaker, is to follow up with a task force to address this issue. A task force is appropriate because there does not appear to be any available information that reviews the legal and social consequences of racism in government. I ask for an 'aye' vote to keep the conversation going and I'm available to answer any and all questions."

Speaker Lang: "Representative McDermed."

McDermed: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to rise in support of this Resolution. When we've had so much discussion over the last couple weeks about sexual harassment, my first reaction

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

to all that was, when we are going to address the other issues that so strongly affect us here in this House and here in our State Capitol? And that is racism and bullying. We have a lot of aggression here in the seat of power in Illinois that we need to address. I'm really glad that a Member of this General Assembly bought... brought this Resolution. And I think it's fabulous and we all need to go to work to deal with racism here in Springfield and in our state. Thank you, Representative, for this Resolution."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House and Representative, I am going to vote for this Resolution, but I have to tell you it troubles me, and I'll tell you why it troubles me. Look, I'm not black, I have never lived in a segregated neighborhood, I don't know what it is like, so maybe it's not right for me to stand up here and talk about this. But what troubles me about the Resolution is the harshness of your words. The harshness of your words that... that to change the culture of racism that befouls State Government... there are 50 plus thousand people that work for the State of Illinois and you know what, there are bigots among them, there are racists among them, there are people that we would not associate and any... and... and engage in the types of actions that you outlined. And it's wrong, absolutely wrong, and we want to root it out. But does racism befoul State Government? Does it infect every department in State Government? I have... I find that very hard to believe, there are really good, talented people that work for State Government that are not bigots, they are not racists, and

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

they would not engage in the type of actions that... that person at that department did. And again, I am going to vote for it, racism is wrong in every way it's wrong, and I... I whole... I wholeheartedly agree with you, and I... I've not felt, I've not been subject to the type of... to the type of bigotry that you most likely have because of the color of your skin and I understand that as much as I can understand it. But I'm not... I'm... I just... I'm uncomfortable... I'm uncomfortable criticizing and accusing everybody in State Government, that it befouls State Government. It's wrong, but the government is better, I think, than what this Resolution may imply. Again, I'll vote for it, I respect you, I understand where you are coming from. I just hope that you can realize that indeed there are good people in this government that would not engage in the type of conduct that you outlined. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to rise in support of the Gentleman's Resolution. And I just want to say that the previous Speaker used the word harshness... harshness, and I don't know if you really understand. But in... in regards to harshness, you know, I make no apologies if anybody was offended or if anyone is offended in regards to the Gentleman's language. Because harshness... the... the harshness of slavery, the harshness of being disrespected, the harshness of being raped and robbed of your dignity, the harshness of free labor, the harshness of being lied on, being called the welfare queen when we know who really was the welfare queen, the harshness of being in the United States of America and having two sets of rules... one for you and one for

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

me, the harshness of implied biases that will cause your son and daughter not to be incarcerated, but cause mine to be incarcerated... harshness? The harshness of slavery. The harshness of our community that we have never... will never be able to recapture all the things that we've lost in the past. The harshness of closing 50 schools and the harshness of imprison innocent people and never to say that I'm sorry? That's harshness. The harshness of purposely... purposely miseducating a group of young people, and they will never know why they are living in the conditions that they are living in. That's harshness. But the people of the State of Illinois have a responsibility to be fair and equal to everybody. The Constitution states that despite the fact the Constitution started off with us being three-fifths or threefourths of a person, I forget which one it is, but then we had to amend it... three-fifths, thank you, Representative. We had to amend it, so in order for me to be looked upon as a whole person, I had to be amended into the Constitution. One of the great generals in Washington D.C. was talking about the reason why there was a Civil War, because we did not compromise. If... if there had been just more compromise, we wouldn't have had to go to war ... excuse me? How long did you want us to be raped? How long did you want us to be robbed of our dignity? How long did you want to sell our families and disrespect us? How long do this go on? I say enough, enough is enough. And I would urge passage of the Gentleman's Resolution. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ammons."

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

Ammons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Resolution. First of all, thank you, Representative Thapedi, for bringing forth this Resolution. And I appreciate the previous speaker enunciation of asking the questions that are relevant to this Resolution's intent, but I would like to just give expression to a couple of areas whereas this idea of racial discrimination in government becomes crystal and clear. And I point our attention immediately to laws that were passed, in particular that have been identified to be racially motivated around drug... drug possession and drug charges that impacted the black community in a way that has not been addressed adequately by this Body. But it has had a discriminatory impact and certainly a racialized focus on prosecutions of African Americans for possession of drugs in this state and in this country. It is an example of racialized policies that are voted on by elected officials. I also point your attention to, we don't have to go that far back, to look at housing discrimination in its policy form that has a racialized implication and discriminatory segregated actions that result in the production of ghettos and the lack of resources in certain communities that have policy implications that have come out of governmental bodies. So, sometimes it is difficult for people to identify themselves what it means when you say racial discrimination, because none of us want to be identified with such terrible terms as ... as was illustrated by one of our colleagues here today. But we have to step back and look at the racialized implementation of laws and regulations that do have a negative impact on certain communities and we can prove their results. So, I think that

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

House... this House Joint Resolution speaks to a longstanding institutional problem that if we had the time and attention that my colleague has suggested that a task force is needed for, that we can with ease identify by research methods the housing discrimination that has come of out implications, the racialized discrimination in employment, and in contracting. These things are easily identified, but the result needs to be that when we vote on Bills and pass legislation, we have to do that with a lens that includes this House Joint Resolution and the possible implications of discriminatory outcomes. And even though discrimination is against the law as it currently exists, racial discrimination exists in all of the institutions that I have named and even some that I have not. And so I appreciate Representative Thapedi for taking the initiating step to put this in a House Joint Resolution as we talk about other implications of harassment, this is certainly one that we cannot ignore in all of our... and this is a legislative Body, all of our research in relationship to legislative implications. So, thank you so much, and I urge an 'aye' vote for this."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Jones."

Jones: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this Resolution. And, you know, it's kind of funny, and maybe it's not funny that while we're debating this important issue, so much talk going on in this chamber and you're not paying attention to the words that are in this Resolution that speaks to what's going on in here in Springfield. And maybe it hurts the Republican side that there is not too many African Americans on the Republican side and not too many African

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

Americans or Hispanics on the Republican side, and maybe it hurts that the Governor doesn't have too many blacks or Hispanics on his staff. Maybe it hurts you that that's happening. But it's mighty funny that if you're out campaigning, and a voter is screaming at you that you can be calm and patient with a voter, but the words in this Resolution make you uncomfortable. Racism is uncomfortable. So, if you're uncomfortable by the words in this Resolution, maybe you should look at yourself and look at how the Representative has presented to you point by point of a Member of this House said words that are demeaning to black people and black kids. A Representative in this chamber said those words. So, if the words in this Resolution offends you, so what? Get over it. Grow up. Racism is here and we have to deal with it. If you're uncomfortable dealing with racism then maybe you should check yourself and check why you're here. We're not here to be uncomfortable, we're here to solve problems. There are not enough blacks in contracting, we're not getting enough contracts, we've said that before. So, why are you here? This Resolution is a great Resolution and I want to commend Representative Thapedi for bringing this forward. And I hope that every Member of this Body supports this Resolution because it's time. If not now, when? Many of you have heard the phrase, the truth shall set you free. If you are afraid of the truth that's in this Resolution, I would like to see how many of you vote 'no' against it. I urge you...

a 'yes' vote on this Resolution. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Thapedi to close."

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

Thapedi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I'd like to thank the roster of cosponsors, the House Black Caucus leadership team for working with me on this. I want to thank both sides of the aisle... Members on both sides of the aisle that have been supportive of the letter and the spirit of the Resolution. We know that there is a long way to go, that there is a long way to go but I think that this Resolution begins that process. That process of addressing an ill that has to be addressed. I also want to thank the folks at the NAACP for working with me on this as well. And I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Resolution will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the Resolution is adopted. Mr. Brady, for what purpose do you rise?"

Brady: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege. On the previous Bill, Senate Bill 770, I would like the record to reflect that I intended to vote 'no'. I had a switch malfunction here."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Sir."

Brady: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Conyears-Ervin, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Lang: "Proceed please."

Conyears-Ervin: "I expect the chamber will help me welcome Mark Legenza, owner of On Tour Brewery. Mark, please stand."

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

Speaker Lang: "Thank you."

Conyears-Ervin: "I would like to congratulate Mark for winning four national honors at the 2017 Great American Beer Festival.

Mark Legenza... oh let's clap, I apologize. Mark is a third generation Chicagoan and located the brewery near where his grandparents lived, in West Town of Chicago. And Mark, some Representatives asked if you brought some product with you?"

Speaker Lang: "Welcome to the House chamber. Thank you for joining us. Senate Bills-Second Reading, Senate Bill 402. Speaker Madigan. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 402, a Bill for an Act concerning government. The Bill was read for a second time previously.

Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Speaker Madigan."

Speaker Lang: "Speaker Madigan on Amendment 2."

Madigan: "Please withdrawal Amendment #2."

Speaker Lang: "Amendment #2 is withdrawn. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #4 is offered by Speaker Madigan."

Speaker Lang: "Speaker Madigan on Amendment 4."

Madigan: "I move to adopt the Amendment and debate the Bill on Third Reading."

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

Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #5 is offered by Speaker Madigan."

Speaker Lang: "Speaker Madigan."

Madigan: "I move to adopt the Amendment and debate the Bill on Third Reading."

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

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

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

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 402, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Speaker Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, after the adoption of the Amendments, the Bill would do four things. Number one, it would amend the Ethics Act and the Lobbyists Registration Act to specifically prohibit sexual harassment, gives each Inspector General the authority investigate sexual harassment claims and bring any claim before an Ethics Commission for a hearing. The Commission may fine a person in violation of the prohibition on sexual harassment up to \$5 thousand per incident. Next, the Bill would require every Constitutional Officer, every Member of the Legislature, every state employee, registered lobbyists, lobbying entity, and unit of local government to adopt a sexual harassment policy. Policy shall include the following: one, a prohibition on sexual harassment. Next, details on how an individual can report an allegation of sexual harassment including options for making confidential reports to a supervisor, ethics officer, Inspector General, Department of Human Rights, or any other entity that is available as well as a reminder that a person may always seek independent counsel. Next, prohibition on retaliation for making a report and finally, the consequences of a violation. Number three,

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

the Bill will require all Constitutional Officers, Members of employees, and Legislature, state lobbyists participate in annual sexual harassment training, which shall include the definition of sexual harassment and examples and instances. Every Constitutional Officer and Legislative Leader must annually submit to the Ethics Commission a report detailing plans for training and the names of those who did not participate in the training. Lastly, requires the Department of Human Rights to maintain a hotline to provide information about sexual harassment including how to file a complaint, anti-retaliation laws, and the availability of counseling. I am going to ask Representative Currie to offer a presentation to the Bill and then she will take all questions on the Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. I think the Speaker described the outlines of this measure well and thoroughly. Our effort here is to see to it that there are clear lines of authority, starting with training. Training of staff, lawmakers, and members of the lobbying community, so as to decrease incidents and examples of sexual harassment throughout the Capitol complex. We're trying to provide very clear avenues for people who have complaints to know where they may take those complaints. Those complaints will be confidential if the person making the charge wishes them to be confidential. We've tried to make it clear that anti... that... that there is a prohibition against any action to retaliate against somebody who might make a claim, and we have offered strong whistleblower protections. This Bill did not emanate

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

entirely from the brain of Michael J. Madigan. He had a lot of help from the stakeholders in this chamber and outside the chamber as well. Representative Durkin's proposal to create a hotline going to the Department of Human Rights is included in this proposal. And many of the women who have been organizing in and outside the halls of the General Assembly have made many suggestions, many improvements that I think will make this Bill a very strong one. I'd be happy to answer your questions. I think it's time for us to find a way to call a halt to sexual harassment, in and around the Capitol. And I think this Bill goes a long way to making sure that it's possible for the sun to shine instead of the shadows to prevail when people misbehave around this Assembly."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Turner."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Turner: "Thank you. Leader Currie, I have a question about the new Section 10.5 in the State Officials and Employees Ethics Act which discusses sexual harassment training. The Bill states that the sexual harassment training program shall be overseen by the appropriate Ethics Commission and Inspector General appointed pursuant to this Act. Regarding the word 'oversee', is it intended that the appropriate Ethics Commission and Inspector General develop and implement the training?"

Currie: "No, it is not. In fact, we don't believe that either the... the Ethics Commission or the Inspector General has the resources or the expertise to provide this training. But we do understand and we think it's important that the ultimate

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

jurisdictional authority should take a role in making sure that the training and the procedures are, in fact, appropriate. So, in this respect, we want to make sure that they can... in... in effect certify that the training that is offered meets the training requirements of the Act."

Turner: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Cassidy."

Cassidy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Question of the Sponsor or Sponsor stand in?"

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie yields."

Cassidy: "You mentioned that there's been a great deal of input from stakeholders, and I understand we're going to pursue... there's going to be another Resolution later about the task force. And I just want to get clarity that... that task force will not only work in conjunction with what they're doing on the Senate side... I'm going to try to get through this before I lose my entire voice... but also that... that if that... the work of those task forces leads us towards a different model that... that we will be equipped to make that pivot. That we're not jumping into repairing this thing that we know is broken and... and fixing it like a car to keep it on the road for a while, but if we figure out we need a new car, were going to be prepared to do that."

Currie: "Under the task force language, the task force will make recommendations to the General Assembly. Included among those recommendations could be a whole different procedure for dealing with issues of sexual harassment in the Capitol. But it would be then up to the Assembly to adopt those changes not for the task force. But yes, the task force has the

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

responsibility to make recommendations to report, and if the... the consensus in the task force is that we need a completely different approach, we'll offer it."

Cassidy: "And... just to... to clarify, you, as a stand in for the Speaker and on behalf of leadership, are open to wherever this direction might lead us? If we find a better model, we're open to going that direction?"

Currie: "Absolutely. And I should think every Member of this chamber would agree."

Cassidy: "I appreciate that. And to the Bill. This is a good first step. But it is just that a first step. I used the analogy of keeping a car on the road. We know that the car that we have has been up on bricks for quite a while. So we're putting some tires on it and we're trying to get it rolling. But frankly, we all need to be open to figuring out the best way and using the best practices to change the culture of... of this building, not only on these issues, but on the issues we discussed in the prior Resolution. We can do better. We can be better, and we need to set a better example. I... I urge a 'yes' vote to get this car back on the road, but I urge all of us to do our homework and find the best possible model to do this right."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wehrli."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Wehrli: "So, first, thank you for bringing this forward. This is long overdue under this Capitol, and I'm glad we're... we're addressing this today. I believe this will pass out unanimously, just to show the commitment of every Member here

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

on how important we take this. But it's along those lines that I have a couple of questions. Are you familiar with the letter from the then Legislative Inspector General Homer, April of 2014?"

Currie: "Yes. I am familiar with that letter."

Wehrli: "So that was a crisis moment when it comes to ethical oversight in our Capitol then and he made several recommendations then... almost over two years ago. Is there any commitment to looking at that letter and incorporating some of the language that he suggested to address the patronage problems, and the reporting problems, and actually giving the Office of Legislative Inspector General some teeth?"

Currie: "Yeah, I would say that the letter has been available, a matter of public record, for the last several years. Any lawmaker is more than welcome to introduce legislation to make changes in the Ethics Act."

Wehrli: "Well, we... we had a vacancy in that office for quite some time, and this letter has basically sat on a shelf collecting dust. I know legislation has been introduced to help address some of this. But to the Bill. My point in bringing this up is we've had ethical lapses here in the Capitol for quite some time. Our state is well known for corruption and unethical behavior, and it's on all of us to try and clean that up. Whether its sexual harassment, which shouldn't be tolerated anywhere, but its patronage schemes, it's not properly reporting on our annually statements of economic interest. There's so much work to be done to clean up the faith and the trust that the people of Illinois want to have in their government. And right now it's sorely lacking. So I

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

once again, I thank the Speaker and the Representative for bringing this Bill forward. It's a good first step. But please, let's not lose sight that this is just a first step in an area dealing with sexual harassment. Massive importance to get this passed, but there's so many other areas that we need to clean up State Government. So I hope we can work in this bipartisan, and hopefully bicameral way, to enact some of the reforms that have been outlined by previous Inspector Generals in just commonsense ethical legislation from around the United States and clean up ethics in Illinois. I strongly urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ives: "We discussed this Bill in caucus today, where there was a couple of questions. One, it appears that under the old Legislative Inspector General Act that sexual harassment was not an offense for which this commission would be able to investigate. Is that your understanding?"

Currie: "That's my understanding, and that's why we're correcting that oversight with this legislation."

Ives: "So in regards to that, however, what we have also been told is that there are 27 complaints over the last 3 years that have not even been looked at. If any of those are sexual harassment in nature, will this law allow for those to be acted on?"

Currie: "First of all, we don't know the nature of the 27 complaints. We don't know how many of them are patronage, or hiring, or sexual harassment. But we do know that the bar to

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

assessing... beginning investigations after a complaint has been on file for a year, I do believe that there will be a later Bill today that will give us the opportunity to make sure that the new Inspector General, the Special Inspector General, just hired by the Legislative Ethics Commission, would be entitled, would be enabled to assess those complaints."

- Ives: "So, you're... you're saying then the new... the legislation going... it's going to allow the Legislative Inspector General to look back and extend the time frame that you can look at the complaints. That that will if there is a sexual harassment complaint in there, you are saying here on the House Floor that your intention is that that Legislative Inspector General should be able to look at that complaint?"
- Currie: "Yes, I do, and... and you'll have an opportunity Representative, just down the line, to vote for the Concurrence Motion on House Bill 137 that will enable the Inspector General to do just that."
- Ives: "Okay. I just wanted to make sure that it wouldn't... wasn't a go forward basis only. Additionally, why is it that we can't find out some generic information about these complaints, such as, how many have been pending for how long? How many are related to Legislators who are elected officials and should be held to account by their own voters? How many are staff? I mean generic information about these complaints should be available to this Body simply because they've been ignored for three years, and we have a right to know the seriousness of the complaints. And quite frankly, I think we

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

have a right to know who those complaints have been made against."

Currie: "My understanding is that the Members of the Legislative Ethics Commission have voted to ask the Inspector General to provide exactly the information you are interested in seeing."

Ives: "Okay. That's good news. My other question is, why? Why did
 we not have a Legislative Inspector General for three years?"

Currie: "I don't know the answer to that question, but I do know that it takes three of the Legislative Leaders to agree upon a candidate for that post. I don't think being a Legislative Inspector General is an easy path to take. And in fact, the two previous Inspectors General have been the subjects of pretty significant attacks from outside organizations suggesting that they were toothless tigers unable to do the job. I don't think that has been a fair characterization. But if I were somebody qualified to take that post, I don't know that I would want to, if my reward for taking that job is just to be condemned from one end of the state to the other."

Ives: "That's a lot of speculation. And I... I have actually personally met Mr. Homer a number of times. I will tell you he is the last one to be some sort of shrinking violet in the face of somebody making false accusations about him being a toothless tiger. He was the one who wrote the report that Representative Wehrli referred to. And he was the one who said that the commission and the actions of the Legislative Inspector General actually toothless. So he was actually confirming exactly what you said about that position which is why we need to strengthen the... the Act itself. Now, my

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

question again is, why? We want to know why it was held vacant. And I can tell you from our side of the aisle, I know that our Members on that commission submitted a number of names over the time frame, and apparently it never really became an item for which you would do a press conference about, simply because they never knew there were any complaints at all filed. None. None. So, now we find out three years hence that there's been 27 complaints filed. Nothing done. No sitting Legislative Inspector General. And we want to know why. 'Cause we have done our job over here. We have submitted names. And there would have been more of an impetus to get resolution had we known there were actual complaints. Nobody knew until apparently last week. So why? I ask again, why?"

Currie: "First of all, my information is different from yours. My information is that there were no names submitted by Members of your caucus who serve on the Legislative Ethics Commission. I would reiterate that it takes the vote of three of the Leaders to appoint someone to this position. So, I would encourage you to ask your Leader what role he played in making sure we were able to fill this post."

Ives: "I assure you that information's false. Regardless, I stand
in support of the Lady's Bill, and I will support it. However,
I think that there are a number of unanswered questions for
which the voters should have information on prior to the next
election. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Skillicorn."

Skillicorn: "Thank you. I rise in support of this Bill. And I think this might be a really good first step in just

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

correcting a trust issue we have with Illinois taxpayers. Obviously Illinois has many examples of corruption, fraud, and abuse, and I hope that this just nips it in the bud. And I am very excited that Leadership chose to modify the Inspector General Act by adding this language, including sexual harassment. I think that's great. I would love to have an opportunity with Leadership to maybe add other things or further this discussion. You know, one thing that's always I think of, is someone that is familiar with new modern technology, and is if... if we are in a situation and we are confronted by a harasser, we could always record this harassment on a telephone. But unfortunately, Illinois is a two-person consent law state. So, you can't actually record someone harassing you and using it against them. So, I hope that maybe we can make an exception for that or we can change this two factor. But I just want to continue this discussion, because we need to restore trust in our state. And we don't have that here at the statehouse. So, I urge an 'aye' vote. But I also urge that we can continue this discussion and continue to move forward and maybe move on to a situation where we can go after and prosecute these people that have wronged the people in this building."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hays."

Hays: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Certainly I think the Bill is an excellent idea. I certainly anticipate that the votes will be unanimous, I will correct one thing though. There is no question that names were submitted from this side of aisle. I submitted names in writing with credentials to the Gentleman in the Chair, when he was standing in that very

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

position. On the… at the same time, we submitted those to the current chair, Terry Link. And Senator Link has reported to the *Chicago Tribune* and other media that that in fact did happen. So, there's no question about that. And certainly, since I delivered them personally, I take very serious umbrage to the notion that it didn't happen. It did happen. It's not a question. Period."

Speaker Lang: "Speaker Madigan to close."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, thank you to all of those who participated in drafting the Bill. I request a 'yes' vote."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please take the record, Mr. Clerk. There are 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Supplemental Calendar #1, Order of Resolutions. HJR83, Representative Feigenholtz. Please proceed."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to recognize with this Joint Resolution, along with my colleague on the other side of the chamber, Senator Toi Hutchinson, to memorialize the courage of some women to correct an injustice and to publically tell their stories about what has been occurring in their lives, possibly triggered by what is now coined as the Weinstein Factor. You know, there are some who believe that it has start... it has begun from the highest office in this country. But this of course was an explosive and extraordinary unveiling of a truth that a lot of women around this building, and in government and politics, have been

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

burying inside of them for years. I know I speak for myself when I say that about things that occur that we sometimes are just ashamed of and are afraid to talk about. So, the descriptions from a lot of these women and many of these men of this pervasive and toxic environment is not just playing out here in Illinois. If you're following stories, this is happening all over the country. That letter was damning to the process. And a lot of Members in this chamber, and a lot of people in all branches of government signed onto it. And I... I am delighted to stand in solidarity with you, not just for the women that were directly involved in Illinois Say No More, but also for the future female participation that we want in government, in policy. In their statement to the committee and to Members of this chamber, and for the record, last week they write in their letter: One of our members met a 13-year-old girl who shared her dreams of holding elected office with bright eyed enthusiasm, and talked about her belief that public service is the way that she can maximize her impact for the greater good. So for young women like her, the next generation of public servants, that's why we have to strive to do better. And when this young woman and her contemporaries inherit this work, and all of us are long gone, long retired, the institution of our state and the integrity of our state will remain, and it should remain with its head held high. So, what we choose to value here, how we decide to move forward, like laying the framework as Speaker Madigan just did with Senate Bill 402, is going to determine the health of these institutions that we hold dear generations. So, this is the inflection point where have to

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

decide what kind of an indelible impact and mark we want to leave on... on the dome here and in institutions of government. I know that certainly something I would like to see, and I know I speak for many of my colleagues. So, a couple weeks ago I walked into the Capitol after this story broke, and one person said to me, I hear you're making trouble, and another person stopped me and said, thank you for standing up. I think that this illustrates the power dynamic here. And so, to Illinois Say No More, I thank you for helping us reflect on our own actions, taking a look at how we behave around here, changing the status quo, and changing things around here so there are more women that run to government instead of away from it. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Evans."

Evans: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this Resolution, and I rise as a man in support of all of the women. As a boy, I've seen women have to deal with sexual harassment. As a man I've seen it. And as a man who's seen and experienced it and watched on the sidelines, like in the case of racism, men like me are moving forward are going to stand up and we're going to get rid of it. We're going to stand up and we're going to speak to say that it is no longer acceptable to sexually harass or harass women. This is a place of business, this is a place of coworkers. And even beyond that, as leaders, we're going to take this back to our various communities. There are issues, we're addressing those issues. And I'm proud to be in an Assembly where we can face the facts, not run away from those facts, but actually move forward, whether it be through policy or Resolutions to say,

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

we're going to end this and we're not going to end it tomorrow, we're going to end it now. Thank you, Sarah, for what you've done. And again, thank you to all of the men who stand with me as we get rid of sexual harassment in this dome and throughout the State of Illinois. Be that example."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Guzzardi."

Guzzardi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Resolution. I, too, stand in support of this initiative and I'm... I stand in support of the courage of the women who serve in this chamber and who work in this building, who shared their stories of facing sexual harassment in this chamber. And I stand also, thank Representative Feigenholtz and all colleagues, who have brought this issue forward. And in fairness, I stand to take my share of culpability. You know, I think, coming down to this place you are told about the way things work in Springfield, and the way the culture is here, and that's just how Springfield is. And you see things happen and you hear things happen and I, too often, stood by and said nothing and did nothing. And that's to my great discredit and my great shame. And I stand here to own that and to make my commitment to the women whom I serve with and the women whom I work with here to be better. And I think all of us... all the men in this chamber have a responsibility to be better. To call out inappropriate behavior when we see it and to help change the culture in this Body. So, I look forward to working with the Leaders who are spearheading this movement, on not only on passing legislation, but also trying to change the culture of Springfield. And I hope that we can do better for our women colleagues. Thank you."

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

Speaker Lang: "Representative Williams."

Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, over the past 23 years, I have worked in several capacities in this building. First, as a legislative staffer on tech review, I was a legislative liaison, I was a registered lobbyist, and here I am now as a Legislator. So, I've spent most of my adult life working in and around Illinois government and politics. And I have loved it: the work, the issues, the ability to make change, the people. I consider myself incredibly lucky to be here and so honored. I've had many wonderful women and men serve as role models and mentors to me over the years. So, when the letter came out a few weeks ago written by women highlighting their experiences with sexual harassment and the culture Springfield, I wasn't surprised. I, like many women, have experienced what it's like to be a woman in a man's world. I understand where women are too often objectified, undervalued, marginalized, and treated unprofessionally and inappropriately. But we've come so used to those dynamics, both blatant and subtle, that handling them or developing work arounds becomes second nature. But until recently, until the letter, we didn't talk about it too much. So I want to give credit to, and thank sincerely, the women who put forth the letter which has led to unprecedented conversation around the rail, on this floor, among men and women who I've known for years. The letter has become a catalyst for an evaluation of how we address sexual harassment, or how don't address it under the dome, and it's exposed the failure of our system. As a result, today we're addressing some of the very important first steps in the short term, and hopefully setting up a

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

mechanism to address these longer term issues to make our work environment a better place for women. And I hope this will lead to a higher standard around the Capitol. But as someone who has spent so much of my life, as many of you have, fighting for the empowerment of women, I sincerely hope this will also lead to a deeper conversation about the role of women in government and politics in Illinois and beyond. Springfield looks a lot different now than it did when I started. There's a lot more women working around the rail and in high level positions, certainly. But here and throughout the country, women are still wildly underrepresented in elective office. We've never had a woman serve as Governor, and it's 2017. While the press box has a lot more female faces than it ever has before, men still dominate executive positions in the majority of media outlets. Women CEOs are few and far between. There are still far too many firsts for women yet to check off the list. This significant imbalance of power in all sectors, ultimately is why sexist behavior, through perhaps more subtle than in the past, remains alive and well in the halls of the Capitol and throughout the country. And this significant imbalance of power also allows an often challenging and sometimes hostile environment to flourish for women, not just here, but anywhere in the workplace. So, to all women who work as legislative assistants in the Capitol, staffers, lobbyists, those working at state agencies, or elsewhere in and around State Government, I think I can support ... say on behalf of many of us in this chamber, we support you. And we are committed to ensuring a better climate for you and all women who work in and around the

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

Capitol. Because we need you. We need to collaborate with you to make a better environment for women, not just in our own micro community here under the dome, but in all segments of society. We need the generations of women who come behind us to succeed and thrive. We need to elect more women at all levels of government. We need more women around the rail and in high level positions in government. We need women in leadership roles, both in the public and private sector. We need equal pay. We need to move the needle for women a little more each day. And we need to be the voice for women who don't have their own voices. We also need the men to stand up with us and address this power dynamic, ensuring women always have a seat at the table. We need men and women to work together to address these issues head on. And we need to start right here, right now."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Stratton."

Stratton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to the Resolution. I stand in support of House Joint Resolution 83. I stand for myself. I stand on behalf of my three daughters. I stand on behalf of the hundreds of women who raised their voices under the #MeToo to acknowledge their own experiences with sexual harassment. And I stand on behalf of the thousands upon thousands of women who perhaps have not felt comfortable, for a number of reasons, to share their stories. Yet, they are also brave and have nevertheless had to endure sexual misconduct in the workplace when they were merely attempting to do their jobs. I want to acknowledge Tarana Burke, the black woman who started the Me Too campaign, to encourage women of color, sexual assault survivors to share

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

their stories. Years later, this Me Too campaign recently went viral. And now women of the Illinois State Capitol, Legislators, legislative staffers, lobbyists, and all of the women who walk these halls and contribute to the success of our State Government's business have stepped up to share their own Me Too stories and have spoken out to say, no more. Research indicates that one in three women between the ages of 18 to 34 have been sexually harassed at work. For a number of reasons, only 29 percent of women report these incidents. Sometimes it is out of fear. Sometimes it's because there's a sense that nothing will change. That these unwelcome sexual advances, these requests for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature is just par for the course. The consequences of such a workplace is an unfortunate culture, which devalues our intelligence and our work ethic and diminishes our contributions to the workplace. Sexual harassment is traumatizing and damaging and has lasting effects on a woman's health and wellbeing. And not only are women harmed, but none of us are able to do our best work for the residents of Illinois when we fail to do right by one another. None of us can do our best work for the people of this great state if we are unable to respect our common humanity. Women throughout the State Capitol have been empowered by the voices of a few that have now become a chorus of many. And now, it has been brought to the forefront and we must work to ensure that such behavior will not be tolerated in any form or fashion. And that women of every age and whatever her role in State Government may be will be respected and treated with nothing less than in a professional manner.

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

Finally, I want to commend the women who courageously shared their stories that got us to this point. It's a vivid reminder that while we are those that have been elected to office, this is in fact, a representative government. And when voices are raised, as they have been in the Me Too campaign, as public servants, we are to listen and include those voices into the problem solving process. We must ensure that we send a clear message that their voices, the people that we represent, matter. And I say today, your voices have mattered and this change is a result of that. I thank the Resolution's Chief Sponsor for her leadership. And I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Martwick."

Martwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Resolution. I rise in support of this Resolution. And as this has developed, this awareness of what has been going on here in the Capitol, I'm reminded of the beginning of my career as an attorney when I worked in the State's Attorneys Office in domestic violence, and we, as prosecutors, tried to focus on our victims of domestic violence. A troubling trend that we saw was that while we could address the victims that came to court, there were so many that because of the nature of the crime, never wound up in the justice system. Could never have that justice, because they were too intimated or too afraid to come forward. And I see that parallel with sexual harassment, as much as I... I... I feel inspired by those who have the courage to come forward and bring this attention to light. I think about the numerous people who were victims of this sexual harassment because of the culture of what went on here in Springfield. Victims whose experiences will never be addressed, and so

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

going forward I feel that this Resolution, while often a Resolution doesn't carry the weight of a law, this Resolution is perhaps maybe one of the most important things that we do going forward. As we establish task force, and we establish new rules and regulations, the only way that we will be able to address those victims who didn't have the courage to come forward or who felt intimidated or felt that they could not come forward is to change the culture of sexual harassment here in Springfield. So, I rise in support of this. I think this is very important. And I thank the Sponsor. And I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Feigenholtz to close."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you for those eloquent remarks. You've pretty much said it all. So, today, people who had the courage to open their voice... to raise their voice, and share their stories should know that they have a voice now. That they are not invisible. I know that there has been a great deal of tension and discomfort around here in the last two weeks. I want to be clear that I am not apologizing for that. I'm sorry for the victims, and I... I too think that we can write as many laws as we want, but until we become mindful humans respecting each other with a commitment to changing the culture, we got nothing. So, let's move forward on this task force and get some work done and pass this Resolution. I appreciate an 'aye' vote."

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

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the Resolution is adopted. On Supplemental Calendar #2, under the Order of Concurrence appears House Bill 137, Mr. Turner."

Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I move that the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 137. The Bill allows the Legislative Inspector General to initiate investigations beyond the current one year limitation. As many of you know, under current law, an Inspector General may not initiate an investigation more than one year after the most recent act of the alleged violation. This would allow for the time period of December 1, 2014 through November 3, 2017 for the current Special... Special Legislative Inspector General Authority to review any allegation submitted to the Office of the Legislature Inspector General or the Legislative Ethics Commission. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wehrli."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Wehrli: "So once again, thank you, Leader Turner for bringing this forward. This is a necessary step in taking the first step in cleaning up State Government from an ethical standpoint. But I have a couple of technical questions for you. Does this only address the complaints that were filed?"

Turner: "Yes, so the answer to your question is, yes. It would...
was specifically deal with the complaints that were filed
during December 1, 2014 through November 3, 2017 when we
didn't have a current... an Inspector General in place to hear
them."

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

- Wehrli: "So... so, that's good, and I will support this Bill for that reason alone. However, the office was vacant for quite some time. That has a chilling effect on anyone that may wanted to have stepped forward, seeing that there's no... there's no Legislative Inspector General. So, they may not have filed a complaint. And so we're basically telling them that those complaints aren't valid, we're going to have to have the measure... the actual action of filing a complaint. So, any other complaint that people may want to bring forward, unless it's been within the past year, this Bill will not capture those complaints?"
- Turner: "I hesitate to say anyone's complaints are invalid. But these... this Bill right here specifically deals with the complaints that were filed between that time period of December 1, 2014 and November 3, 2017. And we don't want those to go unaddressed specifically because we didn't have an Inspector General. So we're going to give the current Special Inspector General the opportunity to go back and review those cases that were submitted."
- Wehrli: "Okay, thank you. To the Bill. This is a... this is a measure that it absolutely necessary, but once again we're limiting what we're going to allow to happen here. We need ethics reform across all areas, not just these 26 or 27 cases need to be heard. The office was vacant since 2014. People were not able to complain... or if they... I mean it had a chilling effect. They could complain, but they knew they it was going nowhere. So, that in itself has a problem. You know, we're not talking about patronage hiring schemes and things like that. So we're... we have the first step here, but there's many

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

more steps to go. I wish this legislation and the legislation introduced before were broader in reach. We need to go deeper into this than just this topic. So, I urge an 'aye' vote, but let's not lose energy behind the reforms that we desperately need in this state along the lines of ethics."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Turner to close."

Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And thank you, Representative, for your comments and those questions. I think it's important to point out, as a Member of the Ethics Commission that I was not aware of any names that were submitted. And was not made aware of any of the claims that were... were... of the 27 claims that we've heard about thus far. But I think that it is very important that we... that they get to... a chance to have their... their say, their claims heard, and addressed. We currently have a new Special Inspector General, former assistant U.S. Attorney Julie Porter, who was appointed as the interim Legislative Inspector General. And we're looking forward to addressing these concerns and changing the culture around the building. Thank you. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Concurrence 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 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 137. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Chair recognizes Mr. Wheeler. For what reason do you rise, Sir?

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

- Wheeler, B.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please let the record reflect that Representative Bennett is excused for the rest of today."
- Speaker Lang: "Thank you. We will do that, Sir. On page 8 of the Calendar, under the Order of Resolutions, appears House Resolution 687. Leader Currie."
- "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. of this Resolution will make sure that the conversation does continue. It will make sure that the actions we have taken today are not necessarily the end, not necessarily the be all and the end all of appropriate discussions about misbehaviors of a sexually harassing nature. This creates a task force, up to 20 Members from each side of the aisle. The task force mission will be first of all, to look at the legal and social ramifications of gender discrimination, of sexual harassment in both the private and the public sectors. The commission... the task force will be charged with assessing best practices in the private sector, in other states in the nation determining whether specific actions should be legally prohibited. Making sure that there are clear lines of approach for people who want to make complaints, make sure that those lines can be confidential if that's what the accuser requests. Making sure that the prohibitions against retaliation and would... would... be strong enough, and that whistleblower protections will be in place. I invite all the Members to participate, as I say room for 20 from each side of the aisle. Anyone who isn't identified as a Member, but wants to join the crew will be more than welcome. I suspect I will be chairing the task force. I look forward to working with each

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

and every Member, and with all the stakeholders inside and outside the Capitol on making sure that the Illinois response to sexual harassment in the world of politics and government is the strongest in the nation. I'd be happy to answer your questions. I would appreciate your 'yes' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen."

Breen: "Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Breen: "Representative, I... I... in reading the Resolution and looking at the makeup of the task force, I notice that the majority has a chairman, but that there is no cochairman for this task force in the same way with other commissions that are of such importance like this, it's my understanding that we will... not divide ourselves up by minority and majority, but will have equal chairpersons for the commissions?"

Currie: "Actually, we did the Education Funding Reform Task Force, which I also chaired, and there was no cochair, but there were equal numbers of Members from each side of the aisle. So, this is certainly not without precedent."

Breen: "And I noticed as well, it was pointed out by our staff, that the actions of the task force are approved by a majority of those voting on the question, instead of a majority of those actually appointed to the task force."

Currie: "And that was done purposely because it's possible for this to be a 40 Member task force. Getting all 40 Members in a single space, at a single time, in a single place, could prove extremely difficult. That's why we did a different... a different number to count as a majority, than we would otherwise have done."

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

Breen: "Because that... I... and certainly our normal practice, House Rule 13.5 is that we go by a majority of those appointed, not by a majority of those voting. And I guess, you'll forgive me if I'm just a little suspicious nowadays that you could have meetings called on short notice or in inconvenient locations, and all of the sudden votes are being taken, and Members haven't had what they believe to be sufficient notice or an ability to contribute in a meaningful way. And all of a sudden things could get adopted that... the Members, as a majority of those appointed, may not necessarily support. Particularly when there is no... there is a single chairman who will call the meeting as he or she sees fit."

Currie: "I just would say that remember task forces do not pass laws, they make recommendations, they make suggestions. I chaired this Education Funding Reform Task Force for the last two, maybe three years, and I think if you consult with the minority Members of that task force, there was no reason for the suspicion that you're suggesting should apply to this one today."

Breen: "I just... on this topic, we've been a little bit suspicious on this side of the aisle due to the inaction in other related areas on this topic. And so, those are the reasons for my questions and certainly my reasons for suspicion necessarily. I certainly support the task force. I hope that we will abide and run this in a bipartisan manner, because the single partisanship of this chamber on this issue has not served us well. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wehrli."

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

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Wehrli: "Leader Currie, is this task force only going to be talking about ethics reform when it comes to sexual harassment?"

Currie: "Well, it's talking... discrimination as well."

Wehrli: "Discrimination and sexual harassment?"

Currie: "And it's... talking about the private sector, as well as the public sector."

Wehrli: "Okay. So, we're not going to talking about any of the reforms suggested in the letter that I previously mentioned about maybe, patronage reform practices?"

Currie: "This is going to be about sexual harassment and gender discrimination."

Wehrli: "So, we're not going to talk about reporting ex parte communications as suggested by the Legislative Inspector General?"

Currie: "Okay. And in fact, when it comes to patronage and state practices I'm told that there has been a special master appointed to investigate that issue, we're waiting for the report from the special master."

Wehrli: "Well, I... I... the special master, I... I... that's the first I'm hearing of that, I'd love to learn more about that and go from there. So, we're not going to talk about uniform roles for casework or any other necessary reforms that the former Legislative Inspector General asked for? We're simply going to keep it to sexual harassment and... you mentioned one other one, what was that?

Currie: "Discrimination."

Wehrli: "Discrimination. Those are..."

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

Currie: "Gender discrimination."

Wehrli: "Those... I mean, we absolutely need to address that. But once again in true Springfield fashion... to the Bill or to the Resolution. We don't go far enough. We're still... we're... we're... we're responding to a crisis but we're not solving the underlying problem here. Unethical behavior, I'm sorry, is... runs rampant inside this State Capitol. It runs rampant. And we're going to address a small segment of it. We need to broaden our horizons here, and look at unethical behavior on all levels and all units of government. And this, this is a good first step, but once again it fails to complete the measure."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie to close."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Members of the House, let's continue the conversation. Perhaps this task force will end up making recommendations that would have application to other areas of ethics in State Government. I invite the Members to join, as Members of the task force, and those of you who don't make that cut, I hope that you'll join us in the discussions. I would appreciate your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "The Chair owes Rep... Representative Hammond an apology, I did not see your light. You're recognized, Representative."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Hammond: "Representative Currie, just very quickly, for purposes of clarification. Will the meetings of this task force be subject to a 48-hour notice?"

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

- Currie: "I... it is certainly the tradition in the task forces I've been involved in have had that kind of notice. But let me just check to see whether or not that is required under the authority of the Speaker to create task forces. There will be notice, but it is not required under our rules that it be specifically 48 hours. But the tendency has been to do at least a 48-hour notice. There's nothing to make any... no one on this floor should think that there's anything that this task force will want to be secretive about, nor is this the kind of issue in which some kind of partisanship is to be expected. I would say it should not even be tolerated."
- Hammond: "And, certainly in no way am I inferring that, Leader Currie, but under House Rule 13.5, it does allow for 48-hour notice for task force meetings. And I just wanted to be certain, particularly when we are going to have such a large membership of as much as 40 Members...."
- Currie: "Well, I would... if... if I am named the chair, I would commit to you that the notice would be more than three hours."

 Hammond: "Thank you very much."
- Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie has already closed. Those in favor of the Resolution will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Hoffman. Please take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and the Resolution is adopted. On page 6 of the Calendar, under the Order of Total Vetoes, there appears Senate Bill 1351. Mr. Guzzardi."
- Guzzardi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Body. Today I ask you to consider the override of the Governor's Total Veto

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

of Senate Bill 1351, the Student Loan Bill of Rights. And I want to start in light of the holiday coming up this week, talking about a group that's near and dear to all of us here in the chamber, about the Members of our armed services and our veterans. Many in the armed services, as you might expect, have federal student loans. But unfortunately, we've learned that the student loan servicing industry has been failing our service members. The Federal Government did an investigation into this issue, and they published a report called Overseas and Underserved. Here is what we've learned in that report. People who deploy overseas, they are often told that their loans will be deferred, as they ought to be, while they're serving our country overseas. But then we've heard so many stories of service members to find that their student loan servicing company, simply didn't do it. They didn't defer the loans. The loan was placed in default. And they've got creditors hounding their family, while they're serving overseas. The servicers failed them. We have service members who are disabled in combat, they're supposed to have their loans forgiven, through what is called Disability Discharge. They're finding that their servicers are reporting them to the credit agencies. Their credit is ruined for life. Again, the servicers are failing them. This is from that report I mentioned. Service members should not have to find themselves distracted from their military assignments by a mishandled payment, an unanswered deferment request, or a botched transfer. Their time should be spent focusing on their mission, with their limited precious free time communicating with their families and loved ones, not fixing

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

worrying about the servicer errors or additional repercussions of potential negative credit reporting. Now, obviously, it's not just members of our armed services that deal with these problems. There are millions of Illinoisans who hold over \$50 billion in student debt in this state. And that's why this Body passed Senate Bill 1351 in a bipartisan fashion earlier this year. It establishes some basic provisions, as a reminder for the Body, servicers have to offer all available repayment plans to their borrowers, not just the plan that gets you off the phone the fastest, but the best possible plan for borrowers. They have to explain the financial consequences of these plans, they have to respond to requests for assistance in a timely manner. We're empowering the Department of Financial and Professional Regulation to license these servicers, to make sure that they're in compliance and to fine them or revoke their license if they're not. And were creating an Ombudsman's Office, within the Office of the Attorney General, to compile complaints and disseminate information. This is a simple consumer protection Bill. Everyone supports this Bill who is involved in this process, teachers, students, veterans groups, even the AARP supports this Bill, because they see their children and grandchildren are facing this crisis. The only people who oppose this legislation, aside from the Governor's Office, are the servicers themselves. A group of billion dollar out-of-state corporations who've hire lobbyists to come here and fight this. So, I urge you colleagues to side with your constituents, with our service members, and our veterans, the students, and the borrowers

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

who've live in your district and join me in overriding the Governor's Veto. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Breen: "Thank you. Representative, I just want to make sure to establish the burdens placed on these servicers by the Bill. Just so that the Body knows. Because I know that your Bill is lengthy, it is a little bit complicated, I know it took several readings on my part to understand it. But what... what you're looking to do with these servicers is to require them to perform in depth counseling on financial options for borrowers. Right? I mean that's part of your... the main part of your Bill? Correct?"

Guzzardi: "I'll... I'll clarify in greater detail and maybe get to the crux of your question..."

Breen: "Right. And... and then you've got in there that you're going to be addressing account disputes, you've got an appeal process, you've made any violation of the Act a deceptive business practice. So that means, you get lawsuits with triple damages, attorney's fees. The servicers have to file fully audited financial statements with a secretary and all of those sorts of things. That... that is what you're... you're bringing forward in this Bill. Right?"

Guzzardi: "So, many of the provisions, particularly regarding the repayment plans of the Bill, these provisions apply specifically to servicers who have federal student loans. This thing called income-based repayment is sort of at the crux of what we're getting after here. We want these servicers

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

to provide the best possible option to their borrowers, and for federal student borrowers that's often what's called income-based repayment. So, your payments are adjusted down if you're making less money than you need to pay for. So..."

Breen: "And... and to be clear, these servicers don't own the loans, correct?"

Guzzardi: "Correct."

Breen: "Okay. They are also paid directly by the Federal Government a rate per month, per student. That's their compensation, isn't it?"

Guzzardi: "That is part of the way in which they're compensated.

Yes."

Breen: "Okay, because as I understand it, they have a sliding scale based on the... the status of the borrower in repayment?"

Guzzardi: "Yes, and I'm so glad that you brought that up, Representative Breen, because that speaks to the crux of one of the biggest problems we deal with. Which is that when students call their servicers, they are often sent to forbearance. They are told the best thing for you to do is put your loan in forbearance. Now, forbearance actually isn't a very good option for borrowers, even though it sounds good, you don't have to make your payments for a couple of years. But your loan is accruing interest all while it's in forbearance.

Breen: "Right."

Guzzardi: "Income-based repayment is a much better option for most borrowers. But for servicers, as you said, they're paid based on the status of the loans, and a loan that's in forbearance is considered to be in good status. So, it is to

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

their financial benefit to put students into forbearance, even though it's to the students' financial detriment. And that's precisely the kind of behavior we're hoping to address with this Bill."

Breen: "And let me just make sure… Mr. Speaker, yeah, thank you. Folks, I... I just… you really do need to hear… Representative, do you have student loans?"

Guzzardi: "I sure do, yes."

Breen: "And how many more years have you got?"

Guzzardi: "I just refinanced them, but I got a good eight or nine years left, yeah."

Breen: "Okay, I'm much older than you. I've got until I'm almost 50 years old to pay these things off. So this is an issue that is near and dear to my own heart, along with the hearts of many of our constituents."

Guzzardi: "And I'm sure many of our colleagues as well."

Breen: "But... so, very clearly, though, on your Bill, you see, you're saying you... you've got servicers that are putting people in forbearance, because the servicers get money when they're in forbearance. But the problem is, when I look at the amounts of money that these servicers are paid, when a student's in forbearance, the servicers only making a buck five a month. But if they get the student into an incomebased repayment plan, what you're trying to do, the servicer gets paid nearly three times as much, 2.85 a month."

Guzzardi: "Right."

Breen: "So already the current incentives are for the servicers to get these kids or these much older kids, like us, into income based repayment plans."

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

Guzzardi: "Well, here's the..."

Breen: "Already. Today."

Guzzardi: "Here's the trick, Representative, here's the trick. A couple things: one, the student... the volume of loans that the servicers receive from the Federal Government is based on the standing of the loans that they have, right? So, by putting more students into this forbearance, right, they are getting more loans in good standing, and therefore can get a higher volume of the total share of loans from the Federal Government. But more to the point, Representative. If student loan servicers are doing this already, if what they're saying is we're already doing the right thing then this legislation shouldn't affect them. If they are behaving in good stead toward our borrowers, then God bless them, and I thank them for their service to the people of Illinois. But if they're doing wrong by our borrowers, we need to hold them to a standard to do better."

Breen: "Now, but the problem is, also, you've exempted a broad swath of loan holders and servicers such as banks, public entities, institutions that service their own loans. So, for instance, Wells Fargo, whom has had a lot of issues lately, they're exempted from all of the requirements of your Bill. Discover, exempted from all of the requirements of your Bill. Sallie Mae, exempted from all of the requirements of your Bill. ISAC, again, I mean, collection agencies are exempted...

Guzzardi: "Can I... can I jump in here, Representative?"

Breen: "Sure."

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

Guzzardi: "So all of this business we're talking about, about income-based repayment, this pertains to federal student loans."

Breen: "Right."

Guzzardi: "And there are only 14 companies that service federal student loans. And they are all going to be required to meet the standards of this Bill. So, these exemptions that you're talking about, these aren't companies that service federal student loans. They may service private student loans, but they don't service these federal student loans, which were really trying to go after with the crux of this Bill."

Breen: "You have included private loans in your..."

Guzzardi: "There are some provisions in this Bill that refer to private loans."

Breen: "Right."

Guzzardi: "But again, what I'm trying... the crux of what we're trying to get at here, Representative, is this question of... this federal income-based repayment program that's simply not being offered to students who need it. That's really the heart and soul of this Bill, and that's what we're pushing for so strongly here."

Breen: "Yeah, okay. Representative, I think... I'm going to go to the Bill. I think we've done enough back and forth. I will... Ladies and Gentlemen, just to package this up for you. We have, the Representative said 14, I had heard 9, servicers that would be regulated by this particular Bill. These are companies that have a contract with the Federal Government, they are paid a monthly fee to keep current... to keep borrowers current. They make three times as much when they keep

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

borrowers current. They are subject to a raft of federal regulations, statutes, and RFPs, and contracts. The only reason that they... we have any jurisdiction over them is because the Federal Government happened to assign them people, who either live in Illinois or moved to Illinois. Our IDFPR is not qualified to regulate this industry. They don't want this Bill. It will cost them extra money that we don't have. The servicers, themselves, already have contracts that they are abiding by. They have standards under the Federal Government. They are given fewer loans, the more students that are not current and aren't paying. In other words, the financial incentives for the servicing companies is to get you paying your loans. And there was another thing, I had someone do an analysis for me. You know, the average loan right now, the new loans, are about ten years. When you get folks on the income-based repayment plan, the one that Representative Guzzardi wants everyone to get on, that means the student stays current for longer. So, if you get on the income-contingent repayment plan, your ten-year loan gets paid off over 16 years. The servicer makes more money under the current incentive plan. So, they make their \$2.85 instead of the 40 cents they make on someone in default. Ladies and Gentlemen, it is bad policy, and it's bad practice for those of us... for us in Illinois to impose additional regulations on these folks that may cause servicers to throw up their hands and say, we won't service loans in Illinois anymore, we just don't want the hassle. That's apart from the fact it may be a violation of the commerce clause... the Contracts Clause of the U.S. Constitution. And it's also something that is

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

absolutely unnecessary in terms of these servicers. There's some provisions of the Bill that are just fine, but this Bill itself does so much to these companies. It weighs them down so heavily that it does no good. It will cause servicers to leave Illinois or to demand more money to service the loans in Illinois. And that will not help anyone. That will not help us repay our loans. It will not help us both on the state level or the federal level. Ladies and Gentlemen, I understand we've had a lot of very important topics to deal with today. This is a much smaller topic than some of those, but for those of us who have student loans and are dealing with these folks and need access to good servicers, this Bill hurts people. It harms folks. And it needs to be defeated today. Let's go back to the drawing board. Let's do it in a way, let's put the Ombudsman in place at the Attorney General's Office, but we can do that without absolutely devastating the loan servicing companies that deal with these loans in the State of Illinois. I would respectfully and vigorously urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Ladies and Gentlemen, the Chair indulged Mr. Breen with I think 10 or 12 minutes. We're going to a two-minute timer. There are eight folks who still wish to speak. The first is Representative Fine."

Fine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. In this House we're always talking about job creation. And passing this legislation is also an investment in small business. Small business is the life blood of the economy and graduates should be using their educations to bring innovations to Illinois' economy. Instead, they're saddled with debt. Research from the Philadelphia Federal Reserve and Young Invincibles has

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

found that student loan debt is hindering the ability to start small businesses. The Student Loan Bill of Rights helps ensure student loans services give borrowers the tools to pay down their debt and use the money to help build the economy and create new jobs. With this legislation we'll really be giving a leg up to our bright, intelligent, new college graduates who need to use their money to start business and invest in themselves and the future of our state. Thank you for bringing this legislation forward."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wheeler."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Wheeler, K.: "Representative."

Guzzardi: "Representative."

Wheeler, K.: "I want to thank you for taking a shot at an important issue here. I appreciate the..."

Guzzardi: "The previous leader called it a small issue. I appreciate your acknowledgement of importance of this subject."

Wheeler, K.: "No, no, I... it's an important subject. I... I'm not disputing that at all. I... I, however... my concern is that this is... well intentioned, slightly misplaced. Here's why. The student loan complaints that I'm getting, that I hear about, that my research shows, aren't regarding servicing errors, so much as they are the fact that they're like, hey, this is a longer loan than I expected it to be, or the terms are... are going to hurt me more than I thought. Maybe the interest rate is higher than I expected it to be or my actual repayment plan is going to impact my future life more than I thought it

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

was going to when I signed on for this. So, and I think it was in the Governor's veto message even, wouldn't this effort be better placed so we don't have the debt in the first place? I mean, that's really, I think well where we want to get to, to really help these young people and now, our age and older that..."

Guzzardi: "Sure."

Wheeler, K.: "...are going through this crisis."

Guzzardi: "Sure."

Wheeler, K.: "Do you agree with that?"

Guzzardi: "I agree wholeheartedly with that and I look forward...

I've heard that concern from many Members on your side of the aisle, and I look forward to working with you all on addressing the issue of college affordability here in Illinois. As you know, that's an issue that's near and dear to my heart. I sponsored legislation for free college tuition at our public colleges and universities here in Illinois. I hope we can work together. Clearly, affordability is an important issue to Members of your side of the aisle as it is to ours. And I hope we can work on that issue in a bipartisan way. But I will also point out that the problems with servicers are very real. And that we have listened... the Attorney General's Office has listened to phone calls between students and their servicers...."

Wheeler, K.: "I'm going to go to Bill real guick, Will..."

Guzzardi: "Oh, I know you got time. I understand."

Wheeler, K.: "Because I've got 15 seconds left, I apologize."

Guzzardi: "No, go ahead."

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

Wheeler, K.: "But, Ladies and Gentlemen, I just want to remind you. While as well intentioned as my colleague has put forth legislation, I just don't think it hits the mark, we're not going to have the impact we all hope for. In this case, I would urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Olsen: "All right. Representative Guzzardi, would you say that college affordability is an increasing issue for college students across the United States?"

Guzzardi: "I would very much. Yes."

Olsen: "And would you say that the amount of college debt that students are leaving with has increased over the past years?"

Guzzardi: "Dramatically so. Estimated to be around \$50 billion of student debt here in the State of Illinois alone."

Olsen: "And is it part of the concern of this Bill that when students are dealing with servicers that those servicers are not transparent enough to those students and to those customers?"

Guzzardi: "Unfortunately, we've heard that concern a lot, yeah, from servicers and from borrowers. Yeah."

Olsen: "And I think that... that's fundamentally the crux of this Bill. And that's why I'm supporting this Bill. This is a Bill that deals with transparency to students. And students are increased... facing more debt, they're facing a lot of concerns, and I think it's very, very critically important that they serve... that servicers are transparent to students. That they're transparent to these customers. That's fundamental to

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

the college experience to ensure that people can get the education that they need for success in today's workforce, while doing it in a way that is full disclosure. That's fundamental. We're talking here about disclosure. So, I'd urge an 'aye' vote on this Bill. Thank you."

Guzzardi: "Thank you."

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

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I initially voted 'no' on this Bill for the reason that was mentioned by my colleague on this side that performing loans get the... the bigger reimbursements from the... to these servicer. But I did a little bit of digging after I received a lot of calls about the matter, and let me tell you what I found out. Like so much that comes out of the Federal Government, the Federal Student Loan Repayment Programs are complicated. As an example, is the loan a direct loan or is it a part of the federal family education loan program? It makes a difference. If you have multiple loans, are you eligible for loan consolidation? It makes a difference. There are as many as nine or ten different categories of repayment plans. Standard, graduated, extended with consolidation, extended without consolidation, pay-as-you earn, revised payas-you earn, income-based, income-contingent, incomesensitive. These are all categories that are available. Now I ask you, do businesses take the time to explain these categories to their borrowers? And it certainly appears that they do not. They want to get on the phone, they want to get off as quickly as possible, and push them into one category. You know, the AMVETS of Illinois came out with this statement,

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

among the most egregious problems caused by the poor handling of these servicers is denial of military deferments without explanations, verbal approvals that are never applied, denial of eligibility and the creation of obstacles to the discharge of loans due to a disability. They push them into forbearance, which means that they don't have to make payments, but the principle continues... excuse me, the interest continues, meaning the principle gets bigger and bigger and bigger. Making it even harder at the end to pay it. Look, I'm not big on... on government regulation. Mr. Speaker?

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

Harris, D.: "I'm just about to close. I'm not big on increased government bureaucracy, but there are times when the government has to step in to protect consumers, and I believe this is one of those times. And by the way, as sort of a coup de grâce or to add insult to injury, in the federal tax Bill that was just proposed, student loan interest which was deductible is no longer deductible if that Bill passes. So my colleagues, Senate Bill 1351, is a good consumer protection Bill. And I urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wehrli."

Wehrli: "I would like to yield my time to General Harris."

Speaker Lang: "I think General Harris closed. Representative Mussman for two minutes."

Mussman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members of the House. I actually just wanted to take an opportunity because we've been spending so much time this Session, and today in particular, about... talking about women's issues, to remind us that for some time now there had been more women on institutions of higher

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

education campuses than men. And that means that women disproportionately carry the weight of the student loan burden. I will also remind us that there's still a gender equity pay gap, which means women are slower to pay back their loans because of that. Also, I want to remind you that women, especially women of color, have difficulty paying back these loans. Thirty-four percent of all women, but 57 percent of African-American women in particular, have trouble just meeting their basic life expenses, much less meeting the terms of these loans. The Student Bill of Rights provides help to manage this high burden, and I sincerely and hope we all vote for this."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Moeller for two minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Moeller: "Representative, is there any conflict between this legislation and Federal Law?"

Guzzardi: "No. Let me clarify for the purpose of legislative intent. This Bill does not conflict with the Higher Education Act or any of its implementing regulations. Opponents have not shown any evidence why servicers cannot comply with this law and Federal Law simultaneously. In fact, servicers are required by contract of... to follow State Law. In response to the inquiry from the State Regulator in 2016, the Department of Education indicated that it is not a conflict with Federal Law for student loan servicers to be licensed by states."

Moeller: "Okay, thank you. To the Bill. I support this effort to ensure that students are able to take advantage of the best terms that are available to them. We all know that student

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

debt is a huge problem both throughout our country and particularly here in Illinois. And we need to take our steps to ameliorate that... that problem. As a prior Legislator mentioned, it's affecting not only the quality of life of the students who take out these loans, but it's also affecting our overall economy. And I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Hammond for two minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Hammond: "Representative Guzzardi, just... I would start out by saying, I have every intention of supporting your Bill. But I do have a question, and I think it's one that ISAC shares as well. That is, if... if a service provider is determined by IDFPR to be in violation and their license is revoked, what happens to the Illinois students' whose loans are administered through this particular provider?"

Guzzardi: "Well, there will be plenty of other servicers in the state operating, and student loans are often transferred among and between servicers as a matter of due course. But I also want to point out that we don't have any intention that these licenses are going to get stripped away from anyone. So, the Attorney General's Office regulates mortgage loan providers in the similar way. They have 250 whom they regulate, and they've only ever even threated to revoke the license of these providers one time, and they very quickly went to court and negotiated an agreement so they didn't have to do that. We want to have this as a tool in our tool belt to make sure we have a way to hold these guys accountable, but we don't intend for it ever to come to that."

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

Hammond: "And... and I appreciate that. I just moving forward... I...

I think we need to be very mindful of a 'what if' scenario.

And so, 'what if' we would get into this type of a situation."

Guzzardi: "Sure."

Hammond: "We need to have some kind of an assurances for... and...
and I'm sure that involves looking at other states to see
what actions they have taken in that realm. But to be certain
that their loans are not transferred without their knowledge,
their loans are not just held with that company."

Guzzardi: "Right."

Hammond: "So... that's my only concern, but I appreciate that."

Guzzardi: "No, I think it's very fair. And I think that'll be a great question for the Ombudsman to think about as they enter into that new role."

Hammond: "Thank you, Representative."

Guzzardi: "Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Fortner: "I want to follow up on the previous speaker's question, because I'm still uncomfortable with response of the... the situation, which when we write laws we have to make sure that we haven't built in strange or unintended consequences. And let me put out a hypothetical situation. So, company X is servicing a loan, they are licensed by the state, they're a federally recognized. They're being supported by payments from the Federal Government for the loans they service. They are found to be in violation of their license, and let's say there is no settlement, and the only recourse is for the

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

department to then take back that license, to revoke the license. They have that power under this Bill. The loan... let's assume that company X remains in compliance with Federal Law, they've only had a problem with State Law. What now happens to that loan? I understand there are other providers, but the Federal Government is still going to recognize them as the servicer of that loan, yet, they won't have license to service that student's loan. Where does the student send their check?"

Guzzardi: "Well, first of all, I want to reiterate that there are a number of other avenues to remedy these kinds of problems, rather than just straight up revoking people's licenses."

Fortner: "I'm assuming that, oh, we've exhausted those."

Guzzardi: "Right."

Fortner: "Because we have to consider. that since we're putting that penalty...

Guzzardi: "So sure... sure..."

Fortner: "...as an option, we have to consider that that actually happens?"

Guzzardi: "In this most extreme case that you're describing, I suspect that the Student Loan Ombudsman at the Attorney General's Office, and perhaps even the Attorney General him or herself, would of..."

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

Fortner: "Thank you."

Guzzardi: "Okay."

Fortner: "I... I think... I think this is a little deeper problem than is being suggested. And we do put these penalties in the Act, and I think we have to be cognizant that if we're setting

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

things up that even though it doesn't conflict on it's face, it may conflict in practice. Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Reick: "Will, do you know of any other states that have similar legislation? Or has this legislation been tried in other states? Do you know anything about that?

Guzzardi: "Yeah, we actually modeled this off of some provisions that were passed recently in Connecticut. They were the first state to take this issue on, and we're hoping to follow in their footsteps."

Reick: "How long ago was that, Will?"

Guzzardi: "I believe it was in 2016, if I'm not mistaken, it was last year."

Reick: "Have we had any kind of... do we have any kind of results as to what... you know, how well that's being administered?"

Guzzardi: "So, it's pretty new yet. But I'll tell you that there are plenty of student borrowers in Connecticut who are still making their payments, and student loans servicers that are still servicing those loans."

Reick: "Thank you."

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

Costello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Like General Harris earlier mentioned, I myself am extremely concerned about how this affects our active duty military. Many times they're unaware of their best payment options while they're deployed. Student loan services should be properly managing service member's accounts. They should be informing them of

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

their best options, and they should make sure that their payments are properly applied. These are all things that this Bill would accomplish to ensure the protection of our military members while they're deployed. Thank you. And I recommend and 'aye' vote."

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

Mitchell, C.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll go straight to the Bill. We have differences of opinion in this chamber and I know we just had one in right-to-work, and we'll probably have another one soon. But I thought surely we could all get together on the student loan debt crisis, because we all either have loans ourselves or children who have them. This isn't a Bill that lowers interest rates or consolidates loans or forces purchasers to do better by our students. It merely says that there's a set of standards we'd have in the State of Illinois to model for the nation what it means to put students first and make sure they have clarity on what it is they're getting when enter into a student loan. A loan, which by the way is now necessary for their education. And their education which is necessary for their livelihood in a way that it didn't used to be for our grandparents' generation. A Gentleman on the other side of the aisle said, you know, well, this doesn't include Wells Fargo or J.P. Morgan, Chase, or any of these large banks, as if the folks on the Republican side of the aisle would vote to do anything to regulate Wells Fargo or any of the large banks. This is a Bill that the Sponsor deserves tremendous credit for that the Attorney General deserves tremendous credit for. It is a commonsense piece of legislation to make Illinois a leader in ensuring

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

students' safety. And it merits an 'aye' vote. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Guzzardi to close."

Guzzardi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Members of the Body. I want to also thank the Attorney General's Office, the Attorney General herself, and her terrific team for their diligent work on this issue. The question before us today is one of those classic cases of whose side are we on. You know, there are millions of people in this state with student loans who borrowed money to try to advance themselves to get an education like we encourage people to do every single day. To borrow that money so that they can pay for college and then get a career, so they can pay that loan off. And they're are simply trying to pay that loan off in a way that they can afford. This is a Bill to protect sheep and the only people opposed to it are the wolves. The student loan servicers who are preying on our students and profiting at their expense. I want to close, we talked a lot about veterans today, again Veteran's Day is Friday, and I want to close with a quote from Keith Wetherell, the Executive Director of AMVETS of Illinois about this Bill. He said, 'The men and women serving this country, and their families, should not have to face unnecessary stress of missed student loan payments because of the failure of student loan servicers to do their job. I urge Members of the Illinois House of Representatives to override the Governor's Veto and ensure that student loan servicers do their duty, just like our men and women in uniform do theirs.' Ladies and Gentlemen, today let us do our duty for our constituents, for the students and families in your district

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

and mine. Please vote 'aye'. And let's override this veto. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Guzzardi moves that the leg... the House override the Total Veto of the Governor on Senate Bill 1351. This 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? Please record yourselves. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 98 voting 'yes', 16 voting 'no', and the Gentleman's Motion prevails. And the House overrides the Governor's Total Veto on Senate Bill 1351. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Representative Chapa LaVia, for what reason do you rise?"

Chapa LaVia: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Please procced."

Chapa LaVia: "I'd like to welcome back one of our infamous Members here, Mr. Jack Franks, our County Chairman. If we could all... we'll send him back, okay. Say hi to him."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome. Weren't you the President of the Farmer's caucus? Representative Willis is recognized."

Willis: "Thank you. For a point of personal privilege, please." Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Willis: "As a Member of the Diabetes Caucus, I'd like to draw to the Body's attention, tomorrow the Illinois Department of Public Health will be having a display promoting Diabetes Awareness here in the Capitol in the south hall. It'll be near the LRB. On display... they will be there from 8:30 until 3:30 with information packs about the impact of diabetes on

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

Illinois available to you. Also, you'll be able to pick a Diabetes Awareness ribbon and take a prediabetes risk assessment test. The month of November is Diabetes Awareness Month. I urge all of you to look at this epidemic and help us put it under control. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Butler."

Butler: "A point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Proceed, Sir."

Butler: "First of all, I think it was the Gentlemen Farmer Caucus for our former Member. I would just like to say, on behalf of the... I believe half dozen Members we have in this Body who are graduates of Eastern Illinois University, the 7 thousand-plus students of Eastern Illinois University, and the thousands and thousands of graduates, what a great day last Friday was when the flagship university made their way down Route 130 and had a little basketball game. And the EIU Panthers beat the mighty Fighting Illini 80 to 67. So, it's the first time the Fighting Illini have made their way to Charleston. I don't believe they're coming back anytime soon. Go Panthers."

Speaker Lang: "Page 4 of the Calendar. Senate Bills-Second Reading. Senate Bill 695, Mr. Slaughter. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 695, a Bill for an Act concerning law enforcement. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Slaughter."

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

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

Slaughter: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment actually becomes the Bill. Initially, this Bill put forth a variety of provisions to reform the Cook Country Sherriff's Merit Board. The Amendment significantly narrows the focus and scope of the Bill, in that it does not consider any of the previous changes and reforms, but it does focus on the aspect of how appointments are made to this board. The Bill is needed to address a current issue, so that the board can function."

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

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

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 695, a Bill for an Act concerning law enforcement. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Slaughter, did you just explain the Bill?" Slaughter: "Kind of."

Speaker Lang: "Do you have more? Go ahead. You may go."

Slaughter: "All right. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Again, this Bill is regarding the Cook County Sheriff's Merit Board. This board is very important to the public safety of Cook County, in that it's responsible for hiring and firing all sheriff's officers, as well as making decisions on discipline and promotion. Recently, there was a court ruling that brought to light ambiguous language in current statute that ultimately supported the claim that Cook County had been erroneously making appointments to this board. Due to this recent court decision and the current language in statute, this board is

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

currently unable to make the necessary appointments it needs to function. Senate Bill 695 provides much needed clarification to remedy the flawed, defective language regarding appointments and provides Cook County the legislative fix it needs to properly be established in so that it can effectively do its work. I urge a 'yes' vote.

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

Breen: "Please excuse Representative Keith Wheeler for the remainder of the day."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Sir. Are you speaking to this Bill?"

Breen: "I'll just... if, the Sponsor will yield, I'll briefly address the Bill?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Breen: "Thank you. Representative, just to be clear, the current board has nine members, and we had an issue with the courts because the… apparently the sheriff was held not to be able to appoint a member, even though there was an open spot. And you've changed the composition of the board and also… to both change the composition of the board and put in place certain requirements for the members. What's the reason for the change in size of the board and the change in the membership type?"

Slaughter: "Thank you, Representative. And this Bill does not change the number of members on the board. It will be seven members... a minimum of seven members on the board, and then Cook County can appoint an additional two members to the board, making it nine."

Breen: "Okay. So there are... 'cause there are currently nine?" Slaughter: "No."

Breen: "There are not currently nine? So how many..."

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

Slaughter: "They can five... they can... they can currently have up to nine members."

Breen: "But your Bill will do how many members?"

Slaughter: "Up to nine."

Breen: "But five of them have requirements for their... how many have requirements for who they are, the requirements of job type and all of that?"

Slaughter: "None, Representative. None."

Breen: "None at all? So the sheriff appoints or the board appoints?"

Slaughter: "The sheriff does."

Breen: "Okay. With the approval of the board?"

Slaughter: "As in currently law, yes, with approval of the board."

Breen: "Fair enough. Are there any opponents that you've heard of or know... know of at this time?"

Slaughter: "I know of no opponents."

Breen: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Slaughter to close."

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

'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Crespo. Please take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1451, Representative Kelly Burke. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1451, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Kelly Burke."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Burke on the Amendment."

Burke, K.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1451, House Amendment 2 is the Small Cell Wireless Act that we had taken up in the spring and which did not ... which was put on Postponed Consideration. And since that time there've been... there's been extensive negotiation between the wireless industry and the units of local government, which has resulted in a Bill that has significantly improved and brought on... or taken away the opposition of many of the former opponents. There are several... there are many changes in the Bill, almost 30 changes, but the most significant ones deal with changes to the Bill that would enhance... or would address the public safety concerns of the municipalities, a change in the fees that are charged, which resulted in increased fees being paid to the municipalities for the placement... or the collocation of these small cell facilities in poles and the right of way. Some additional changes regarding the aesthetics and the placement of the devices in areas like historic districts and also a grandfathering provision for contracts that are already in place. I ask for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Fortner, do you wish to talk on the Amendment, or wait until Third Reading?"

Fortner: "Third Reading."

Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. 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."

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1451, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Burke, have you described the Bill?"

Burke, K.: "I've described the Bill, but I would like to just... elaborate on some of the negotiations that took place. I'd like to thank Representative Mike Fortner Representative Fred Crespo, who were very active in the negotiations, attended many of the meetings, and offered a lot of constructive comments, and helped us produce a better Bill. I'd also like to thank the local government advocates who participated in good faith and the resulting Bill moved many of those advocates from opposing the Bill back in the spring to a neutral position today. I'd like to also thank Representative Peter Breen for his leadership on this issue. And just to let the Body know that over the course of October... the end of September and October, we had over 25 hours of negotiation between the different groups and the Legislators. And then there were many, many hours of private back and forth as Amendments were drafted... or ... or changes to the Bill were drafted. So, this is a jobs Bill. This is the wireless industry recognizing that consumers are demanding better and quicker service, and they're trying to put their technology in places where it will enable that better and quicker service. So, this is something consumers demand. I think the resulting Bill is a balance between the interests of local government and the needs of consumers and the wireless companies trying to provide what their consumers want. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

- Breen: "Representative, thank you for your work on this Bill. I just want to clarify a few things. We're talking about... because some folks have worried about the need for a... a larger Bill here. I mean, we're talking about thousands if not tens of thousands small cell antennas that need to go up across this state in order for us to be able to have a good 4G network and into a 5G network. Isn't that correct?"
- Burke, K.: "That's correct. These devices are the technology that will enable a build out of the 4G and then the… the advent of the 5G."
- Breen: "And then just to be clear, the municipalities retain control over the final issuance of permits. They just have to do so in accord with their ordinances."
- Burke, K.: "That's correct. And the negotiations, the back and forth, resulted in a lot of changes that while it introduces a uniform process for... for municipalities and counties in the permitting process, it does also provide a significant amount of leeway for those counties and where the... where the devices are placed."
- Breen: "Thank you. And to the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, this Bill is protective of your constituents, your residents who want this service. It's also protective of smaller municipalities that can't drive as hard a bargain with these wireless companies. There are strong protections here. These drawings have to be... certified by structural engineers. Those municipalities still get their taxes, they're getting a tax

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

that one percent tax from Wireless Telecom. They keep that money, and they get an extra \$350 per antenna. And there could be five or ten antennas going up at once. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a wonderful compromise. It is a good..."

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

Breen: "It is a good balanced protective Bill. Protects your consumers. Protects municipalities. And it does protect legitimate business interests that want to put a lot of jobs, a lot of investment in our state, give them some certainty and uniformity in the standards across the state. Please vote 'yes'."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Fortner: "Representative, I want to thank you for bringing this Amendment forward, and even more so for really opening the doors after our debate that led to a Postponed Consideration in May. One of the things that I think stands out through this is how much we have learned about the technology that's on its way, 5G.

Burke, K.: "Yes."

Fortner: "As I understand it, even may the people who oppose it, particularly in local government, were still supportive and understand this is the technology that we need to get in Illinois eventually. Isn't that right?"

Burke, K.: "That's... that's correct. And I think that the common refrain we heard is that people want this technology to come to their area."

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

Fortner: "And this is a technology that goes through the wire and to increase the bandwidth, you have to have a lot of placements. It's not like the tall towers, where I can put them miles apart. It's not like underground cable where I know exactly which homes it's going to serve specifically. So we need to make sure that there is good, uniform coverage. Isn't that also correct?"

Burke, K.: "That's correct."

Fortner: "So, one of the things that I think was a challenge was understanding how do we bring this technology in, understanding it has to be in high density and yet make sure that municipalities are reasonably and fairly compensated. I sat through many of those hours of meetings that the Sponsor described, and what I can say is both sides bargained fairly. They bargained hard. And I think they bargained in good faith to reach an agreement. And I know that it doesn't reach what everyone would like to see, but that's often the case in a well negotiated arrangement, which I think this Amendment is. This is a tough issue. Its technology that we need to bring to Illinois and I would..."

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

Fortner: "...and I would strongly urge the Body to consider this and give us an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Chapa LaVia for two minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Chapa LaVia: "I'd like to thank Representative Kelly Burke for her hard work on the Bill, but I still have quite a few questions and hopefully I'll do it very quickly. Aurora spent

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

- over two years and millions of dollars developing its wireless ordinance. Why was Chicago exempt from the Bill, but other communities that have wireless ordinance, such as Aurora, were not granted an exemption and a discussion of other possible exemptions? And why were they taken off the table?"
- Burke, K.: "So, to my knowledge, Representative, the only entity that is exempted from this is the City of Chicago. That was a very hard fought battle in the Senate. It doesn't appear that there is an avenue for putting the City of Chicago back in it. Every other community in this state is going to be part of this. Every... every community, every county will be included in this ordinance except one."
- Chapa LaVia: "Which goes to the next one. Why was the preexemption of Home Rule authority in the Bill taken off the table in negotiations?"
- Burke, K.: "So, it's not a preemption of Home Rule authority. The state is exercising concurrent regulation over this area and under the Home Rule statute it is not a preemption of Home Rule and thus only requires 60 votes."
- Chapa LaVia: "And who would pay the additional electricity costs that will be incurred with the small cell wireless antennas on poles? Who will be paying for that?"
- Burke, K.: "I do not know the answer to that, but I can get back to you. I have no idea if that's a large amount or not."
- Chapa LaVia: "There will be very likely then be an increase in electricity cost to cities under this Bill. Will the provider be liable for 100 percent of this cost?"
- Burke, K.: "I'm sorry. What did you say?"
- Chapa LaVia: "Will the provider be..."

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

Speaker Lang: "Please being your remarks to a close, Representative."

Chapa LaVia: "Thank you, Sir. Will the provider be liable for 100 percent of this cost?"

Burke, K.: "I... I didn't hear which cost you were referring to?"

Chapa LaVia: "The cost as far as the wireless antennas and the poles."

Burke, K.: "Yes, they will be paying..."

Chapa LaVia: "So, the citizens will not be on the hook of paying any of these things? It will all be the provider?"

Burke, K.: "No."

Chapa LaVia: "Thank you."

Burke, K.: "And they're paying a permit fee and a yearly rental fee."

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

Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. And to the Bill. Let me talk briefly about the process. When this Bill came before us, after it left the Senate, it was brought to our attention that the Senate Sponsor decided to ignore some of the council of governments including the Northwest Municipal Conference. Just for the record, Northwest Municipal Conference represents 1.3 million residents, 44 towns, 300 square miles which include Cook, DuPage, Kane, and McHenry counties. Since then, I... I... have to congratulate the new Sponsor. 'Cause I'm pretty sure she feels like she spent 25-hour days, eight days a week and stayed through these negotiations. But I'll tell you, all sides came together. They dealt in good faith. And it definitely resulted in a better product than the one we got from the Senate. So, again, it is not a perfect Bill. But

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

we shouldn't let perfect get in the way of good. I would ask for your support. And again, congratulations to the Sponsor. She came in late in the game. And I also want to thank all the Members from all of these cogs and the providers for coming together, working together to put this product before us. So I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Flowers for two minutes."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Lady yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Flowers: "Representative, is Chicago exempt?"

Burke, K.: "Chicago is exempt from the permitting and application fee and the other requirements of this Bill, Representative. Chicago has its own ordinance and the companies are installing these small cells in Chicago, but under Chicago's scheme rather than under this statutory scheme."

Flowers: "Well, okay. So, Chicago has its own set of rules for this?"

Burke, K.: "Correct."

Flowers: "So, where will the 5G be placed? Will it be placed only on the north side or will it be placed all over the City of Chicago? Or will we have red-lining situations?"

Burke, K.: "I would... since Chicago itself is not in this Bill, Representative, I don't have all the details. I think that's something that the companies could maybe sit down with you and show you where their... their deployment is thus far and where they plan to deploy in the future. I just don't have that information since it really wasn't part of the negotiations."

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

- Flowers: "So, there is a possibility that the south side of the City of Chicago could be totally left out? And this 5G only placed on the north side?"
- Burke, K.: "I... I doubt that that will be the case. And you also have to remember that each... each wireless provider has their own network. So there is numerous providers of service in Chicago. So, they're all going to have different plans. And I would... I... I will talk to them after and ask them to sit down with you and give you an idea of what the roll out for Chicago is. I'm just not..."

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

Flowers: "Is there… my last question. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Is there any protection in regards to red lining? Is there any protection for the people on the south and north sides of Chicago to make sure?"

Burke, K.: "Again, since this Bill did... exempted the City of Chicago that is something that is going to have to be dealt with separately."

Flowers: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Wallace for two minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Wallace: "Thank you for bringing this legislation. But I do need to express the concerns of Rock... the City of Rockford and some of the other municipalities in northwestern Illinois. Some of the concerns are, who will be responsible for the maintenance of any of the equipment that's installed? How does that work with this Bill?"

Burke, K.: "It would be the wireless company that installs it."

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

Wallace: "Okay. But if something breaks, is it the wireless company..."

Burke, K.: "Yes."

Wallace: "...or is it the municipality?"

Burke, K.: "It's the wireless companies."

Wallace: "Okay. And then if there's a... if there has to be a project that is located near where these small cells are located, say its road construction or some other form of infrastructure, who takes care of the removal or temporary move of the cell to get that infrastructure project done?"

Burke, K.: "So, the cells are mounted on poles. So, I don't think road constitution, unless they were actually physically removing the... the, let's say it's put on a light post, unless they were actually, the road construction project involved the removal of the post, I don't know that the small cell facility would have to be affected at all by the road project."

Wallace: "So let's assume, though, that that's the case. Then who pays for the removal of that post?"

Burke, K.: "Well if they're removing the… if the… let's say it's a street light. So if the street light is being removed for purposes of the construction, the small cell box is affixed to the pole. So, when they take the pole down, the small cell would come down with it."

Wallace: "So, and then the final question is, in terms of the potential for increasing electricity to the city or to the municipality, who's responsible for that energy increase?"

Speaker Lang: "Please complete your remarks."

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

- Burke, K.: "I'm going to find out for that. I'm going to send a text. I don't know. This is the first time anyone has addressed that question to me. So, let me double check and I will try to find out before the end of debate for you."
- Wallace: "Okay. I hope so. It's become quite a concern. And this is a Bill that I would love to continue to support. However, I would just have to express the issues that cities like Rockford, Aurora, some of the suburban areas have expressed. Thank you, if you could get back to us on that."
- Burke, K.: "I did just... somebody upstairs is psychic and gave me the answer that the carriers pay for the electricity costs."

Wallace: "So the wireless carriers will pay for the increase?"

Burke, K.: "The wireless increase pay for the increase? And not..."

Wallace: "Not the municipality?"

Burke, K.: "That's what I'm being told."

Wallace: "Okay."

Burke, K.: "Well... why don't we have somebody visit with you..."

Wallace: "Yes."

Burke, K.: "After and clarify that for you?"

- Wallace: "Well, I would hope they would visit with me before I have to cast this vote. This is... this is important information for me to know."
- Burke, K.: "Well I'm being told that the carriers pay the electricity, but the specifics of that... we can... somebody can sit down with you on that."
- Wallace: "Okay. Thank you so much, Mr. Speaker, for the liberty.

 Thank you, Representative Burke."

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

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

Andersson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, we all say that we're in favor of local control, right? We all say that every day, except when we aren't. And this Bill would be an example of when some people apparently aren't. You have to understand, right now, today, these providers can negotiate and get into the right-of-way as long as they provide reasonable... not reasonable compensation, reasonable rules with regard to the municipalities. In fact, they have an absolute right to do it. The right-of-way is a public trust. So they're not going to get told no by the municipality, they're going to have reasonable rules and regulations imposed. And that's what had been going on until this process started. Until this process started, our communities were negotiating in good faith on a case-by-case basis, based on what mattered to their municipalities. Some of them cared about historic districts. Some of them cared about the fact that they are trying to improve their street scape and minimize the number of intrusions. In fact, the City of Elgin, which I am proud to represent, had a handshake deal. They had worked out a handshake deal of where they could put these in. You know what happened? The providers said, you know what, we're negotiating at the state level, we think we can get a better deal, we're out. So, they walked away from the table. This is not good faith negotiations. This is a bum's rush, and that's not appropriate. Now, understand when the Sponsor says there's the ability to have some control, its exceedingly minimal. To the point where if a municipality says, could you put it on this pole instead of that pole? Guess who gets to decide the answer to that? The applicant.

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

Not the city. It's inappropriate. This is overreach and doesn't need to be done. And in my last moment..."

Speaker Lang: "You may complete your remarks. I'll give you an extra moment."

Andersson: "Thank you. In my last moments, I would compare with the City of Chicago, which of course is exempt. We're being offered \$2 hundred a year in pole fee. The City of Chicago's pole fee, \$2,564.93 if it's a regular pole, and if it's a traffic control pole \$5,129.42. You tell me that this is a fair negotiation. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wehrli."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Wehrli: "Representative Burke, you said that the carrier will be responsible for paying the electric bill. Do you know at what rate that bill will be charged at? What rate the carriers will pay?"

Burke, K.: "I do not..."

Wehrli: "Okay."

Burke, K.: "...but I can find out."

Wehrli: "All right. Thank you. To the Bill. So, we've heard that Chicago is carved out. But what hasn't been said on the record, it needs to be said, is Lake County is opposed to this Bill. Cook County outside of Chicago is opposed to this Bill. McHenry County, who I believe the Chairman is here today, is opposed to this Bill. Kane County is opposed to this Bill. Kendall County is opposed to this Bill. Will County is opposed to this Bill. Inside of those areas, the Cities of Aurora opposed to

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

this Bill. The City of Elgin is opposed to this Bill. Naperville is opposed to this Bill. We heard some discussion earlier about geographical infill. So, I'm sorry to tell you, but if you live on the south side, you're probably not going to be a high priority to get this service, just as long... just as in a similar was as if you live in Sparta, Illinois you're probably not going to be a high priority to get this service. Why? Because that's not where the money is to be made by these corporations. We also heard that some of the language in this Bill will strike out preexisting agreements. The County of DuPage has one. This will null and void that agreement after two years. So at the end of the day, there's massive opposition to this Bill. Here we are on a Tuesday, the last week of Veto Session. We're going to come back in January. What's the rush? There is no hurry to get this done. The effective date of this Bill is June of next year. We can still come back in January and continue the hard work to remove the opposition to this Bill. Naperville has spent a lot of money investing in getting its utilities underground. This will fly in the face of that. Our... we own our own electric municipal electrical distribution system, we own our light poles, we decide what gets to put on there and this Bill will undermine that authority. It removes Home Rule authority. This is a bad Bill. It's not soup yet, it needs to come back after..."

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

Wehrli: "...it needs to come back after the new year. I urge a 'no'

vote."

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

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

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Skillicorn: "Representative, I hear a lot of talk about rightof-way. Do the people own the right-of-ways or are they the property of the municipalities?"

Burke, K.: "Its... it's for the benefit of the public."

Skillicorn: "And is this a great burden? I mean, is there going to be... how... how tall are these devices? Are they 100 feet tall? Are they just big devices that are going to sit on the right-of-way?"

Burke, K.: "No. These are actually devices that are going to be attached to utility poles, street lights, things of that nature. And there is a size maximum contained within the Bill."

Skillicorn: "And is it a requirement to dig up the right-of-way to install these?"

Burke, K.: "No."

Skillicorn: "So, to the Bill. We all talk about infrastructure. We all talk about keeping people in Illinois. We worry about millennials leaving Illinois. We need to have a solid 5G infrastructure here in Illinois to keep millennials here. To provide the technology that our citizens, our constituents want but also businesses need. And we can just grow and thrive with something like this. This is a small step. I would reiterate that the right-of-ways are not something to squabble over. They are the property of the people. The people want 5G. I urge support of this Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Burke to close."

Burke, K.: "If I may, Mr. Speaker, I do need to read some legislative intent before I close."

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

Speaker Lang: "Feel free."

Burke, K.: "House Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1451 addresses concerns regarding the impact of the Act on existing agreements regarding small cells on authority utility poles. The intent of these changes is to avoid interference with those existing agreements, balance the transition from existing attachment rates to rates consistent with the Act, and create a level playing field for all wireless carriers. First, all existing agreements in effect on the effective date of the Act, which would be June 1, 2018, remain in place without change, subject to termination provisions. Therefore, if 100 small cell collocations were on authority poles under an existing agreement on the effective date, those 100 collocations would remain on the contract rate for the term of the existing agreement. That can be found in Section 15H on page 24 of the Bill. Second, language was added that creates a two-year grandfather period. This means that collocations on authority poles, added by a carrier, with an existing agreement any time after the effective date of the Act until the end of the two year grandfather period would remain under the existing agreement without change, subject to termination provisions. Therefore, if 50 collocations on authority poles were added during the two-year grandfather period, and assuming the existing agreement was in effect, those 50 collocations would remain on the contract rates for the term of the existing agreement. Third, after the two-year period... after the two-year grandfather period, a carrier with an existing agreement could obtain collocations on authority poles pursuant to the authority's ordinance or pole

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

attachment agreement that implements the Act, by notifying the authority that opts to accept those rates, terms, and conditions consistent with the Act. This is found in Section 15 I4E, on pages 28 and 29. I think this is a good Bill. I think it is... there were some hard fought advancements made by the local government group. And there were... there are many local government groups that are neutral on this Bill. And there are many supporters in committee: we had 49 proponents, 10 no position, and while we did have opponents, those have become fewer and fewer. So, this is a good Bill. It's a jobs Bill. It brings investment in the future to Illinois. It's a balance between the needs of a municipality to manage what goes on in their rights-of-way, and the needs of business to get technology that consumers are demanding. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Lady moves for the passage of the Bill. This Bill requires 60 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. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 62 voting 'yes', 41 voting 'no', 5 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Representative McDermed. For what reason do you rise?"

McDermed: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

McDermed: "I'd like to draw the attention of the Ladies and Gentlemen in the General Assembly to a very important product from my district. We've had some discussion of pumpkins and

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

barbeque sauce and corn. But I have a very much more exciting product coming out of my district and that's beer. I have with us today one of the chief brewers from Hailstorm Brewing in Tinley Park, Illinois. Not only is this a rapidly growing employer, but Brandon Banbury, the chief brewer of Hailstorm, recently won a gold medal for their 2017 Prairie Madness American Style India Pale Ale at the 2017 Great American Beer Festival, and a silver for their Rock Out With Mai Bock in the Bock category. Please give Hailstorm Brewing and Brandon Banbury a warm Springfield welcome."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome. Thank you for joining us today.

Representative Finnie is recognized."

Finnie: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege, please."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Finnie: "I'd like to recognize a distinguished guest in the gallery. We have the Director of the DJJ, the Department of Juvenile Justice, Heidi Mueller, and Legislative Liaison Erin Harris, and last but certainly not least my good, good friend and Deputy Director of Operations down at IYC in my district, Billy Payton. Good family friend of ours. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome to the House chamber. Thanks for joining us. Mr. Reick is recognized."

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

Speaker Lang: "Proceed."

Reick: "I have just noticed the shiny white hair of my predecessor in office here, today. County Board Chairman from McHenry Country, Jack Franks is with us today. I'd like to welcome him."

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

Speaker Lang: "We're only going to greet him once, Sir. But thank you. Page 6 of the Calendar... excuse me. Representative Flowers is recognized."

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

Flowers: "Last week we voted on House Bill 2984, and had I been in my seat, I would like to have been recorded as voting 'no'.

And I would like for the record to reflect that. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "The record will reflect your intention. Page 6 of the Calendar, under Total Vetoes there appears Senate Bill 1905, Mr. Moylan. Please proceed, Sir."

Moylan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today I'm urging my colleagues to join me with... join with me in standing up for the middle class families. We can send a clear and loud message that Illinois still cares about the proud working men and women of our state. And believe in the rights of workers to stand together and negotiate a... negotiate as a group for fair wages and a safe workplace. By overriding Governor's Veto of Senate Bill 1905, we can protect the wages and safety of workers across the state. I respectfully ask for a 'yes' vote. And also, Senate Bill 770 passed the Senate 51 to 1. And that was the trailer Bill that eliminated the penalties."

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

Breen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Motion. Ladies and Gentlemen, we know the stakes here. We know that we've had employers now say that they are not going to come to the State of Illinois because of the lack of any sort of freedom in any level of government on this issue. I mean we've got... we've had the issue of the misdemeanor, we've had the issues of

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

these others. We know the Supreme Court is going to speak on this issue soon, and we ought to let them do that. We ought to let the process play through. And then as Representative Demmer had referenced earlier in the debate on the earlier Bill, why can't his town be able to put together a package to bring folks here if that's what they need? It doesn't mean we have to like it. It doesn't mean that it's a great policy, good or bad, but why wouldn't we let them... allow them that flexibility to bring new factory jobs... jobs of... just good jobs here to the State of Illinois. So, again, I would respectfully request that we maintain our rejection of an override of this veto. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Yes. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Hoffman: "Yes. Representative, I think you said it in your opening remarks, but let's be very clear. Two weeks ago, when we debated this issue, many folks had a major problem with the penalties that were in the Bill. They indicated they weren't against the Bill. They had a problem with these empowerment zones, right-to-work in local municipalities and local counties. But they didn't like the misdemeanor provisions of the Bill. Where does that stand? And have you removed those misdemeanor provisions with a trailer Bill?"

Moylan: "Thank you, Mr. Representative. The Representatives on this side of the aisle had concerns about the penalty. We agreed that we would file a trailer Bill, which we did. It passed the House and thus it passed the Senate. So it alleviates all of their concerns. Thus..."

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

Hoffman: "So, if an individual Legislator got up and said that their only concern was the penalty provision, they now should be free to vote for the Bill because the penalty provision has been removed. Is that correct?"

Moylan: "That's correct."

Hoffman: "Now let me just go to the... to the history of this. This is right-to-work. That's what it is. You can't paint it any other way. It's taking away the rights of working men and women to collectively bargain. We called the Governor's right-to-work legislation for a vote. His language. Zero people. Zero voted for it. So then, they go back to the drawing board and they develop this silly notion of empowerment zones. Where we'll have a patchwork of right-towork municipalities and counties throughout the State of Illinois. The Attorney General said it's unconstitutional. Constitutional scholars say it's unconstitutional. Yet, the Governor persists. Now, I'm not Oliver Stone and I am not a big conspiracy theorist, but I guarantee everybody on our side of the aisle, everyone on our side of the aisle is going to be voting with Representative Moylan to ensure that working families throughout Illinois..."

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

Hoffman: "...maintain their right to organize. Their right to a decent wage. Their right to a pension. Their right to sick time. Their right to time and a half. We're all going to be voting for that, I believe. Maybe one or two of us might not but the vast majority are. But being the conspiracy theorist that maybe I am, I have a sneaking suspicion that there will only be enough over there, even though individuals gave their

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

speeches, even though individuals have made commitments to members of organized labor that they're going to vote for this and for working men and women. I've got a sneaking suspicion we may only end up at 70 votes. Shocker. And maybe I could be wrong, and I hope I'm wrong, but that's my inclination. Stand up for working men and women. Stand up for what you said two weeks ago. Stand up with organized labor and the right to organize. I urge an 'aye' vote."

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

Long: "Thank you, Speaker. Straight to the Bill. I've got to say one thing. I've got 30 years as a Central State Teamsters and nobody can take that away from me. I ran for union steward, I have written bylaws for our workforce, and I have also shown people how to write good grievances against a company. There's no doubt in my mind. There's no doubt in anybody's mind in my family or in my district that Jerry Long not only a third generation union, but a... my daughter's a fourth generation union, even doubts my dedication to the union. I have supported HB688, HB622, Senate Bill 521. I have supported HB3044, and I have opposed HB4027, Leader Durkin's own pension reformat. I will tell you that we've have got to stop getting the cart before the horse in the State of Illinois. We've got to make Illinois business friendly otherwise we're going to lose our union jobs. My union brothers and sisters know that. They understand that. This Bill is not going to stop... going to create a right-to-work state. We don't have enough votes in this House to vote for right-to-work. There's no way that we can make the State of Illinois right-to-work. All this is, is political theater. This is a wedge issue that the other

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

side of the aisle wants to use against certain Legislators in this House. And I would like for somebody to yield me some more time..."

Speaker Lang: "Please bring your remarks to a close. Mr. Andersson is giving you his two minutes. Please proceed, Sir, for two minutes."

Long: "Thank you, Sir. I will say this state will never be rightto-work because we don't have the votes for it. But this is a wedge issue that the other side of the aisle wants to use against certain individuals to make sure that they can lose their seat in the upcoming election. This is political theatre. This is wrong, folks. This is absolutely wrong. I'm not in favor of right-to-work. Never have. I believe that free market principles and unions can actually coexist. We got none of the... none of the reforms during the negotiations of the budget. We didn't get any structural reforms. But this is what we have now. A bunch of junk out there to make sure that a certain Representative if he votes 'no' on it, they can run hard against him and put him out of here. This is unconscionable. This is wrong. My support for the union is undying. I'm not going to discuss about what vote I take from this point on, but I encourage everybody to vote their conscience. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: Mr. Thapedi for two minutes."

Thapedi: "I yield my time to Leader Hoffman."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hoffman waives off the time. Mr. Skillicorn for two minutes."

Skillicorn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. A little bit earlier I asked the Sponsor of this Bill about the First

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

Amendment, and I'm going to go back to that. And specifically not the Freedom of Speech or the Freedom of Press, but the right of the people to peaceably assemble. When I read that it tells me that workers can organize. When I read that it tells me that people can band together for their beliefs. When I read that it tells me that the Congress, State Legislatures, local municipalities can't put a stop to that. So, I hear a lot of campaign speeches in this chamber and I've heard right-to-work a lot. And I'll point out that this Bill does not create a right-to-work, does not take away right-to-work. It doesn't change the status quo here in Illinois. So, no matter the outcome of this Bill, Illinois will not become a right-to-work state or become the opposite of right-to-work state. It is a pure... purely theatrics. It doesn't change anything. The status quo is the same. So, let's get back to the First Amendment. If the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights and the First Amendment of the Constitution say that we have the right to peaceably assemble, shouldn't that also extend itself that we have the right to not peaceably assemble? Doesn't that make sense, that if someone so chooses they might want to consider not being part of a bargaining unit? Isn't that such that they may not want to associate in a union? I think the First Amendment does say that. And I think that the Supreme Court, when they rule on some of these cases, next summer, they're going to guarantee the right to organize, but they're also going to guarantee the right to opt out. And that's what I really want to talk about is... this is not a dirty word. I think workers deserve

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

choice. I think workers should decide what's in their best interest. And they may freely decide..."

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

Skillicorn: "Can someone yield time?"

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Morrison yields his time to Mr. Skillicorn.

Please proceed, Sir."

Skillicorn: "Thank you. I'll be brief. So, I believe that workers have choice. And I also think that workers should decide where their dues go. These are dues that come right out of workers' paychecks. Should the dues that come out of their paychecks be used to fund political campaigns? Should their dues be used for a Chicago politician that might want to take away their guns? Should worker dues that come out of their paychecks be used to pay for Hillary Clinton signs in their neighbor's yard? If a worker has the right to choose, if a worker has a right to assemble, I think they have the right to choose that. So, they decide where that money goes. Currently in Illinois they do not have that ability. So, I do urge my colleagues to vote 'no'. Because voting 'yes' is against worker choice and is against saying where workers can use their dues. Thanks."

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

Walsh: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Motion. Last week we had this debate. We debated it an hour. We're here again today, and I'm listening to the comments. And I've been involved in the union movement now for 20, 25 years. And I'm going to tell you folks, the Holy Grail for the labor movement is right-to-work. Because it... it just dismisses the availably of the union to operate functionally. That is the sole purpose.

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

That's what it's driven in each and every state across the nation by these so called true believers in workers' rights to dismantle their ability to collectively bargain. For them to stand up as a unit. I've heard comments about the First Amendment, the Freedom of Association. When you go into an organizing drive and you convince, and those people are convinced to organize a union by a majority vote, 50 percent plus one, to create a union in that workplace against unsurmountable odds, billion dollar industry to fight unions and organizing. They overcome that and they sit down and they put in a collective bargain agreement. And in there those workers decide to put in a union security clause that states if you are going to work here, you are going to pay union dues or the equivalent fees for the cost of that bargaining. What right-to-work does say, you can go in and freeload. You can get all the benefits that we work for. That we stood together for maybe, possibly, even went on strike for, and you can get that for free."

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

Walsh: "That's what this does. And it's wrong. It's not fair.

Please, stand up for your workers in your districts and vote
'aye'.

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

Wehrli: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Should this Bill receive the required number of votes, I request a roll call verification."

Speaker Lang: "Your request is acknowledged. Representative Ammons for two minutes."

Ammons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. We've had these conversations over and over again. The interesting thing

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

about this conversation today is that there is an assumption or assertion in this chamber that this is not the result of a very public campaign by the newly elected Governor in 2015 to dismantle unions. That's what he said he would do in Illinois. And by way of doing that it was to push right-towork legislation which he went on once he was elected a public tour to sell this idea of right-to-work in Illinois. People rejected it overwhelmingly throughout the State of Illinois. And here we are talking as if the right of workers to organize is on some way unfair to them if they have to pay or invest in that organizing effort. Let me just say this. For workers who are listening to this debate, and those who do not believe that you should pay union dues for proper representation against management, get in trouble at work without a union. Because you will regret it. I have watched many cases over and over again, where thankfully to the union's credit, they were able to protect the working class members of their unions under... in some cases very insurmountable odds. Should there be a benefit without investment? That's the question of privilege. And if we don't deal with that that is what a lot of the issues are that we are experiencing here today in the General Assembly. So, I urge an 'aye' vote for this legislation. And I certainly hope that the Members on the other side will support the workers to this degree."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives for two minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ives: "If this Bill fails are we still a union state?"

Moylan: "Correct."

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

Ives: "Okay. That's exactly right. It makes no difference. Doesn't make us a right-to-work state if this Bill fails. Not at all. We still remain a union state. So, you guys have a bunch of choices here. But I'll tell you what, the entire side of your aisle that has been here longer than a year, has failing grades when it comes to business votes. Failing grades when you're rated by the Illinois Chamber of Commerce, the NFIB, and other associations that look at our votes. Failing grades. And Illinois is failing as a business state. We're failing. And we're never going to get out of \$250 billion in debt and \$16 billion in unpaid bills. They continue to cost drivers ... that continue to indebt us and our citizens. We're never going to get past that unless you do something about it. So, if you want to remain a union state, I want to see the business reforms that are going to come forward. At the end of Session, business stood up at a press conference and said, they got nothing. And it's right. They absolutely got hammered. And it's continuing to this day. And you don't care, but guess what? The voters care, the residents care, and they're leaving. They're fleeing the State of Illinois. So, if you want to be a union state give us all the other reform. You want a 32 percent tax increase, where's the reform? We got nothing. Zero reform. Zero reform. And you're sending a very loud and clear message if you pass this Bill today. We are not open for business in this state. You do not care about workers. That's the message you're sending. Eleven hundred people... 11 hundred companies have blacklisted us. Blacklisted us for being right-to-work. We lost the Toyota plant because we're not right-to-work. I know personally of plants going to

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

other… across the states to Kentucky when they could be down in Decatur."

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

Ives: "I know personally, I know personal business owners that own companies in this state that... that their headquartered in this state that have current manufacturing plants in this state, but they're not expanding here. And you know it. And they're doing it because they cannot afford to make a dime here in the State of Illinois. And you know it. So, if you don't... if you want to stay union, give us all the other business reforms and do it now, because all we got was the tax increase from you all."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Moylan to close."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the General Moylan: Assembly. I just want to make a few points. Workers in rightto-work for less states earn less than those in states that preserve collective bargaining rights. Workers in right-towork for less states receive fewer employee benefits than states that protect collective bargaining. Workers are less safe in right-to-work for less states compared to states that protect collective bargaining. Representative Long and others on this side of the aisle, after I presented my Bill last week, stated that if I filed a trailer Bill, and got it passed that they would vote for the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, I can only take them for their word. Their word is their bond. When somebody tells me they're going to vote for a Bill after I did what I was supposed to do. We voted for the trailer Bill, we passed it to the Senate, and they voted for the Bill,

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

the penalties are off. Ladies and Gentlemen, I respectfully ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves that the House override the Total Veto of the Governor on Senate Bill 1905. This requires 71 votes. Please be reminded Mr. Wehrli has asked for a verification of the vote. Members will be at their own chairs 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. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 70 voting 'yes', 39 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And do you withdraw, Mr. Wehrli?"

Wehrli: "Yes. I withdraw."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman withdraws his verification request. Mr. Moylan's Motion fails. Page 3 of the Calendar, Senate Bill 332, under the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading, Representative Mah. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 332, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous date. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 332, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Mah."

Mah: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. SB332 provides for the issuance of the liquor license to an establishment within 100 feet from a place of worship. We have letters of support from the local

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

alderman and the parish priest of said place of worship. This measure passed in the Senate 55-0. I ask for your 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Lady moves for the passage of the Bill. Mr. Breen is recognized for two minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Breen: "Thank you. Representative, I just want to make sure the facility in question, this is a restaurant that happens to serve liquor and not a bar, whose primary business is liquor sales. Is that correct? Do I have that right?"

Mah: "Yes, that is correct."

Breen: "Okay."

Mah: "And it is across the street from another restaurant that also serves liquor."

Breen: "Okay. And... part of the problem here is that Chicago has different rules on liquor licenses for restaurants than the rest of the state. Isn't that... that's really the issue we're dealing with here, today, right?"

Mah: "I suppose it is. Yes."

Breen: "Sure. Okay because there are kind of two provisions that folks should be aware of. One is the bar... you know, you're not supposed to put a bar within a hundred feet of a church. The other is a restaurant that serves liquor within a hundred feet of a church, that's only a Chicago rule. And as I understand the Governor's veto message, he said, I'm not going to approve any more of these... I guess it's the restaurants that are within a hundred feet of the church. Have we gotten

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

any indication that he's actually going to sign this if we pass it or do we know?"

Mah: "I believe that we've had discussions and there's indication that he will sign this."

Breen: "Okay. And then I guess just as a general principle, what do you think about removing the special treatment of restaurants that happen to serve alcohol in Chicago and putting that back to the same standard as the rest of the state, which is the municipality just approves it in the same way?"

Mah: "That seems to make sense."

Breen: "Fair enough. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Mah to close."

Mah: "Thank you. I appreciate your support for this Bill. It would help a local business and we have support from the parish priest across the street as well as the local alderman. And there is already precedent in that there is another restaurant that serves liquor a few feet away. Thank you."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 80 voting 'yes', 29 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Chair recognizes Representative Wheeler, for what reason do you rise?"

Wheeler, B.: "I stand... point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Proceed."

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

- Wheeler, B.: "I would like to make aware... this Body aware that our pal... old colleague, Jack Franks is here. I'd like to welcome him."
- Speaker Lang: "He's been recognized more times today than the entire time he was a Member. Page 6 of the Calendar, Total Veto, Senate Bill 419, Mr. Martwick. Please proceed, Sir."
- "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 419 had two provisions as it passed the... as it passed the Legislature and got to the desk of the Governor. One of those provisions dealing with the Chicago fire pension system was actually taken care of in Senate Bill 9. And so, that provision of this Bill is sort of irrelevant. The provision that remains that the Governor vetoed relates to a downstate fire pension fund for the City of O'Fallon. In 2008, they hired a full time... for the first time they hired their... their first and only full-time employee of the O'Fallon Fire Department which was the Chief, Mr. Brent Saunders. And because they're municipality of over 5000 residents, the City of O'Fallon was required to offer a full-time firefighter's Article 4 pension. However, the City of O'Fallon in their infinite wisdom decided to offer him a 457 deferred pension plan, instead of the... what they were required to do was to put him into a Tier 1 pension. When they realized this mistake and created a pension fund, because we had closed Tier 1, he was only eligible for a Tier 2 pension. This Bill, what it would did... what it did, and this is an initiative of O'Fallon, which to be fair, I don't represent O'Fallon. What it did was, the city said that we will make this whole by paying all of the required contributions, plus interest, and the firefighter,

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

the chief, would pay all of his contributions, plus interest, to make sure the fund was exactly where it should have been, had he been put into the fund in 2008. The Bill was passed by the Legislature. It was vetoed by the Governor. The only thing that I would suggest is that, he was required to be in a Tier 1 pension fund. I would suggest that there is at least, at the minimum of possibility of litigation that he could pursue against the taxpayers of O'Fallon for the negligence, not putting him in a pension plan and the loss that he's had. This, by agreement, they're putting in all of the necessary funding to make it whole. It makes sense. I'm not really sure why anyone would be opposed to this. But however, as I said, it's not really a big issue for me personally, but I think it should be overridden. I think this is the right path forward. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

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

Breen: "Thank you. To the Motion. Mr. Speaker, why in the world we would create additional Tier 1 liability anywhere in the state for any taxpayer is beyond me. It is outrageous that we would do this. This particular individual was a fire chief. He came in, he... he asked for a 457 or at least thought he was supposed to get one. He got one. He paid into it. Everyone got the benefit of the bargain. They got what they wanted. They've been paying in for 10 years. I think the Governor's Veto message was correct. You're actually having to create a pension system, which will then be underfunded immediately. Then they'll saddle the people of this small town with liability for decades and decades to come. Why in the world would we do this, at a time where our pension systems are so

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

dangerously underfunded? Our entire system is a mess. Please. This is a tiny little issue for one little town, but why in the world would we saddle the people of O'Fallon with another Tier 1 liability? I mean, that is... it is shocking that we would even think about doing this. Please vote 'no'."

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

Morrison: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Briefly, to the Bill. Just echoing those comments from Representative Breen. Once again, it highlights the need to modernize, truly modernize, our pension plans, our retirement systems for our public employees, our valued public employees. But when you look at these byzantine rules, and all of the different pension funds and all of the different complexities of managing these. We need to modernize our systems by going to a defined contribution. And as Representative Breen said, this individual was content to work for 10 years and we should not change course from this. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives for two minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ives: "Representative Martwick, in this... case with the City of O'Fallon, what we're doing is we're rewriting legislation to allow this particular individual to go into a pension fund. Is that correct?"

Martwick: "No. What we're doing is... or at the request of the City of O'Fallon, we are correcting a mistake that was made. Right? So..."

Ives: "Our analysis..."

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

Martwick: "...he already is in a pension fund. He is in a Tier 2 pension fund, but by law he was... when he... the mistake that O'Fallon made was, and apparently I don't know where they got their advice from, they put him in a deferred compensation plan when they were required by law to put him in a pension fund. And so, by the time they addressed that, he was in the wrong fund. And I would suggest, Representative Ives, that we are potentially exposing the City of O'Fallon to litigation. And, and, and what this is, is their attempt to cure a problem and handle all of the finances, so that there is no shortfall. When this pension fund, if we were to allow them to go back into Tier 1, their fund would then be 100 percent funded because they would put in all the contributions."

Ives: "Okay, my point is, is that we are, with this legislation, writing a specific proposal to allow this gentleman to move to a different pension fund, a Tier 1 pension fund, when he had been in a 457, correct?"

Martwick: "No. And I apologize..."

Ives: "He was in a 457."

Martwick: "...I get... I get what you're going at. We are definitely addressing, this is addressing to this individual, but he was improperly put in to a... and again, this matters not..."

Ives: "I understand that..."

Martwick: "...to me."

Ives: "...I understand that he was improperly put... my point is, is that I've seen legislation fly around here doing anything that we all want to do, regardless of... of other..."

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

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

Ives: "Sure will. My point is, we could just as easily write legislation that allowed him to remain in a 457. We could just as easily do that, make it a legal act, and keep him there. Instead, you're taking a different approach. We should've written this legislation differently and allowed them to continue."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Martwick to close."

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

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves that, notwithstanding the Total Veto of the Governor, Senate Bill 419 become law. 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 82 voting 'yes', 28 voting 'no'. And the Gentleman's Motion prevails. And the House notwithstanding the Total Veto of the Governor on a vote of 82 to 28... This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Representative Moeller."

- Moeller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to reflect... or the record to reflect that I was a... intended to be a 'no' vote on Senate Bill 1451."
- Speaker Lang: "The record will reflect your intention. Page 6 of the Calendar. Under the order of Amendatory Vetoes, there appears Senate Bill 1462, Representative Kifowit. Please proceed."
- Kifowit: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that we override the Governor's Amendatory Veto of Senate Bill 1462. This is an entrepreneurial learner's permit. It is a pilot program. The

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

Senate has... had voted to override the Governor's Veto with a 49-7 vote count. What this does is it provides a pilot program for emerging fields that are entrepreneurs. And it allows new business to get a foothold in their... in their area of expertise: Information services, biotechnology and green technology."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Breen: "Representative, why didn't we do the... sustain the Amendatory Veto, which would've broadened this out to entrepreneurs starting new businesses across the board, and not taking... not capping the fee reimbursement? Because it's currently only capped at \$500 thousand."

Kifowit: "Correct. It's fiscally responsible, for it being a pilot program, to cap it at \$500 thousand. When discussed this with DCEO, they said that the cost would raise significantly higher than \$500 thousand. This is subject to appropriation. It is a pilot program, which means in the future if we are successful in the pilot program, we can extend it to other areas and other entrepreneurs. The fact of the matter, it's not fiscally responsible at this point in time to open it up to an unimaginable number that would be significantly higher than 500 thousand.

Breen: "Now, the Governor had also I believe criticized the choice of biotech, information services, and green tech as being poorly defined industries. And I understand that because there's just a lot of... nearly every business that's started, nowadays, is going to have some information services and

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

oftentimes will bleed over into biotech or to green technology. How do you answer that particular critique?"

Kifowit: "The... the point, in fact, and in working with DCEO, these three are emerging businesses. We are going to be ahead of the curve and we are going to be... excuse me, Mr. Speaker. I can't hear very well. These... these industries... we're going to be ahead of the curve. These are emerging fields that were identified in conjunction with DCEO. Again, DCEO must report to the Governor and the General Assembly on the effectiveness of this pilot program. It is a pilot program and if the General Assembly wishes to expand it to other fields, it can do so at a future time."

"To the Motion. Ladies and Gentlemen, I voted for this Breen: first time, I'll vote for again on the override. But at the same time, we should've sustained the Amendatory Veto. I understand that maybe certain individuals wouldn't ... wouldn't allow this to move forward if... if we actually broadened it out to all of the entrepreneurs in the state because, you know, information services, biotech, green technology, those are hot fields. They're really... everyone's excited about them and all of that, but they're not necessarily the majority of the new jobs being created in our state which are often in more fields. much mundane And those folks, entrepreneurs who are working hard, trying to get, get their businesses off the ground deserve our help just as much as these folks in... in these very you know, hot fields that that everyone wants to talk about. So again, I really hope that we can take a broader view of the business community and how we create jobs in Illinois. Thank you."

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

Speaker Lang: "Representative Kifowit to close."

Kifowit: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, this program is going to be administered by DCEO which directs directly underneath the Governor. It is a pilot program in which the General Assembly can expand to other issues. It is subject to appropriation to \$500 thousand. And I ask for your support."

Speaker Lang: "The Lady moves that the House concur with the Senate in that Senate Bill 1462, do pass, notwithstanding the specific recommendation for change by the Governor. This 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? Please record yourselves. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 82 voting 'yes', 27 voting 'no'. And the Lady's Motion passes. And the House... and the House passes Senate Bill 1462, notwithstanding the Governor's specific recommendation for change. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On Supplemental Calendar #1, House Resolution 672, Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This is a Resolution encouraging the Federal Congress to leave its hands off the state and local tax deductions that have been allowed since 1913. As we know, people in the Unites States Congress are looking for ways to find revenue, so that they can go ahead and cut taxes someplace else. The problem with taking away the deductibility of property taxes and other state taxes, income taxes, sales taxes is that it means people who face those taxes will be double taxed, first by the State

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

of Illinois, or the State of New Jersey, or the State of California, and then again by the Federal Government. I don't think that's fair and I know that in Illinois many, many residents are using that particular deduction. Our property taxes are particularly high, if they're not higher than New Jersey they're close. And it seems to me it would be a very unfair burden on our constituents were the Federal Government to decide to deny people the opportunity that as I say they've had since 1913, to deduct these taxes from their federal requirements. I would be happy to answer your questions. And I'd appreciate your 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. Page 4 of the Calendar. Senate Bills-Second Reading, Senate Bill 868, Mr. Zalewski. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 868, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. 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 Zalewski."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski."

- Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to adopt Floor Amendment #2. It becomes the Bill and I'd be happy to discuss it on a Third Reading."
 - 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.

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 868, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 868 is follow up legislation to an unclaimed property... that... rewrite that we did this summer. It addresses numerous concerns from a variety of stakeholders about conforming with the Uniform Law Commission on unclaimed property. I would say for the record, there still remains some issues related to unclaimed property that I think stakeholders have asked us to review later on down the line. But we got as much possibly done as we could in this short amount of time. And I would 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: "Thank you. So, Representative, this is not about the Organ Donor Registry? This is about unclaimed property and gift cards?"

Zalewski: "Correct."

Breen: "Okay. Now, I see proponents IRMA, the Treasurer's Office,
Income, American Express, Service Corporation International.
Are there any other opponents or proponents?"

Zalewski: "I'm aware of no opponents, I know some people are
 neutral on the merits 'cause they'd like to see further work.
 And I'm sure there's other proponents, I don't have the list
 in front of me."

Breen: "Okay. And... and then one of the issues here is that there is a Seventh Circuit decision that not paying interest

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

violates the takings clause of the Fifth Amendment of the United States Constitution. Is that the… that's what your Bill is trying to care of?"

Zalewski: "It's one of the many issues we tried to take care of.

We're under pressure to comply in a lawsuit in federal court

and enacting this law would help relieve that pressure."

Breen: "Okay. And then otherwise you're just doing clean up language on definitions and other... well really it looks like adds and revises definitions, makes grammatical and technical changes?"

Zalewski: "Correct."

Breen: "Are there going to be technical changes that we are going to regret having made, and have to come back next January and very quickly reverse?"

Zalewski: "Not to my knowledge."

Breen: "Okay. And you've read it carefully and considered every little bit of it, Mike?"

Zalewski: "I do my best, Representative Breen."

Breen: "Okay, fair enough. Thanks much."

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

Demmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please excuse Representative Davidsmeyer for the day."

Speaker Lang: "We can do that, Sir. Mr. Harris for two minutes."

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Compliments to the Sponsor. There were... there were tough negotiation and thorough negotiations on this really just technical clean-up Bill. There's as many as 20 different provisions of the Bill, they are very technical. But as was referenced previously, there are none which are... are

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

objectionable and should be helpful regarding unclaimed property. A 'yes' vote would be in order."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski to close if you wish, Sir."

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

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

Sosnowski: "Thank you, Mr. Chair. Can the record please reflect that intended to vote 'yes' on Senate Bill 1451?"

Speaker Lang: "The record will reflect your intentions. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk Bolin: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolutions 661, offered by Representative Stewart. House Resolution 663, offered by Representative Mayfield. House Resolution 664, offered by Representative Willis. House Resolution 665, offered by Representative Phillips. House Resolution 667, offered by Representative Ammons. House Resolution 669, offered by Representative Beiser. House Resolution 670, offered by Representative Scherer. House Resolution 671, offered by Representative Severin. House Resolution 673, offered by Representative Bellock. House Resolution 674, offered by Representative Jones. House Resolution 675, offered Representative Conyears-Ervin. House Resolution 676, offered by Representative Hammond. House Resolution 678, offered by Representative Hammond. House Resolution 678, offered by Representative McDermed. House Resolution 681, offered by

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

- Representative Walsh. House Resolution 682, offered by Representative Bellock. House Resolution 685, offered by Representative D'Amico. And House Resolution 686, offered by Speaker Madigan."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, Committee announcements. 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. Now, Mr. Clerk, Committee announcements."
- Clerk Hollman: "The following committees will be meeting immediately upon adjournment: the Rules Committee will be meeting immediately after adjournment. Revenue and Finance will be meeting in Room 115. Judiciary-Civil is meeting in D-1. Heath Care Licenses is meeting in C-1. And Appropriations Public Safety is meeting in Room 114. Tomorrow morning note that the Appropriations-Elementary & Secondary Education: School Curriculum & Policies Committee has been canceled. Education: School Curriculum & Policies has been canceled for 9:30 in the morning."
- Speaker Lang: "Members, an announcement. The Chair recognizes Mr. Cabello."
- Cabello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I need to report, unfortunately I was a little tardy this morning so, I apologize for that. The fallen officer that I happened to be on the same department with, Officer Jaimie Cox, 30 years old, graduated from Hononegah High School in 2006. He served in the Army National Guard from 2004-2010 and left with an honorable discharge, part of the Army National Guard contingent deployed to Afghanistan. Officer

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

Jaimie Cox received the Army Commemoration Medal, the Army Achievement Medal, and the Combat Infantry Badge. He was also awarded the Illinois National Guard Abraham Lincoln Medal of Freedom Award. Officer Jaimie Cox started with the Illinois Department of Natural Resources as a conservation officer and came to the Rockford Police Department, where I first met him in December of 2016. Officer Cox is known as a hard worker. In fact, the day... just two days ago, when he was killed in the line of duty, he was working the day shift and volunteered to stay on the afternoon shift because there wasn't enough policemen to work. I won't go into the details of his death at this time, but I do want folks to know that this man was a very honorable, good policeman. I can't imagine what his coworkers feel like today that actually found him. Chief Dan O'Shea and the members of the Rockford Police Department have acted honorably through this whole situation. The integrity task force is investigating to find out exactly what happened. And with those findings will be released. We thank the Rockford Fire Department, all first responders, and other of the many agencies in this ... in the region of Rockford, and the over 120 squad cars that escorted Officer Cox from the Coroner's Office to the funeral home. To the family of Officer Cox, we appreciate you for sharing him with us. You are a part of our family. We will do what we can any day, any time. We will be bringing a Resolution at another time, so I appreciate the House's indulgence on honoring Officer Jaimie Cox.

Speaker Lang: "Take one moment of silence, Members. Members may be seated. Members, it is the intention of the House to finish

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

our work tomorrow, Wednesday. That is the intention of the House. Rules will meet upon Adjournment, Ladies and Gentlemen. And now, leaving perfunctory time for the Clerk, Leader Currie moves that the House stand adjourned until Wednesday, November 6 at the hour of 12:30 p.m. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the House stands Adjourned."

Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Committee Reports. Representative Thapedi, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary - Civil reports the following committee action taken on November 07, 2017: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 61. Representative Zalewski, Chairperson from the Committee on Revenue & Finance reports the following committee action taken on November 07, 2017: do pass as amended Short Debate Senate Bill 872; recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 482. Introduction and First Reading of House Bills. House Bill 4151, offered by Representative Wehrli, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 4152, offered by Representative Ford, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 4153, offered by Representative Flowers, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 4154, offered by Representative Meier, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. First Reading of these House Bills. Second Reading of House Bills. House Bill 4118, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading of this House Bill, will be held under the Order of Second Reading. Second Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 403, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Senate Bill 779, a Bill for an Act

85th Legislative Day

11/7/2017

concerning public employee benefits. Senate Bill 872, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 1103, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Second Reading of these Senate Bills. They'll be held on the Order of Second Reading. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."