119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Speaker Turner: "Members are asked to be in their seats. We shall be led in prayer today by Pastor Keith Thomas who is with Mount Olive Missionary Baptist Church in Champaign, Illinois. Pastor Thomas is the guest of Representative Ammons. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off all cell phones, and rise for the invocation and Pledge of Allegiance."

Pastor Thomas: "Let us pray. Our Father, we acknowledge Your presence and power as we're gathered as an assembly. Every leader from every county, from every city, from every neighborhood. We're all standing at this sacred pause to petition Your presence as we all play a role in fashioning a beloved community. A community where justice, wisdom, strength, and love have a strong, unyielding voice. We lift this great body of leadership before You that they may manage their responsibilities in a manner that is right and pleasing in your sight. Give them the insight to rightly and justly dispense the law and to discharge their judgements and decisions in the fear and admonition of the Lord. Lord, we ask Your grace this day as these men and women endeavor to govern the people of this great state. May the authority granted to each individual be exercised with attentiveness and regard for all. Help each lawmaker to reflectively remember Your commandment to love our neighbor, to consider the poor, to regard the immigrant, to uplift the marginalized, and to give hope to the least of these. Help them to lead in a conscious, seared mind with integrity and insight as they've answered the clarion call to create a more peaceful society and a flourishing community. We commend these Members of this

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Legislative Body to the leadership upon high. It is in the name of the Lord, Jesus Christ, as he has taught us to pray, Amen.

Speaker Turner: "We shall be led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative Andrade."

Andrade - et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

Speaker Turner: "Roll Call for Attendance. Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record show that Representative Gabel is excused today."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Wheeler."

Wheeler, K.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please let the record reflect that Representative Skillicorn is excused today."

Speaker Turner: "With 115 Members present, a quorum is established. Representative Butler, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Butler: "Point of personal privilege, please Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Sir."

Butler: "I would like to remind Members next Tuesday is the annual Diabetes Caucus bowling event here in town. If you have not gotten your team, time is running out. So, please remember to participate. We had a great crowd last year in the Diabetes Caucus event. It's a wonderful time. I have applications here if you need them. Get your team in. But we need to get everybody registered for next Tuesday's event. Feel free to ask myself or Representative Davis any questions you may have

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

about it but please come out and support the Diabetes Caucus next Tuesday. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative. Representative
Davis."

"Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'd be remissed if Davis: didn't follow Representative Butler. Encouraging Members and all to come out and support our effort. Enjoy some great rivalry and competition on the bowling alleys. We know we got a few ringers around the Capitol and they get recruited to participate, and that's great. But you know I'm not a ringer, but I'm going to do my thing next week. I know some of you were wondering why I was wearing my coat yesterday as if to say I was going to have some big reveal of my fantastic bowling shirt. Well, that wasn't the case and it's not today either. But trust me, I will have a fantastic bowling shirt next week for the event that supports our efforts to raise money to create awareness around diabetes. It's a debilitating disease and maybe doesn't get all the notoriety that some of the others have but it does have a tremendous impact in our communities particularly in African American and communities of color. So again, we hope that you will support our efforts. Representative Butler says he's got forms, if you want to ... if you want to participate or maybe jump on a team, but please participate in this effort. I appreciate all the hard work that Representative Butler puts into this effort. When he took over from Representative Tryon, we didn't skip a beat, we kept moving, we kept pushing, we keep raising money so that Members... and these dollars are available for all of us to be able to do awareness events in

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

our districts. So we just need to take advantage of it. So again, thank you Representative Butler for all your hard work and the other chairs of the Diabetes Caucus and we look forward to seeing you on Tuesday next week. Thank you, Mr. Chair."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative. Representative Carroll, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Carroll: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Sir."

Carroll: "Starting yesterday at sundown and going through this evening at sundown is the 70th birthday of the State of Israel. So, I would like, on behalf of the Jewish Caucus and all Members of the House, to wish Israel a happy 70th birthday or as we like to call like, Yom Ha'atzmaut. Thank you so much."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative. Representative Stratton, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Stratton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My last professional position, other than being a State Representative, was serving as the director of the Center for Public Safety and Justice at the University of Illinois in Chicago; and today I'd like to welcome staff from the Center for Public Safety and Justice who's on my left in the gallery. Jason Stamps, Charlene Moe, and Katie Holihen, who all train on procedural justice throughout the country and work with law enforcement all around the country. They also testified this morning before the House Task Force on Sexual Harassment and Sexual Discrimination. I would like the House to please welcome the Center for Public Safety and Justice here today. Thank you."

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

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

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

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

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Sir."

Sommer: "Ladies and Gentlemen, I'd like to introduce my two Pages for the day. Sitting down front are Pete and Jake Van Scoyc, who lives in rural Bloomington. Pete is a sophomore at Normal West High School. Jake is a eighth grader at Parkside Junior High. Their mother, Stacy Van Scoyc... Dr. Van Scoyc, very active in the Illinois State Dental Society. Please welcome them to the Capitol today."

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

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

Andersson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege." Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Representative."

Andersson: "Thank you. I'd like to introduce to the Members of the House my Page for a day. This John Austin Little standing next to me. And his mom, dad, and brother are up in the gallery. John Austin is from Geneva, goes to Williamsburg Elementary. He's a fifth grader, very into social studies, and told me today that he's very, very into politics. So hopefully, he'll be sitting in my seat in not too long. Everybody please give him a warm welcome."

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

Representative Jimenez, for what reason do you seek recognition."

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

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Representative."

Jimenez: "In honor of our state's 200th birthday, I'm partnering with Illinois Bicentennial Commissioner, Rikeesha Phelon, for the Illinois Proud Penny Drive. We are asking the children of Sangamon County to look under their couch cushions, ask their grandpa if he has pennies in his pocket, to gather up all the money from 64 schools in Sangamon County to put toward an important Abraham Lincoln artifact that is currently in New York but we need it back here in Illinois. It's called the Sangamon County Minute Book and it includes the certification that Abraham Lincoln was a man of good moral character and that was the certification he needed to become a lawyer at that time. So, this is modeled after a campaign in the 1940s where the children of Illinois raised money to get a copy of the Gettysburg Address and we're looking to give the kids a boost. So, if anybody's interested, any of the adults in the room are interested to helping give the Sangamon County kids a boost, a GoFundMe account has been set-up. So, be on the lookout for that and we hope to bring this important Lincoln artifact back to Illinois. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative. Representative Meier, for what reason do you seek recognition?

Meier: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Sir."

Meier: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today in the gallery right behind me, if they'd stand up, we have the Albers-Damiansville Girl's Basketball team, the Cougars. And we want to congratulate them on winning the 2017-2018 Southern Illinois Junior High School Athletic Association Class S Championship. They

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

- defeated St. Mary's of Mt. Vernon at... of a score 47-40. They went 27 and... wins and 1 loss for the year. The team members are Sophia Kennett, Julia Korte, MaKenna Lake, Abigail Crosby, Camryn Hall, Sophia Bretz, Tori Joest, Austyn Jansen, Avery Budde, Maddy Santel, Reagan Norrenbers, and Sophie Thomas. Their coaches are Taylor Kampwerth, Nick Hollenkamp; and manager is Kaitlyn Toennies. So I'd like everybody to give them a round of applause on their championship."
- Speaker Turner: "Congratulations, and welcome to your Capitol.

 Representative Harris, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Good to see you in the Chair today. Actually I thought the Deputy Majority Leader might be in the Chair, because I had something to announce for something in his area. Point of personal privilege, if I may?" Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Representative."
- Harris, D.: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Illinois Holocaust Museum and Education Center in Skokie has been named one of the ten recipients of the National Medal for Museum and Library Science. The award was announced in a joint press release between the museum and the Institute of Museum and Library Sciences. The accolade is regarded as 'the nation's highest honor given to museums and libraries for service to the community'. So, hats off to the Illinois Holocaust Museum and Education Center in Skokie. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative. Mr. Clerk, Committee Reports."
- Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

following committee action taken on April 19, 2018: recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is House... Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 4345, Floor Amendment #4 to House 4469, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill Representative Moeller, Chairperson from the Committee on Aging reports the following committee action taken on April 17, 2018: recommends be adopted is House Resolution 846. Representative Costello, Chairperson from the Committee on Agriculture & Conservation reports the following committee action taken on April 17, 2018: recommends be adopted is House Resolution 752. Representative Sente, Chairperson from the Committee on Environment reports the following committee action taken on April 17, 2018: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment 1 to House Bill 1439, House Resolution 875. Representative Flowers, Chairperson from the Committee on Health Care Availability & Accessibility reports the following committee action taken on April 17. 2018: recommends be adopted is House Resolution 850. Representative Evans, Chairperson from the Committee on Transportation: Regulation, Roads & Bridges reports the following committee action taken on April 17, 2018: recommends be adopted is House Joint Resolution 90, House Joint Resolution 92, House Joint Resolution 93, House Joint Resolution 99, House Joint Resolution 100, House Joint Resolution 104, House Joint Resolution 105, House Joint Resolution 110, House Joint Resolution 114, House Resolution 871. Representative Thapedi, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary - Civil reports the following committee action taken on April 18, 2018: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment 2 to House Bill 4754,

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Floor Amendment 2 to House Bill 5157, House Resolution 702, House Resolution 828. Representative Crespo, Chairperson from the Committee on Elementary & Secondary Education: School Curriculum & Policies reports the following committee action taken on April 18, 2018: recommends be adopted is House Joint Resolution 108, House Joint Resolution 115, House Resolution 790, House Resolution 795, House Resolution 851, House Resolution 852, House Resolution 853, House Resolution 865, House Resolution 873. Representative Riley, Chairperson from the Committee on State Government Administration reports the following committee action taken on April 18, recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment 1 to House Bill 4217, House Resolution 816, House Resolution 843. Representative Chapa LaVia, Chairperson from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs reports the following committee action taken on April 18, 2018: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment 1 to House Bill 4288. Representative Mayfield, Chairperson from the Committee on Elementary & Secondary Education: Licensing, Administration & Oversight reports the following committee action taken on April 18, 2018: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment 1 to House Bill 1265, Floor Amendment 1 to House Bill 1295, Floor Amendment 1 to House Bill 5196, Floor Amendment 1 to House Bill 5627. Representative Gabel, Chairperson from the Committee on Human Services reports the following committee action taken on April 18, recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment 3 to House Bill 4707, House Resolution 729, House Resolution 803, House Resolution 812, House Resolution 835, House Resolution Resolution 883, House Resolution 897. Representative

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Turner, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary -Criminal reports the following committee action taken on April 17, 2018: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 2561; recommends be adopted is House Resolution 735, Resolution 876, House Resolution 885. Representative Crespo, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-General Services reports the following committee action taken on April 18, 2018: recommends be adopted is House Resolution 899. Representative Chapa LaVia, Chairperson from the Committee on Energy reports the following committee action taken on April 18, 2018: recommends be adopted is House Resolution 847. Representative Thapedi, Chairperson from the Committee on International Trade & Commerce reports the following committee action taken on April 18, recommends be adopted is House Resolution 741; recommends be adopted as amended is House Resolution 765. Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 995, offered by Representative Durkin, is referred to the Rules Committee."

Speaker Turner: "Members, we're going to begin with Bills on Third Reading. And first up we have House Bill 4275, by Representative Andrade. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4275, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Andrade."

Andrade: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 4275 is an update to the Health Club Act that was incorporated in 1965. The Bill has no opposition. It actually takes the Attorney General's language put into length... into the Bill. It also improves consumer protection by reducing the amount of time they can

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

contractual itself and it provides an open market for the health club industry. There's no questions, I respectfully request an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Members. Representative Breen is recognized."

Breen: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

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

Breen: "Thank you. And Representative just so that I'm clear on this, the issue with physical fitness services is that we haven't changed the law on this since 1981?"

Andrade: "Actually though, the part that we're changing is from 1965. In 1981 also, there was a change that actually incorporated the health clubs into it. For example, like an x-sport or something. So it actually goes way back. The part we're changing was actually incorporated in 1965. I've worked with the Republicans on both sides, and the Democrats, and Attorney General's Office to make sure there's no opposition and to the business community."

Breen: "Okay. So again, there's no opposition from any of the parties involved?"

Andrade: "No."

Breen: "Okay."

Andrade: "It's all been... been resolved."

Breen: "Okay. Thank you, Representative."

Andrade: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Hammond is recognized."

Hammond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And to the Bill. I want to thank the Sponsor of this Bill for the work that he has done and the efforts that he put forth to work with both sides of the

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

aisle and our concerns. And the Sponsor has done a masterful job of it. Thank you very much.

Speaker Turner: "Representative Andrade to close."

Andrade: "Thank you. Ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Gentleman moves that House Bill 4275 pass. All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 84 voting 'yes', 25 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', House Bill 4275, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5771, Representative Chapa LaVia. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5771, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Chapa LaVia."

Chapa LaVia: "Thank you, Speaker. The piece of legislation just puts in information on... for... if a early childhood program receives fed... state dollars, that in their report card that they place absentee attendance information and such. And I'll take any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Pritchard is recognized."

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

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

Pritchard: "Representative, why is it important that we start looking at the absence of early childhood..."

Chapa LaVia: "I'm glad you asked that..."

Pritchard: "...attendance?"

Chapa LaVia: "...my amazing counterpart on that side. Is that we... what we find is the patterns of truancy and absenteeism start

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

as early as three, four, and five, of course. And throughout the state, we need to start focusing and retraining our brain to understand that early childhood is just as important as primary and secondary ed. And it gives the pattern and the relationship, not only just with the parent, but with the child understanding that school is important. And if... as they matriculate into the next level of education, if they miss more than 10 days, they're... the chance of them going ahead and going to the next grade is like 57 percent. So, this is a really important step to start collecting data to see the habits of our early childhood programs throughout the state if they receive state funding. Not if they're private, state funding. And I want... I want to say, Representative Pritchard, it's been an honor, a delight through the years to work with you on legislation, that we're really pushing education to the forefront on everybody's minds. So, thank you for all your support over the years."

Pritchard: "Thank you. And is there any requirement that the early childhood organization follow up on the absence or truancy?"

Chap LaVia: "I think that's a piece of legislation that we're going to be getting to once we start to collect data, to see where we... that information takes us as a state. But we don't put mandates in a sense of taking that information and then dissecting it and saying how it affects their school directly. But it's definitely an idea of going forward."

Pritchard: "Thank you very much. It's a good Bill. I ask for the Body's support."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Ives."

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

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

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

"So, this budget year we will spend approximately \$500 million on early childhood education, \$500 million. The incremental cost for the next \$50 million that is going to be spent this year via ISBE documents, actually showed that we were going spend upwards of \$17 thousand per student in the coming fiscal year for a four-year-old preschool, thousand. In many cases, we're spending \$10 thousand. The lowest we're spending per child is about \$5 thousand for early childhood education. And so now what you see here is a Bill basically saying, by the way, if you don't show up for class, we want to know about it in a written report. Well, how about this. If you don't show up for class, you don't ... no longer get to put your three, four, or five-year-old into taxpayer funded child care and child ... early education. How about that as the accountability measure how about you lose your spot? Because we know there are more children who actually want and need early childhood education. So, the answer here is not to say that we're going to report absentee children from preschool which, by the way, is not mandated by law. The real way for accountability here is saying you're not going to get it anymore. If you're not showing up, you don't get it. Meanwhile, I think we should talk about the expensive nature this program. Seventeen thousand dollars incremental cost for early childhood education. You might as well put them in ISU at that cost."

Chapa LaVia: "Well, the funny thing is Representative..."

Ives: "So, that would be the deal."

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Chapa LaVia: "...they don't get to ISU if they don't have early childhood."

Ives: "I..."

Chapa LaVia: "If you want to look at the statistics... and your numbers are so off-base, okay?"

Ives: "No, it's actually true."

Chapa LaVia: "Someone needs to put you in your place on that.

Because I remember as a freshman, you saying you wanted to eliminate all of early childhood education. You know what the difference is in a high minority, high poverty district and someone that lives in a wealthier district, the lack of early childhood. You want to know what's different about your community and my community?"

Ives: "I don't believe that I actually..."

Chapa LaVia: "My kids go to jail when they don't have early childhood."

Ives: "I don't believe I actually..."

Chapa LaVia: "So... so..."

Ives: "...asked a question of the Sponsor..."

Chapa LaVia: "...she is irrelevant and she..."

Ives: "...and I was not finished with my statement."

Chapa LaVia: "...should talk to the Bill 'cause she's not talking to me. Okay?"

Ives: "I actually was not finished with my statement, nor was I
 asking a question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Turner: "You can go straight to the Bill, Representative."

Chapa LaVia: "You didn't ask me a question."

Ives: "To the Bill."

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Speaker Turner: "Would you like to go straight to the Bill, Representative Ives?"

Chapa LaVia: "You were talking to the Bill."

Ives: "To the Bill."

Speaker Turner: "To the Bill."

Ives: "There was no question involved here. To the Bill. The truth is those are the numbers, those are the numbers. That's the incremental costs if you look at the ISBE document. And they need to explain it better to this Body. Fifty million dollars more, this year alone. The point here... the point here is that if you are looking for accountability, then if you're not putting your kid in the program, then you don't get the program the next year. That's what we should be doing. Then people will show up, if you really want them educated. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Wallace is recognized."

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

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

Wallace: "I want to first start by thanking you, Representative Chapa LaVia, for bringing this Bill forward. At first, I was a little concerned because we know that in a lot of communities like the ones that you and I represent and the one that you were just talking about, it's difficult for parents to have the resources necessary to get their children to and from and it's difficult for their children to matriculate. But this Bill simply says we'll record the data around that issue, correct?"

Chapa LaVia: "I'm sorry, Wallace. Could you... could you repeat the question, Dr.?"

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Wallace: "So it says that we're just going to record the data around attendance and absenteeism?"

Chapa LaVia: "Right. And what we're trying to do is get accountability for those slots as well, to make sure that the dollars are going where they're needed and to find out the mechanics around that. 'Cause I think it's really important that we understand if a child misses, it's not day care, it's early childhood academies these days."

Wallace: "That's right."

Chapa LaVia: "We need to train our children... I mean... standing in line, don't touch somebody, playing with sand, doing colors, their numbers, how to... how to listen to authority to... so instruction, are part of developmental components that all children deserve, all children deserve. So, what we'd like to do is some of the data that's going to start to be collected based on that data and what we'll do going forward will help us with early childhood to see what we're missing, how we can work with a parent or parents or grandparents on why this is happening. But we need to reprogram society that early childhood academies are that. It's not day care anymore."

Wallace: "That's right."

Chapa LaVia: "And we... we're falling behind. And where we see the inadequacies, we see them that if we're not providing help to the parent to understand that this is a early school. This is... this is a academy building our children up so they can go into society. They can into colleges if they want to or vocational, or go into the workforce and be taxpaying citizens. So..."

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Wallace: "I want to say thank you so much. So, to the Bill. We've talked extensively in this chamber about the benefits of exposure to early childhood education. Children who participate in these early programs are not only more likely to finish high school, not only more likely to go on to a university setting, they're also more likely to go on to graduate school. This has lifelong, lasting effects. And so, being able to collect this data, being able to see what types of resources and supports need to be in place so these children can be within these programs, I think it's absolutely essential. I want to, again, applaud Chapa LaVia for this. I think it is a shame that we continue to try to penalize poverty because that what's I heard in the previous speaker's discussion around this issue. It's a problem, it's a problem this chamber must deal with and I hope that you will address it moving forward. But thank you, again and I encourage an 'aye' vote from everyone here. This will have so many great benefits moving forward. Sometimes we have to invest now so that we can have a greater return in the future. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Andersson is recognized."

Andersson: "Thank you... thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Number one, Representative Chapa LaVia, thank you for bringing the Bill and I fully support it. I wasn't going to speak to this Bill until I heard some of the prior comments. The idea that we would throw our children out of preschool because they didn't show up enough, that'll teach 'em, huh. That's the answer? Can I tell you it's not just about a low-income area; it's about my area too, affluent areas. You know why kids sometimes become chronically absentee, because they have

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

mental health issues. There's a diagnosis called school refusal, school refusal. It's an early indicator that there's a problem with a child. Not that the child is a problem, but the child has a problem that needs to be addressed and can be addressed. But to suggest that because they have been absent too much, we ought to kick them out. That's a great recipe for disaster. You're abandoning our children when you do that. You're not helping them and that doesn't help any of us. I'm... thank you for bringing this Bill. I'm obviously upset and I apologize for that. But Representative Chapa LaVia, you are a hundred percent right. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Scherer is recognized."

Scherer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a quick comment. I stand in full support of this and intend to become a Sponsor. I would hope that the Members of this Body would understand the importance of developing good soft skills from the very beginning. And what I have seen in my years of teaching is if they learn to show up to school and be ready to learn, show up and be on time, that's a skill they develop for the rest of their life. I strongly urge an 'aye' vote and hope it's unanimous."

Speake Turner: "Representative Chapa LaVia to close."

Chapa LaVia: "Okay. I want to just give you one statistic and people know this. I've tried to get away from education so much because I want other people to understand it 'cause I'm not going to be here forever and it is a very important thing in our State of Illinois. But all statistics show if you... in fact, An Ounce of Prevention put out a statistic out there; a three-year-old, a three-year-old that is in formal day

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

academy setting and another child that sits in front of a TV at a grandma/grandpa's house, maybe saw Sesame Street, what have you, the four-year... I mean, the... I'm sorry. It's probably a four-year-old or five-year-old, I forget the statistics, but what it showed is still dramatic. It showed that the child that sat in front of the TV looked like they had a stroke. It looks like they had a stroke because they're not connecting the synapses in their wonderful amazing brains and that we were behind the eight ball once that child gets into preschool they'll... I mean, kindergarten, they'll never catch up to their counterpart 'cause they're missing over 30 million words verbally. This is child abuse at its rare... at best form when we don't educate and put money into early childhood. The number is, per year, we spend about \$4 thousand per kid. Not \$10 thousand what you heard earlier, but \$4 thousand per kid to educate them at early childhood academies across the state that are given state public funds. And I want to thank everybody for the discussion. You know I get very passionate, especially about early childhood 'cause that's one of the most important things we can do. And there are economists out there throughout the United States that the best money return on your dollar, the ROE, is putting money into early childhood academies. And I appreciate an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 5771 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting
is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the roll. On
107... with 107 voting 'yes', 4 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present',
House Bill 5771, having received the Constitutional Majority,

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4348, Representative Connor. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4348, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Connor. Take your time."

"Okay. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 4348, as it's currently amended, creates a mechanism to utilize what is called Namus, the National Association of Missing Unidentified. It requires law enforcement agencies and coroner's offices here in the State of Illinois to submit a packet which will... which will permit the National Association of Missing and Unidentified Persons to test DNA samples from unidentified remains that are recovered. There's a laboratory in north Texas that provides the best testing in the nation. It is federally funded, it doesn't cost anything to local law enforcement or to the coroner's offices. Currently, many organizations still don't know about this. So, this Bill is an effort to require that the samples be sent in so that this national clearing house can contain more information about missing remains. In addition, they post information on the web about the unidentified individual and this assists law enforcement nationwide in helping to identify these remains. It doesn't as I said, it doesn't cost anything. All local law enforcement or the coroner's office has to do is request the packet and they place samples from the remains into the packet, they send it off to this organization. A great example occurred about six months ago in Kentucky. They identified a 46 year old body that had... it was called 'Mountain Jane Doe'. It had never been identified before. But through NamUs they

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

were able to this. So, this doesn't cost local law enforcement or the coroner's offices anything. I did what to indicate, we do intend to make changes to this on the basis of some input from the stakeholders on the Senate side. However, all the stakeholders have agreed we want to pass it out of the House and I already have a Sponsor in the Senate. So, I would urge an 'aye' vote to help identify unidentified bodies."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate the question is, 'Shall House Bill 4348 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 4348, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5077, Leader Bellock. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5077, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Bellock."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. And this is a Bill that is an initiative of the Department of Juvenile Justice. I don't know of any opposition to it. And what it does is just clarifies the current statutory language to ensure that most accurate transfers of information from the courts go to the Department of Juvenile Justice."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 5077 pass?' All favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 113 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

voting 'present', House Bill 5077, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4990, Representative Crespo. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4990, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Crespo."

Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. Members of the House. House Bill 4990 does two things. Number one, it allows DCEO to award grants to municipalities that participate in the convention incentive program that we passed last General Assembly for obligations that they have incurred in a prior fiscal year. It also extends the sunset date of the annual report of the effectiveness of the program that DCEO must submit to the General Assembly and also requires that they submit the report electronically. Happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Breen."

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

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

Breen: "Thank you. And... Representative, just help me out here.

We're... what exactly does your Bill do then? I see it's about
past year expenses being paid for by current year funds. What...

tell me about this issue."

Crespo: "So basically, the... it allows the municipality to provide an incentive and we've laid out the best March for that that Bill we passed a couple of years ago. This would just allow the municipality to get the award or the incentive paid the following year... the following fiscal year."

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Breen: "Is this Bill still opposed by the Governor's Office of Management and Budget?"

Crespo: "As far as I'm aware, no."

Breen: "Okay. We've got it on our analysis that GOMB is opposed because they believe that the Bill would undo previous budget management steps. So, they're... obviously, we're always having trouble meeting our budget. So, I guess there where was some thought that they wanted to reduce the amount of spending in this program."

Crespo: "Representative, let me tell you the way this award program was put together; they can only get the incentive paid back if they can prove to DCO that absent the incentive, they never would have had the business. So, it would have to prove that in fact they generated new business for the State of Illinois. So, it's pretty much revenue neutral. And I have to admit, this is the first I hear that the Governor's Office OMB, is opposed. I've had meetings with OMB on other matters and they never said anything to me."

Breen: "Okay. But again, this is... this idea is that we want to use current fiscal year grants to pay for past fiscal year costs?"

Crespo: "Right."

Breen: "Okay. But now I... I guess should... I mean, again, we're trying to... I guess I'm trying to guess at an objection from an agency that I hadn't heard from myself. If the point is to bring in more tourism dollars, wouldn't you only have a... wouldn't only future, current, or future tourism events be within the look of your grant? So, I mean if you're talking about past expenses they've already... those folks have already

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

come and gone. Is there some... what... so if this is supposed to be improving revenues for the local area; if the event already happened then you've already, you know, those folks already came and went. Wouldn't we already be... I mean I'm assuming we would only be looking at events to occur down the road?"

Crespo: "The problem is that the municipality already committed to that incentive. So, they're out. And absent this language, I don't think the program is going to work, because I doubt very much if any municipalities would even try to offer incentives to bring in new business."

Breen: "So just so that I'm clear at least, I see the Village of Schaumburg is one of the main proponents, or at least they had needed the Bill. Did they extend an incentive to someone and then we didn't fund it at the state level, was that what had occurred?

Crespo: "It happened to Schaumburg. This would also apply to Quincy, Springfield, Tinley Park, Peoria, Collinsville, the Quad Cities, Lombard, as well as the Sports Center in Rockford. They also qualify for this program."

Breen: "But again, it's the idea is they already extended the incentives, but through our process we never funded..."

Crespo: "Right."

Breen: "...and so they've been waiting for the money to come back..."

Crespo: "Correct."

Breen: "...for something they already extended? Okay. I think that gets to, again guessing at the objection from the agency, and..."

Crespo: "Listen... and again as far as... this Bill actually passed the Senate and was taken by someone else in the House. My

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

understanding was that the Governor's Office was fine with this Bill."

Breen: "Okay, fair enough, fair enough. Thank you for the answers to my question, Representative."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Davidsmeyer is recognized."

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

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

Davidsmeyer: "So, I have a quick question on this. My concern, you know, we're trying... with these funds, we're trying to incentivize tourism, correct?"

Crespo: "Right."

Davidsmeyer: "So, it sounds to me like somebody wants to spend the money, they're going to spend it anyway, but then they're going to ask the state to reimburse them for money that they were going to spend anyway?"

Crespo: "I don't necessarily..."

Davidsmeyer: "Or was there like a pre-authorization?"

Crespo: "Well... I think they can only offer the incentive if they think that they're going to recover that incentive. Otherwise they might not offer the incentive for the new business to come into to the state."

Davidsmeyer: "So, is there a specific case? It says here that the Village of Schaumburg offered this up."

Crespo: "The what?"

Davidsmeyer: "I believe it says that Schaumburg offered this up."

Crespo: "Well, I... well, I represent part of Schaumburg..."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay."

Crespo: "...so obviously, I've had conversations with them as well as some of the other municipalities

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Davidsmeyer: "So..."

Crespo: "...that qualify for the incentive program."

Davidsmeyer: "Was there a specific instance where they were not receiving any funds for this?"

- Crespo: "As far as I know, based on this program, they were able to attract two new conventions to the area and I believe some the municipalities were able to do the same thing. I just haven't had a chance to talk to the other municipalities."
- Davidsmeyer: "So, was it a case where the state promised them money and they didn't get it?"
- Crespo: "It was a case where the municipality acted based on the law that we passed a couple of years ago. The model was there saying was hey, if you can prove that absent this incentive... this new business would have never come into town and they have to prove that. There's a baseline to set going back three years say hey, the last three years this has been our average for this period of time. Absent this grant or this incentive, we never would have gotten this business."
- Davidsmeyer: "So, my... I guess my question is, I don't feel like a clear answer. Did they actually get promised this money from the State of Illinois?"
- Crespo: "Well, they were acting on a piece of legislation that we passed two years ago. And when we did pass the budget last year, we did appropriate the funds for this program."
- Davidsmeyer: "Yeah, so I guess it's not... if it was something they were going to do anyway, it's not an incentive anymore. It sounds like Schaumburg was going to go ahead and do this anyway and they just... after the fact, they said oh, we should've applied for this or we should've gotten this. You

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

know incentives are prospective, right. You're moving forward. So, I think an after the fact reimbursement is completely different. I think there has to be prior authorization for something like this."

Crespo: "Where I disagree with you, Representative, is. I'm not sure if the Village of Schaumburg would have offered the terms that they did to these two convention planners. So, the terms were based on the premise that hey, we have some wiggle room here and we can make this offer based on the problem... based on the fact that we have a model in place where they can collect that incentive, provided that they can prove DCEO that absent the incentive, they never would have had the business."

Davidsmeyer: "So, did they clarify with DCEO that his was, that they're incentive would... qualified for it..."

Crespo: "Oh, absolutely."

Davidsmeyer: "...or is that just their personal..."

Crespo: "Yeah."

Davidsmeyer: "...belief?"

Crespo: "They have to prove to DCEO that the incentives that offered fall within the parameters of the program that we decided and we passed a couple of years ago. That's already out there. They're certain...

Davidsmeyer: "Sure."

Crespo: "...requirements they have to meet and then they qualify."

Davidsmeyer: "So, you're saying that this... so, you're saying that current law allows for this or that was their understanding of current law?"

Crespo: "Correct."

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Davidsmeyer: "Is this clarifying current law?"

Crespo: "Yes."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. I... it sounds to me likes it less an incentive and I don't know that DCEO should be going back and retrospectively paying people back for things. But if it was an agreement and DCEO said that they would reimburse this, I understand the reimbursement. If they didn't say ahead of time that they were going to pay for it, I think that was the Village of Schaumburg's risk to take for the incentive that was coming in, the business or whatever it may have been. So, I understand what you're trying to do to clarify the law, I'm not sure that I agree with it. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative David Harris."

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

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

Harris, D.: "So, Representative, let me just make sure, as I look through my list here, I see the proponents, according to my analysis, the proponents of this Bill are the Village of Schaumburg, the Illinois Municipal League, the Village of Tinley Park, the Peoria Area Convention and Visitors Bureau, the Chicago Southland Convention and Visitors Bureau, Meade-Chicago Northwest, DuPage Mayors and Managers. I can go on for about four or five more and the only opponent I see here is the Governor's Office of Management and Budget, is that what you see?"

Crespo: "I just pointed out that there was one opponent today.

I'm aware of the other proponents because they can participate in this program."

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

- Harris, D.: "So, it's helpful here I think for the Body, let's follow how the dollars flow here. The Convention and Visitors Bureau up in our area, you're in Schaumburg, I'm in Arlington Heights, and we're somewhat covered by the same convention/visitors bureau which is Meade-Chicago Northwest. And when they book an event, they book an event… it could be a year or even more in advance. Right?"
- Crespo: "That is currently how the system works. Lot of these convention planners need some lead time and it takes them one..."

Harris, D.: "Right."

Crespo: "...or two years before they can commit."

Harris, D.: "Right. Yet the grant is based on the… grants are awarded off the base of the net proceeds received under the Hotel Operators Occupation Tax, for the renting, leasing, or letting of hotel rooms in the municipality for the month… for the month in which the convention, meeting, trade show, or sporting event occurs. So in other words, the grant is based on something which occurs in the future."

Crespo: "Sure."

Harris, D.: "So, that's why we're kind of reaching back to saying an appropriation in a previous years is appropriate to be used for something which is occurring in the future. So, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think it's instructive to follow the flow of the dollars and how the grants are awarded and this Bill makes sense because of the way that conventions and visitors bureaus have to book trade shows and other events. And again, look at the list of proponents. I guarantee you any convention and visitor's bureau in your

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

area is going to be supportive of this Bill. I recommend a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Andersson."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Actually, I remember the predecessor Bill that Representative Crespo brought. And the reason that I opposed that Bill is the same reason I'm going to oppose the Bill today, which is that not every convention center benefits from this. In fact, only certain convention centers benefit because the ... the circumscribed parameters of who qualifies makes it only applicable to a few. So for example, Tinley benefits from it, Schaumburg benefits from it, Springfield benefits from it. However, St. Charles does not. So, the Pheasant Run Private Center has to compete with these other publicly run convention centers. The Q Center in St. Charles has to compete with these and they do not receive any opportunity for this same benefit. So, I don't actually object to the fix that Representative Crespo is bringing for Schaumburg's past situation, I object to the extension of the program because this is going to extend it two years and that's two more years that my communities and my convention centers can't benefit from it. So, any of you who don't reside in those areas, I certainly urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Crespo to close."

Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. Just want to make sure I explained the requirement for the two years. Again, we did find out that many of these convention planners make their decisions a year or two ahead of time. So for... in order for this to become a five year pilot, we need to study extend it for two

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

years to really have a true, five year pilot program. If we show that the model works, there's nothing to say that we could implement this and broaden the scope and allow other municipalities and maybe private convention centers to apply in the future. And I ask for 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 4990 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record.
On a count of 94 voting 'yes', 14 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 4990, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4923, Leader Currie. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4923, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. This is an initiative of the Treasurer's Office to make some technical changes in the Secure Choice Program. First, it aligns the reporting requirements to a fiscal year rather than a calendar year. Which comports with what else happens in the Treasurer's Office and it specifies what kinds of investments the Secure Vote... Choice funds can be used for. And finally, it clarifies that the Secure Choice board has the ability to set a time at which employers will begin to report. And finally, it does say that new reports will be electronically available rather than in paper form. Happy to answer your questions and I would be grateful for your support."

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 4923 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 4923, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Bourne, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

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

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed."

Bourne: "Thank you. Today, I'd like to introduce to the Body my intern for the semester and my Page for today, Andrew Callan. Andrew went back to college at UIS and he's finishing up his degree this semester with an internship here at the Capitol. He's gotten to see some wonderful things happen, hopefully he sees some more. And he will be finishing up at the end of the month. So, we want to say thank you for all the work that he's done and welcome him to be a Page today."

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

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

Hays: "Point of personal privilege, please."

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Sir."

Hays: "I would like the record to reflect that on House Bill 4990, it was my intention to vote 'yes'."

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Speaker Turner: "The Journal will reflect your request. House Bill 4392, Representative McAuliffe. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

McAuliffe: "House Bill 4392, a Bill for Act concerning health.

Third Reading of this Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have House Bill 4392, which is the Breast Density Notification Bill. Forty percent of women over the age of forty have dense breast tissue and the dense breast is the most prevalent of all forms of cancer. Mammograms miss about half of the... half of cancer patients and this Bill would allow the radiologist to confer with the patients if they need to do any further testing. And I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Bellock is recognized."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I just wanted to speak to this, I'm a cosponsor of this Bill. I've been active in this issue with Women in Government, the national group, about cancer prevention for the last eight years. And this Bill is extremely important in detecting canc... breast cancer in women. You will find a lot of women who all of a sudden go to a doctor for a mammogram and find out that they have stage 4 breast cancer and they have been going to their doctors on a yearly basis. This Bill will help prevent that because it allows women to have a special test that can say about the death... dense breast tissue, which is extremely important. I highly recommend this Bill. Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Stuart is recognized."

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

- Stuart: "Thank you. I want to thank you for bringing this Bill.

 I don't know if you remember but last year, I was able to pass a Bill to make sure that women with desperance... dense breast tissue who needed MRI screening, in addition to mammogram screening, were able to have that covered by their insurance. So, I think this is an issue that we always need to keep in the forefront. And I would ask that you could please add me to the Bill. I would appreciate that. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative McAuliffe to close."
- McAuliffe: "Thank you. Hopefully, with passage of this Bill Illinois would become the 34th state in the nation to have an informed Bill on the density of breast. So, thank you very much and I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 4392 pass?'
 All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 113 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 4392, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Long, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Long: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record reflect that I intended... intended on voting 'yes' on 4990. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "The Journal will reflect your request. House Bill 4467, Representative Hurley. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4467, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Speaker Turner: "Representative Hurley."

Hurley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 4467 simply clears up some language in the Higher Education Student Assistant Act. It makes it clear that the natural born children of fire, police, and Department of Corrections need not be born before a disability or death occurs in order to receive a line of duty waiver. There is no objection and I'm here for any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 4467 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. House Bill 4467, having received a Constitutional Majority, is declared passed. House Bill 5019, Representative Manley. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill.

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5019, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Manley."

Manley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 5019 is the Comptroller's Administrative Bill. The Bill makes some technical clean up to laws impacting the Comptroller's Office. Specifically, it updates statute to allow state employees the ability to have part of their wages invested in a state college savings program. Prohibits involuntary withholding deductions of more than 25 percent of each pension or disability payment of an individual. Allows an individual to authorize the Comptroller to deduct an involuntary withholding immediately, waiving the 60 day protest period

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

for the deduction. 5019 makes changes to the Comptroller's Merit Employee Code to conform with Public Act 100-496, which gave hiring preference to National Guard members. And it removes... this is the most important part, it removes the terms ledger and warehouse from the statute to allow the office to rename the programs. There are no opponents."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 5019 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 113 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. House Bill 5019, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4428, Representative Meier. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4428, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Meier."

Meier: "Yes, this Bill was brought to me from a group of Prairie Farm members and the Federal Government last year changed the reporting process and said that the department could go electronic but didn't say they had to. The Illinois Public Health Department went totally electronic and we have dairy farmers that are losing points because they're not leaving this application... the printed sheet in the barn after the inspection. If you lose five points for not having this sheet hung up and you get hit from one other thing, you're no longer shipping Grade A milk, which means you can't sell your milk to Prairie Farms. There is a surplus of milk in the State of

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Illinois. For 70 years, the Health Department has left a written sheet in every dairy barn when they inspected it, we're asking them to do the same thing. Our Amish have no electricity, have no computers, they have no way of printing this sheet out and taking it back to their barn. So, we're asking for a 'yes' vote just to leave a written sheet of the inspection in the dairy barn."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 4428 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 113 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. House Bill 4428, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5121, Representative Mitchell. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5121, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Mitchell."

Mitchell, C.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 5121, it's an initiative of the Comptroller's Office, it's the Truth in Hiring Bill. Now, the practice we're talking about here is called offshoring; it was something that was not pioneered by this Governor, it occurred under previous Governors, including Pat Quinn. But it's something that certainly we've seen a lot of in this administration. And all this Bill is saying is we want to close a loophole in intergovernmental agreements whereby employees in the Governor's Office are being allowed to be offshored to other departments. That's

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

taking away money from corrections, from human services, from other... the state police and it's just an improper practice. Now, that's not a commentary in anyway on the size of the Governor's Office. It is to say that whatever his appropriation is should be proved up to the General Assembly. So, this came out of the committee unanimously with bipartisan support. So, I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Breen."

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

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

Breen: "Representative, the purpose of this offshoring is that the particular executive office holder has staff that they need to employ in order to do their job. But because of the constraints of various budgets, they pull the money from various places to get those staff paid for. I mean, isn't that what we're talking about?"

Mitchell, C.: "That... I think that's one permutation. I think another would be that, historically, it's always been a situation where people want to seem as if they are leading by example. So, they want to reduce the size of their own office relative to asking for other cuts. So, if you can find a way to make your budget appear smaller, can make you appear more fiscally responsible. Again to be clear, Representative, I'm not making a commentary on what the Governor's Office does or does not need. But as you noted, it is a way of putting these in other places. Whereas otherwise, you might prove up that hey we need this person to be hired and to be in this office."

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

- Breen: "Am I reading your Bill, correctly? That this is only applicable to the Office of the Governor, so it doesn't apply to Comptroller, it doesn't apply to the Treasurer?"
- Mitchell, C.: "So, my understanding, Representative, is that they do not have the capability to this right now. It's a particular loophole in the IGA Act that is specifically for the Governor's Office and so this is closing that loophole. I'm actually... I'm also by the way, Representative, not aware of other constitutional officers who have engaged in this practice. This was engaged in by... it's been engaged in by this Governor but also by the previous Governor who was Democratic."
- Breen: "As I had understood, and, yeah, I think it's been multiple governors that have done this..."
- Mitchell, C.: "Correct."
- Breen: "...but, I thought even those other offices, the Treasurer's Office, the Comptroller's Office, they have employees paid through funds that maybe don't necessarily match with the employee's purpose. I think there are court reporters being paid for out of certain funds that are not necessarily allocated for them and others."
- Mitchell, C.: "Representative, I would take your word for it. I'm just not aware of that. And to my understanding, the language of this Bill deals with specifically with an IGA loophole for the Governor's Office."
- Breen: "Well then, what is... I guess, what is this Governor or future Governor supposed to do when they need to hire someone to do a job and now we would prevent them from being able..."

 Mitchell, C.: "They should allocate."

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Breen: "...to do it?"

Mitchell, C.: "They should come before the proper appropriations committee and they should ask for their budget to be increased by the amount of that line item. Again, at least for me, this is not a commentary on the needs of Governor's Office, the size of the Governor's budget. It is to say that insofar as you want to hire an employee to work for you as the Governor, you ought to ask the General Assembly for that appropriation rather than falsely reduce the size of your own line item while taking away money from departments like the State Police or other offices."

Breen: "But... and I guess part of the issue I keep getting at is, as I understand it, I've been informed that, you know, the Governor's Office head count is somewhere around 120 or 150. Whereas the Treasurer and the Comptroller, who are controlled by the Democrats, their headcount is somewhere in the 300s.

Mitchell, C.: "Okay."

Breen: "And so, ...

Mitchell, C. "Representative, respectfully that's..."

Breen: "...the Governor is supposed to be the chief executive of the state and he's got... I mean we expect him to execute over a broad range duties. And so allowing him to move functions back and forth as he sees fit is part of... that's part of our constitutional structure."

Mitchell, C.: "Yeah. So, Representative, respectfully, you're sort of comparing apples and monkeys. What we're talking about is not whether or not the Governor's Office should have more employees or a higher budget. But when..."

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Breen: "And just to be clear, who's the apple and who's the monkey between the Governor and the Comptroller?"

Mitchell, C.: "I was referring to the two situations rather than the two personalities..."

Breen: "Okay."

Mitchell, C.: "...involved, Representative. But you're welcome to make that application if you'd like to."

Breen: "I was just asking who you were calling which."

Mitchell, C.: "But what I'm saying is when you have a situation where the Governor's Office has 102 employees and 58... only 58 of them, I think 58 of them are on someone else's payroll, that's a problem. Right? So, it's not a commentary on whether or not he needed to hire a Secretary of Education for \$250 thousand. The question was why he didn't come before the General Assembly and ask for that appropriation in his office. So, the issue is not about the size, or the scope, or whether or not he needs to hire people. The issue is you ought to prove up your budget. You ought to come before the General Assembly, ask for what you need, and defend it. And then we continue to fulfil our constitutional role in process of being a check and balance on that office."

Breen: "Again, I go back to the issue of your... your Bill seems like just a bunch of show. Because all of those budgets fall under his executive authority, he is the chief executive, he has that power. Whether he's a Republican or Democrat and we expect him to execute the office. And if we unduly limit, well we say oh, well you can only have so many people in your office even though we know you need these other people. I mean, why... why do we even..."

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Mitchell, C.: "Sir, Representative I'm sorry...

Breen: "...why do we even put this in?"

Mitchell, C.: "...but I object to the underlying premise of your question and your assertion because if I appropriate X million dollars to Department of Human Services I'm expecting that money to go toward whether it be cancer screenings, immunizations, Medicaid, whatever it is. I don't expect it go toward paying \$250 thousand for an education secretary. Now, it's not that we don't necessarily need an education secretary; it's that ought to go in the Governor's budget 'cause she's performing a Governor's budget management function. So, the question is, how do we properly do fiscal planning. Now, the Governor, as I understand it, was a relatively successful businessman before he got here and they do long term fiscal planning in the financial sector. I see no reason why you can't do that in the Governor's Office."

Breen: "And to the Bill. This... this Bill seems like an unnecessary constraint on the chief executive of the state. It seems like we're playing partisan politics. So, when we've got a Democrat in the Office of the Governor we're going to let them do whatever they want. Get the Republican in, we're going to tie his hands so tightly that he can't do his job. While at the same time funding the Democrat Treasurer, the Democrat Comptroller healthfully. We have a strong chief executive under the Illinois Constitution. We should allow the chief executive to do the job that they are expected to do. If they are overspending, well fine. Call them in front of the General Assembly and ask them to account for the overspending. But the way to do this is not to unnecessarily and really,

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

politically gamesmanship wise to tie their hands of doing the job that they were elected to do by the people of the State of Illinois. We all know from day one that Governor Rauner took office, the Democrats have pretended that he wasn't actually elected by a majority of the people of the State of Illinois. And this is yet another Bill to try to say, oh well got you, you know didn't do this right or that right. He's just trying to make this state run and this Bill will only harm our Governor in terms of being able to that. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Jimenez."

Jimenez: "Question of the Sponsor, Mr. Speaker."

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

Jimenez: "Representative, can you talk to us a little bit about the effective date of this Bill?"

Mitchell, C.: "Yeah. So we, thank you for that question, we actually amended this Bill to deal with the effective date. And so, let me just you sort of a concrete example of how this would work. So, immediate effective dates, what would for example, we pass this Bill now it will apply to the budget for this year. So, as a concrete example, budget fiscal year is passed on May 31, but House Bill 5121 is signed into to law on June 1. The prohibition applies to the following fiscal year. If however, we pass the Bill... I'm sorry, the Bill was signed on June 1 and the budget's passed after June 1, then the prohibition applies and the budget must be in congruous with it for this year. "

Jimenez: "So, if we were to pass this Bill today, and we're simultaneously working on the budget, it would be the

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

responsibility of the General Assembly to make that higher appropriation to the Governor's Office in this budget coming up."

- Mitchell, C.: "Pursuant to his request, correct."
- Jimenez: "But he's already made his budget address and his request. So, that would obviously have to be adjusted..."
- Mitchell, C.: "Correct."
- Jimenez: "...if we were to include and that would come out of the General Assembly."
- Mitchell, C.: "Well again, I would imagine that adjustment would be at the behest of the Governor's Office. 'Cause we would be talking about potentially some reshuffling of personnel. So, I don't want to presume to speak for the second floor, but yes, pursuant to the Governor making such a request, or us deciding to make such a modification, we would then have to adjust appropriately; yes, ma'am.
- Jimenez: "And you've made this Amendment so that people wouldn't immediately if they're under the... an agreement of another agency."
- Mitchell, C.: "And to avoid confusion and to make sure that the Governor's Office had clear indication of what our expectations were for them this year."
- Jimenez: "Okay. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. One of the concerns we had in committee was about the effective date of this Bill because we didn't want there to be an unnecessary layoff. This has been a practice by administrations other than this one in the past. To me, this is a matter of good public policy and as long we can work it out. We can come to agreement with

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

the General Assembly on an appropriate appropriation. I advise an 'aye' vote on this Bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Fortner."

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

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

Fortner: "I'd like to follow up a little bit on the previous speakers question because I think the Amendment did some things even beyond perhaps what was discussed. As I understand the Amendment, and correct me if I'm wrong, if it were the case that our appropriations were enacted before..."

Mitchell, C.: "Representative, I'm just going to ask you to restart question, I was having a little trouble hearing. Sorry about that."

Fortner: "No problem. If the appropriations for fiscal '19 were enacted before your Bill became law, then in fact those appropriations for fiscal '19 wouldn't be affected. In fact then in that case, it would fiscal '20 would be first affected year. Is that correct?"

Mitchell, C.: "That's correct, Representative."

Fortner: "So, I think it actually is even more protective, the Amendment, than what was perhaps discussed in the previous line of questioning. In that not only would not affect people who were covered by budgets enacted for fiscal '18, but potentially, depending on what the sequence of legislations, should this become law, should there be an appropriation where that would come into play with this law, what the sequence of those two Bills would be. So, it could be that this wouldn't even affect anything until fiscal 2020 is the way I read it."

Mitchell, C.: "It could be depending on sequence of events."

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Fortner: "I would also add that, at least during my term here, this being the third Governor certainly, as you have pointed out, this has been a practice used by a number of administrations. And I think one of our duties as a Body is to say if we want appropriations to be used for a particular thing that is our prerogative as the General Assembly. We have had years where we've actually given the Governor lump sum authority and say we don't have a direction and we just going to give the Governor authority. I think we did that for the fiscal 2011 budget if memory serves me right. So, we can make that direction if we want to provide latitude, we have the ability to do that to. Wouldn't that be a reasonable assessment of what we have and could do?

Mitchell, C.: "Representative, I think you've articulated what I was trying to speak to for one of the previous speakers, which is the appropriate of the General Assembly in the appropriations and learning from past mistakes and doing things better. So, I would agree with that Representative."

Fortner: "Well, thank you very much. I will be supporting your Bill. Thank you."

Mitchell, C.: "Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Wehrli."

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

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

Wehrli: "Representative, does this Bill sunset?"

Mitchell, C.: "Not to my understanding."

Wehrli: "So, this will apply to every person that holds office on the second floor until this Legislative Body or the one the across rotunda decides to change this law...

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Mitchell, C.: "That's correct, Representative."

Wehrli: "This will apply..."

Mitchell, C.: "Yes."

Wehrli: "...to everyone going forward?"

Mitchell, C.: "Correct. Yes, Sir."

Wehrli: "To the Bill. The only thing I would like to add to the conversation, which I thought is tie traded out pretty well, is the appropriations process here. I think it needs to be a little more transparent on all sides and how we go about it in a public setting and I think things like this should be publicly discussed in appropriations hearings for all to see. I urge an 'aye' vote on this Bill.

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative McSweeney."

McSweeney: "Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. This is a good, transparency
Bill; truth in accounting. The budget right now for the
Governor's Office is 4.8 million but over \$10 million is being
spent. We have a Governor who says that he wants to cut
spending, he could do it. We have two Deputy Governors, we
have a Lieutenant Governor, so that's a good place to cut the
budget. So, this is a great Bill. It's a Bill for
transparency, it's a Bill for reducing spending in this state.
I urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Keith Wheeler is recognized."
Wheeler, K.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Turner: "Sponsor indicates he will yield."

Wheeler, K.: "Representative, I voted for this Bill in committee.

And I just was going through my analysis again and reflecting
on a Appropriations: General Services meeting yesterday with
Do It. And I wanted to make sure your legislative intent is

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

not to prevent interagency agreements that would prevent employees from one office, in this case Department of Innovation and Technology, being used in the Governor's Office. Because right now, they're paid in a structure that's like a back and forth."

Mitchell, C.: "Representative, it would not apply to that specific situation."

Wheeler, K.: "I wanted to put it on the record. Thank you very much."

Mitchell, C.: "No problem."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Mitchell to close."

Mitchell, C.: "Well, thank you everyone for the debate and thank you to my friends across the aisle who are supporting this Bill, for your help throughout this process. Thank you to Comptroller Mendoza for bringing this issue to the attention of the General Assembly. As has been mentioned by previous speakers, this is not just an issue with this current Governor. Though he's been prolific with it, he was not a pioneer. This is an issue that... that Democratic Governors have abused as well. So, this is a chance to get our appropriations with the actual needs of the Governor's Office. To be transparent, to save taxpayers some money, and to make our operations more efficient. I'd urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 5121 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting
is open. Have all vote who wish? Have all voted who wish?
Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record.
On a count of 110 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

'present'. House Bill 5121, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative David Harris, for what reason do you seek recognition."

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I spoke on support House Bill 4990 and unfortunately I was called off the floor before the vote and I was listed as not voting. I wanted to show that I would have voted in support of that Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Journal will reflect your request. House Bill 5247, Representative Pritchard. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5247, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Pritchard."

Pritchard: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. This Bill would amend the School Code to recognize that there is a growing trend across our country in implementing, again, apprenticeship programs in schools. This is an initiative that has been brought forward by the Illinois Manufacturing Association to recognize that there are a lot of wonderful careers that are available that don't require a college education. But are the result of apprenticeship program where they learn the skills that necessary. And this Bill would require that the State Board of Education begin a process of writing rules to allow this to happen in our schools for an individual 16 years of age and older. I'd be happy to answer your questions."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Flowers is recognized."

Flowers: "Representative Prichard, is this a mandate?"

Pritchard: "It is not a mandate."

Flowers: "And why is it not mandate?"

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Pritchard: "Because we believe in choice."

Flowers: "Choice. And what choice would the people have if this program was not available?"

Pritchard: "Well, the State Board will write the rules and it'll be up to citizens to encourage their school districts to take advantage of it."

Flowers: "Is it in current law now that the State Board shall provide some type of technology or apprentice program dealing with vocational education or technology?"

Pritchard: "Well, certainly that they provide some. And you passed a Bill yesterday that talks about higher technology and we need to encourage our school districts to do that, to have computer training and many other things that students today are going to need in their working career."

Flowers: "And what is your Bill doing, Sir?"

Pritchard: "My Bill would require the State Board to begin writing rules that would allow 16 year olds to participate in a apprenticeship program where they would be employed with an employer during their school year and also take the necessary classes for graduation."

Flowers: "Can you explain to me the definition of the word require?"

Pritchard: "I don't have Webster in front of me. But it would be one that..."

Flowers: "Can you Google it, please?"

Pritchard: "Excuse me?"

Flowers: "Can you Google it?"

Pritchard: "I'm sorry, I didn't hear you?"

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Flowers: "Would please Google the word? Because I just want to make sure..."

Pritchard: "Well the..."

Flowers: "...that the definition of required is like shall, and is not like may."

Pritchard: "Those are good adjectives."

Flowers: "Pardon me?"

Pritchard: "Those are good adjectives."

Flowers: "I'm not going to argue the point. Representative, quite frankly, I think your Bill is fantastic and current law to a certain degree applies this already. It is up to the State Board of Education to do just what you and I man... are mandating by requiring... by saying that they shall do these things. And this is in the best interest of the state. So, I would encourage everyone to please vote 'yes' on House Bill 5247 and would you please add me as a Sponsor."

Pritchard: "Be my pleasure."

Flowers: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Pritchard to close."

Pritchard: "I would ask for your support."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 5247 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 5247, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 55... excuse me, House Bill 4531, Representative Moylan. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4531, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, please take this Bill out of the record. House Bill 5180, Representative Rita. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5180, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Rita."
- Rita: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 5180 is a Bill to fix an audit issue at the Department of Lottery. Basically, changes the date when they deposit money in the various accounts and especially into the... or not the various accounts, the Capitol Projects Fund from July 1 to September 30."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate the question is, 'Shall House Bill 5180 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 5180, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4508, Representative Sauer. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4508, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Sauer."
- Sauer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to present House Bill 4508. It's the extension to the Illinois Water Systems Viability Act. The Act allows municipalities to receive fair market value, if they choose, to sell their water or their

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

water systems. The Bill extends the sunset, makes technical changes, and permits any size community, not just small municipalities, to access the good parts of this program. Communities remain in control, this is not a mandate. And the new language in this is for a 10 year extension and it will permer... permit, as I said, any size community to benefit from the programs options while providing existing customers with all existing consumer protections. As you can see, if you look up at the board, this is a bipartisan Bill. We have a great group of cosponsors. It is also an agreed Bill between Labor and Business, IML, and many others. And I'd ask for a favorable vote and I'm happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Spain."

Spain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. You know there's few people that I have better respect for than the Sponsor of this initiative and I thank him for bringing it forward. But, I rise in opposition to this Bill. And I think we need to be careful about the way that we are approaching the ability for private water systems to acquire public water systems throughout the state and the mechanism that they use to finance those acquisitions. Because the mechanism is for the existing ratepayers to really be responsible for the costs of those acquisitions. This practice began five years ago, really as a pilot, and this Bill expands. So, we're one, expanding this Bill, this practice, for 10 years. Which I think is uncustomary for this Body, with the way that we normally approach sunsets. Ten years is far too long. We also now allow the acquisition of any size public water system, where the previous version of this legislation really was

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

limited to small communities, small systems. The reason that matters is that even the protections that were originally include in the legislation to make sure that existing ratepayers weren't hit with too much of a rate increase, really are now insufficient the way we have seen private water systems continue to proliferate throughout the state by buying up existing municipal systems. So, I think we need to have caution on this issue. And I appreciate what the Sponsor is doing, but water systems don't work the same way that our private electric utilities work. There's not a ubiquitous, grid providing power. Usually, water contains important local sources and when you allow these systems to be acquired by a private operator and then paid for by the existing customers, I think you're doing a disservice to so many of those existing customers. So, if you represent a private... if you represent constituents that have a private water utility, I would urge your caution on this Bill. Because you're likely delivering a future rate increase for those constituents. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Hays."

Hays: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. As a... as a former mayor of a small community, this dynamic is imperative as small communities grapple going forward with how are they going to handle their utility responsibilities? How are they going to handle the aging water system in their community? How are they going to handle an aging waste water system in their community with increasing demands in term of rules and regulation, et cetera? This is a method for those communities to be able to contemplate the reality of the future. And the

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

reality of the future is that the attempt to continue to run their water and/or sanitary sewer system on their own, will result in tens of millions of dollars of investment that cannot possibly be covered by the local citizenry. It will result in the fair market value of those systems being substantially less than the system is actually valued at. And this is a pathway for a small community to really do two things. Not have an enormous increase to citizens for a system that they can't possibly support, but yet be in a conversation with a utility that will be in a position to offer a fair market value for the existing system and rates that do not go out of control once the transaction is completed. This is ... there's also cover as it relates to the ICC still being in charge of these rate cases. There's no evidence that there's been any rate increases for any of the communities involved that are out of line. And it really allows for, again, what I would term a... the small communities reality that this is an extraordinarily viable step forward that ensures three things. One, that the service continues uninterrupted, is managed in a professional fashion, fair market value is realized for the system that's been maintained decades usually by the small community. And probably most importantly, that the rate situation does not become exorbitant and one that is simply unmanageable. I support this Bill, I thank the Sponsor for bringing it forward and I urge your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Connor."

Connor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I represent a significant number of customers of Illinois American Water in

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

the Bolingbrook area. Based on numbers from 2011, although Bolingbrook gave up its municipal water system in a swap deal with IAW in 2002, statistics from 2011 show that the average annual rate increase for my constituents in Bolingbrook during the course of that time was 16 percent a year. That's simply unacceptable and I think that the turnover of what had been a public utility, where obviously the constituents have the ability to vote people on and off of a Village Board if that Village Board is not responsive enough, to then place that in the hand... hands of a private company that is not responsible to the constituents by way of voting is basically kind... undemocratic in the process. And as we have seen, the rates substantially increase. It's particularly troubling in this piece of legislation that the upward ceiling 7,500 households has now been removed from this provision so that both Illinois American Water and Aqua can acquire systems that are far larger and then force all their other ratepayers to pick up the cost of that instead of the shareholders. Obviously today, if this Bill passes, if I was ... if I was a stakeholder in IAW or Aqua, I would absolutely dancing a jig, because I know that I have income increase for the foreseeable future. But I don't think that this is doing any favors for any of my constituents in Bolingbrook who currently have two lawsuits pending against IAW, both to clawback rates and also to attempt to obtain control along other municipalities over the water supply from Lake Michigan that comes through Bedford Park. So, given the fact that the residents of Bolingbrook have been complaining about their rates, and they have two pending lawsuits against IAW, I obviously cannot support this

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

legislation. I think it's basically taxation without representation and I would urge a 'no' vote from the Members. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Wehrli."

Wehrli: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. We need to be really careful here. When public assets are sold in Illinois, we usually do not see a public benefit. I can reference the Chicago Parking Meters when we talk about janitorial contracts at public schools. We do not see a net positive income. So as our municipalities and other local units of government are facing more and more financial strain, they're going to be under more and more pressure to sell assets, probably at a rate that they... that will not benefit the current owners of those assets. So, this is... this to me is the start of a slippery slope that we probably don't want to go down. This should be allowed to sunset. If we need to come back and rework how we go through this process. I mean we've heard of water rates in Bolingbrook going up 16 percent a year. We have other examples throughout the state of selling assets to the private sector does typically not bode well for our residents. I strongly urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Reick."

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

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

Reick: "Couple of questions on the Bill itself. Are there... what type of companies are subject to this Bill? Are there companies that are not subject to the terms of this Bill?

Sauer: "There are smaller companies that are not outlined in the beginning of this Bill. It talks about the size and the scope.

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

They are many of the larger, more reputable companies that have been in business for many years. So, they provide those consumer protections already for people. What's interesting about this five years that we've had in this pilot program is that the companies that are currently utilizing this program, and that communities have utilized to do it, we've seen rates... there's one company where there have been seven acquisitions and four times the rates have gone down. So, what we're seeing is actually it's a very good program, it has had consumer protections, but they are for some larger companies that have been in existence for many years that are doing a fine job."

Reick: "What types of protections for rate increases are in... for consumers are included in this Bill, please?"

Sauer: "So actually, it's specified in the Bill that there is... I believe it's a 2.5 percent cap for any increases. So, it specified their provisions. The ICC will still man... monitor these and there's still that oversight from the ICC, as well."

Reick: "Then did the previous Representative's question about 16 percent rate increases under IAW, how does that square with what's in this Bill? If this Bill is an extension that increase ought to be in the original Bill, is that correct?"

Sauer: "Is that a question to me? Sorry."

Reick: "Yeah it was."

Sauer: "Yeah, I guess it was. They could have actually acquired that through a different process and it could have been prior to this five year window in response to that. I know that there's a study that I looked at; some acquisitions have happened in data that has been presented from 2011, which would have been before this process became..."

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Reick: "So, are you..."

Sauer: "...law..."

Reick: "...so..."

Sauer: "...in the State of Illinois."

Reick: "So, are you saying that a contract that was entered into prior to this Bill is grandfathered in and is not subject to the provisions of the rate increase?"

Sauer: "What... what this would be is anything that's acquired during that period, Representative."

Reick: "During the period. Okay, fine. The reason I ask is that the Village of Johnsburg, up in my district, has a water system that's owned by one of the companies that is not a part of this legislation, it's too small. And we're dealing with like a 640 percent increase in water and sewer rates."

Sauer: "Then this would help them because this would provide that provision and that...

Reick: "Except for...

Sauer: "...super protection."

Reick: "...except for the company that owns the water company... or water system is not..."

Sauer: "Correct."

Reick: "...subject to this Bill because of the size of this company.

Sauer: "Correct."

Reick: "So, I guess the question is, why... why do we have exemptions for smaller companies that you know are possibly..."

Sauer: "I think the answer to that question, as I said before, is the bandwidth of some companies to come into a community that may only have a few thousand people. The reason why this is opening is... this up is to provide clean water for many

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

communities. And so if you are smaller community, you may not have the bandwidth to do the coverage for a variety in many communities. So, it's the reason for the language being the way that it is."

Reick: "So, the elimination of the 7,500 cap, the 7,500 household cap, would seem to me that if you are able to buy a water system with a hundred thousand homes in it that a necessary cost, you know, a necessary improvements to the system will be spread out among a larger number of ratepayers and thus each one will... will endure a smaller increase. Is that the theory?"

Sauer: "In theory, yes."

Reick: "Very good."

"And the reason for this cap, there are communities that Sauer: maybe 8,100 people, they can't have access to this program. And we have seen... we saw it in Quincy, we saw it in Flint, Michigan. And with all due respect to previous a Representative talking about parking meters and the selling of assets, the reality is, the selling of a parking meter as an asset does not threaten anyone's health. We're talking about making sure that we can clean drinking water for people. There're some in our state where they're... we need to lift this cap because they're at 8,100, not 7,500. So, I think that if we're going to do the good work of the people and make sure that if a community chooses to go this route, because they can't afford to do it on their own, that afford them that ability so they can have clean water and make sure they manage their community effectively."

Reick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Or I guess..."

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Speaker Currie: "Representative Currie in the Chair.

Representative Guzzardi. Representative Guzzardi."

Guzzardi: "Thank you. There we are. Thank you, Madam Speaker.
Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Currie: "The Sponsor will yield."

Guzzardi: "Thanks. Representative Sauer, we talked about this Bill a little bit on the floor and you mentioned some of the proponents. But we... you didn't mention either then or in your presentation of the Bill the environmental groups who were opposed. Can you discuss their opposition briefly?"

Sauer: "I'm not sure on the opposition. I believe that the Sierra Club filed. I'm not sure the extent of their opposition."

Guzzardi: "Food and Water Watch, also do you have a sense of the nature..."

Sauer: "Oh, I didn't have them listed. I..."

Guzzardi: "Okay."

Sauer: "...I don't know the nature of that."

Guzzardi: "What it is that they might be opposed to about this Bill?"

Sauer: "I don't know the answer to that."

Guzzardi: "Would it be fair to speculate that they might concerned about limited regulation and oversight over these private companies that are running our public water systems?"

Sauer: "I'm sorry, say... say that again."

Guzzardi: "Would it be fair to speculate that they might concerned about diminished regulatory oversight?"

Sauer: "I don't want to speculate. I've learned very early in this process that I don't want to think for anyone and I

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

certainly don't want to speak for anyone. I know that they didn't testify in committee, so I'm not exactly sure why."

Guzzardi: "I understand. To the Bill, briefly. I will do the speculating if Representative Sauer won't. I think that the risk of losing regulatory oversight over our waterways is very serious and the risk of potential environmental damage to our communities is serious as well. I'm also proud to stand in strong agreement with Representative Wehrli about his concerns over privatization of public assets. We've seen in the City of Chicago and elsewhere around the country, a tremendous harm to the public when we sell off our public goods for private profit. So I stand in opposition to this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Representative Phillips."

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

Speaker Currie: "He indicates he will."

Phillips: "Sir, just a quick question, it's technically I guess.

I noticed that this... the town that was sold to Illinois

American Water their waterways and then the company came in

and did two million dollars' worth of renovations to the

waterways. Is that correct?"

Sauer: "That is correct."

Phillips: "And I guess my question is I see that your proponents are the AFL-CIO and some of the Local 150. So I assume that work was done with prevailing wage rates?"

Sauer: "I believe so."

Phillips: "Okay. So, even though it's a private company, it still had the prevailing wage rates on that?"

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

- Sauer: "I believe that was the decision of the company's, but yes."
- Phillips: "Would that be any purchase that American Water or any other company bought? All of that would since they're selling water to residents..."
- Sauer: "I'm sorry I couldn't hear that. I had Representative Reis squeaking in my ear. Could you repeat that?"
- Phillips: "Representative Reis, could you please keep it down?

 Thank you. I guess my question is, I mean you may not know
 the answer, but any purchase of waterways, local waterways,
 any of the work that's done would be done then prevailing
 wage rates?"

Sauer: "Yes."

- Phillips: "I guess I'm curious how then they end up lowering their rates? That's..."
- Sauer: "Well, I think that the reality is that you have, and I don't know their business, right. So, I don't work for the business. I'm not operating in the business. I'm not exactly sure to answer that. But in a business, you know, unlike in some communities you have to do prevailing wage as well. So, the issue that I think is before us is they've got to manage their project and go through it and they found a way. And like I said before, there's one community or... pardon me, there's one company that's offered this seven different times, their rates have gone down. But as you said before, you've got a municipality that could not afford to do their infrastructure on their own. The only option that they had was to go private. They made that choice, they were able to

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

do it. And actually in that community their rates did go down to offer clean water."

Phillips: "And you know of no communities where the rates went up when these took place?"

Sauer: "I mean if there's seven and four, then three, potentially, may have gone up or stayed the same. I know that in four of those they went down."

Phillips: "Okay. Thank you, Representative."

Sauer: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Representative Unes."

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

Speaker Currie: "Indicates he will."

Unes: "Representative, there seems to be some confusion on this... on this Bill and I think you were trying to clear up some of it. I'd just like to reiterate I think what you were saying to a previous speaker not long ago. Just to be clear, there is nothing in this Bill that would require municipalities to sell, correct?"

Sauer: "Correct, correct."

Unes: "So, this Bill pretty much is saying that if a municipality makes that decision on their own, makes that local decision on their own and they want to, this Bill is providing protection and saying that it must be sold at fair market value. Is that correct?"

Sauer: "That is correct and to one... to add one more thing, in some cases these companies are actually made to follow standards even higher. So, they're made and investigated and looked into for EPA standards to make sure their water is even clean."

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Unes: "Well, thank you for that clarification. Because as I was listening to this Bill, I wasn't... I wasn't hearing that part of the debate. And so, I think that is an important part of this debate and this Bill that says this is a local control Bill and gives the municipalities some protection if they make that decision on their own and want to sell, that they are going to receive fair market value for the asset. Thank you for your work on this and your sponsorship on this, Representative and I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Representative Manley."

Manley: "Thank you, Speaker. To the Bill. I represent the other half of Bolingbrook that Representative Connor mentioned. been inundated with e-mails, calls from constituents that have found themselves in this situation for a long time. Their rates are high, the village has two pending lawsuits since 2010 to try to get out from under the situation that IAW has gotten them into. And I stand opposed to this Bill and it puts a lot of other municipalities in jeopardy. And while they may find themselves in the same situation that Bolingbrook is in, while they're going through that, everybody else who's in this situation with Bolingbrook pays for this. So, although just really adore the Sponsor, such a nice, young man, I would ask that you do not support this legislation. And I know there's many, many people that are may be hurt by this. So, I would love for you reconsider it at some point. But, I stand opposed. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Representative Wehrli's name was used in debate and he's taking his option of having a second bite at the apple. Representative Wehrli."

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Wehrli: "Thank you, Madam Chairman. I would just like to once again reiterate that once we start selling public assets, bad things typically happen. If we could let this sunset, let's work together collaborately to find a way that we could allow this process to happen. So, there is a solution here, this isn't it. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Currie: "Final discussion, Representative Ives."

"Thank you. To the Bill. I think it's important to note that the City of Alton, right now, is in negotiations with Illinois American Water to actually sell their plant and sewer system. And they specifically cited in this report that they did that 'it's something we are going to have to do because other things involved with the city. Like the pension debt obligation we cannot afford, ' said Alderman Charles Brake in that for... February 14 meeting. The treatment plant is in bad shape requiring several million dollars in repairs. This is not something you necessarily want to do, but the city is not in the position to meet the pension obligation in the next several years. So a core responsibility of a city would be absolutely to provide a service like water to its residents. Unfortunately, they have other obligations that are eating up their city funds. So, in walks Illinois American Water, somebody was willing and... obviously able to provide that type of service to the residents. However, I do urge this Body to exercise caution. Which why... is why I think a 10 year sunset is too far out. I've had my own issues with a constituent in Winfield literally being charged double the rates that right next door we have in Wheaton, of which we have a public system and they have Illinois American Water. And when we went to

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

relief at the Illinois Commerce Commission, it was pretty alarming that... I really believe that they were not given a fair hearing nor was it fairly disclosed exactly how these rates are prepared and if there was going to be any relief in the future from ever increasing rates. And so, that is my concern. I have the same concern as Representative Wehrli that when we look at selling a public asset, whether it's a skyway, or parking meters, or other things, that we have to be really concerned about how functional are things like the Illinois Commerce Commission in holding down the rates and holding private companies accountable. That's not to say that Illinois American Water can't do the good job of delivering services, it's just at what cost. So, at this point I'm not willing to sign on to a Bill with a 10 year sunset and I think more negotiation and more protection for ratepayers need to be put into this Bill before the rest of the General Assembly were to sign onto it. Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Representative McDermed."

McDermed: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I also represent a district with two different sets of Illinois American Customers. And they have been besieging my office with requests that we vote 'no' on this Bill. So, it seems like every set of Illinois American Water customers in the state has stepped up and said, you don't want to get mixed up with these people. They raise your rates and the Illinois Commerce Commission gives you no relief. Please vote 'no'."

Speake Currie: "No further discussion. Representative Sauer to close."

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Sauer: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and thank you for the healthy debate in this chamber. I just want to make something clear. I did not pull my hair out due to this Bill. The reality is simply this, I've heard a 10 year window on this. I think we need to provide some certainty to communities that are investigating this option, for companies to go through the engineering. This has been a successful program for five years. We've had a lot of conversations, been top of mine for people over clean water in our state as well as other areas. As communities, large and small, are hurting and they're crunched for cash, this simply gives them a choice to if they want to, from a local control standpoint, make determination if it fits the integrity of their community to go private. The track record on these companies is good, the ICC's provisions and consumer protections are still there, and part of this Bill is to make sure rates do not increase at a really rapid rate but at a 2.5 percent; if they go up, and in some cases they haven't. I would urge an 'aye' vote for those communities that want to explore this and thank you for your time."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Sauer moves for passage of House Bill 4508. And on this question, all in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this measure, there are 69 voting 'yes', 37 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having achieved the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Continuing on Third Readings, we have House

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Bill 5214, Representative Sente. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5214, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Sente."

Sente: "Thank you. House Bill 5014 (sic-5214) is a routine cleanup Bill to last year's Angel Tax Credit Bill. As with last year's Bill, this is a great Bill for small business and specifically innovative startups. The Bill comes from DCEO. It is bipartisan and without any opponents. The Bill does two things, it revises the definition of applicant to clarify that an Angel Tax Credit investor cannot receive a tax credit for investing in an entity in which the investor has 51 percent or more ownership. The second change is that last year we established two set aside credits for rural areas and areas of high unemployment. This Bill clarifies that if those set—asides are not used up by the end of the third quarter, the unused funds can be rolled into the remaining funds and accessed for credit by any eligible company in the final calendar quarter."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Sente moves passage of House Bill 5214. And on that, is there any discussion? Seeing none, all in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 110 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having achieved the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. We're now going to House

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Bill 4911, Representative Thapedi. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4911, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Thapedi."

Thapedi: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 4911 is an initiative of the surgeons in the context of outpatient surgeries. It ensures that licensed ambulatory surgical treatment centers and accredited ambulatory surgical treatment facilities are both covered under the auspices of the Health Care Services Lien Act. The concerns of the trial lawyers and the hospitals have all been put aside. There is no opposition, I'm available to answer any and all questions."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Thapedi moves passage of House Bill 4911. On that, is there any discussion? Seeing none the... on the Motion, all in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Clerk, take the record. On this Motion, there are 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having achieved the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. We will now go to House Bill 5490, Representative Sosnowski. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5490, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Sosnowski."

Sosnowski: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. I rise on House Bill 5490, which deals with downstate police chief pensions. Many Members of the House may remember

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Representative Wehrli passed a Bill last year which will take effect in 2019 in regards to police chiefs taking or being eligible for a secondary pension. So, in the meantime while that Bill will take place in about... or will be in enacted within a year, it will be effective. This Bill allows for a little bit of cleanup for those agreed upon contracts between police chiefs and communities to allow for those chiefs to be able to opt out of receiving a second pension. I know of no opposition to this, I think this will be a great Bill and continues to move that process forward. Thank you and I'm available for any questions."

- Speaker Currie: "Representative Sosnowski moves for passage of House Bill 5490. And on that question, Representative Wehrli, whose name was used in debate, wants to speak. Representative Wehrli."
- Wehrli: "Inquiry of the Chair. If your name is used in debate before you get a chance to speak, do you get two bites at the apple?"

Speaker Currie: "No."

- Wehrli: "Okay. So this is... this is good cleanup language. I strongly urge an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Representative Andersson."
- Andersson: "I'd just like to... thank you, Madam Speaker. To the Bill. I'd just like to urge the chamber to stop using Grant Wehrli's name in debate. Every time you say Grant Wehrli's name, he's going to hit his button. So, stop saying Grant Wehrli."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Sosnowski moves for passage of House Bill 5490. And on that Motion, all in favor vote 'aye';

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

opposed 'no'. And voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? On this... on this Motion, 108 vote 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having... Clerk, please take the record. And this Bill, having achieved the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Crespo, for what reason do you rise?"

Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. I'd just like the record to reflect that on House Bill 5214, it was my intention to vote 'yes'.

Speaker Currie: "The record will so reflect. House Bill 4765, Representative Leader Turner. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4765, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Turner."

Turner: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the Body. House Bill 4765 requires that by January 1, 2020, Cook County must adopt and implement a predictable fee schedule that eliminates surcharges and other additional fees to record standard documents with the County Recorder. Last year, Legislature passed a law that requires every county, except Cook County, because Cook County's fees were set by different statute, to establish a predictable fee schedule for the ... recordation of documents in those counties. The fact that Cook County was not included in this legislation was an oversight. This legislative proposal would allow the Cook County Board to establish a predictable fee schedule that is similar to the one that was passed last year for every other county in Illinois. I know of no opposition and I ask for an 'aye' vote."

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Speaker Currie: "Representative Turner moves for passage of House Bill 4765. And on that measure, is there any discussion? Seeing none, all in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this Measure, there are 74 voting 'aye', 37 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having achieved the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. We're now going to House Bill 5011, that's Representative Spain. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5011, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Spain."

Spain: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. House Bill 5011 is a follow up to legislation passed last year. And it simply states that a food service certificate for food service sanitation managers are valid until their date of expiration. I know of no opponents, I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Spain moves for passage of House Bill 5011. And on that is there any discussion? Seeing none, all in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this measure, there are 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5696, Representative Welch. Clerk, please read the Bill."

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5696, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Welch."

Welch: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. House Bill 5696 creates the Higher Education Statewide Bridge Program. What this Bill would do, it would create a program that would provide access, academic support, and financial aid to students who show promise for succeeding in college. This Bill would help us end what is known summer melt and get those students who would otherwise be in college... in college, in the seats that our universities currently have and hopefully end a lot of the brain drain that's going on in our state. I am not aware of any opposition to this Bill, the University of Illinois has a similar program that's been very successful, and I would ask for your support of House Bill 5696."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Welch moves for passage of House Bill 5696. And on that, is there any discussion? Representative Ford."

Ford: "Madam Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Currie: "Sponsor will yield."

Ford: "I just have a real, quick question, seatmate."

Welch: "Yes, Sir."

Ford: "I've been waiting on this Bill and could you tell me why it take you so long to get your Bills called?"

Welch: "I think... I wouldn't say Madam Speaker does it, because she called me today. But I think there's a bias against those of us at the end of the alphabet."

Ford: "So, your name has something to do with it?"

Welch: "Can we start at the end of the alphabet sometimes?"

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Ford: "I have no problem with the process, you know, Ford at the beginning. So, I'm it takes you so long, but just be patient and your time will come."

Welch: "It's happened to me my whole life."

Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Representative Breen."

Breen: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Currie: "Sponsor will yield."

Breen: "Thank you. And Representative, I just want to make sure this particular program is not a mandate to spend the funds, it only goes into effect if there is an appropriation from the General Assembly."

Welch: "Representative, that is correct. It's subject to appropriation."

Breen: "Fair enough. And all of the state's universities appear to support the program they are ready to administer the program."

Welch: "That's correct."

Breen: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Welch moves for passage of House Bill 5696. All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'no'. And the Clerk will open the record. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this Measure, there are 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having achieved the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Hammond, for what reason do you rise?"

Hammond: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. If the record would reflect that on House Bill 5011 I intended to be a 'yes'. Thank you."

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

- Speaker Currie: "And the record will so reflect. Representative Kelly Burke, for what reason do you rise."
- Burke, K: "Thank you, Madam Chair. We have a school group from Blue Island. The Blue Island Veteran's Memorial Middle School. They were here, I think they just disappeared. But we'd love to welcome them to Springfield. Hopefully, they can hear us cheering for them as they walk out of the gallery. Thank you."
- Speaker Currie: "Welcome, and thank you. And now we're going to Senate Bill 2273, Representative Williams. Clerk, please... please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2273, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Williams."

Williams: "Thank you. Thank you, Madam Chair. Crosscheck is a program you may have heard of. It's designed to identify potential duplicate voter registrations on voter rolls across states. What this Bill would do would be to prohibit the State Board of Elections from utilizing the Crosscheck system. Instead, utilizing a different system, which they also currently use called the Electronic Registration Information Center, which is called, for short, ERIC. And the Bill also provides the State Board to enter into a share agreement with Indiana. So, the purpose for Crosscheck and for ERIC is to insure that voters aren't being duplicated and getting to vote twice. But there are some significant problems with the program. First, due to very poor data quality, many duplicate names are eliminated simply by mistake. Common names such as Williams, Hernandez, Garcia, Jackson. And unfortunately,

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

those often disproportionately impact communities of color. Resulting in hundreds of thousands of voters potentially being disenfranchised. Secondly and very troubling, is the issue of voter security. We have identified significant dangers in terms of the security protocols in the Crosscheck program. Things like unencrypted passwords to Illinois voter files e-mailed to Kansas officials. Unencrypted IP addresses, usernames, and passwords to the server were e-mailed back and forth between states. The ERIC program, which is privately managed, has the necessary security protocols to handle this very sensiter... sensitive personal data. There have been numerous press reports on this, some of which said novice hackers could break into this data. And of course we all know that hacking into voter data isn't a far-fetched scenario anymore. So, I'd love to answer any questions but before I do, I wanted to make a special acknowledgement of Indivisible Chicago. Who is the volunteer, grassroots organization that brought this issue to the attention of the Legislature, did all the legwork, did countless hours of research, FOIAed over a dozen states, researched and sorted the data to come up with this excellent and important piece of legislation. All because they wanted to make a difference on an important issue. So, thank you for all our hard work and I'm happy to take any questions."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Williams moves for passage of House Bill 22... Senate Bill 2273. And on that Motion, Representative Ammons."

Ammons: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. To the Bill."

Speaker Currie: "To the Bill."

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

"First and foremost, I want to thank Representative Ammons: Williams for her consistent work on this initiative. This was a very complicated process going forward and the advocates who've worked on eliminating Crosscheck from Illinois' usage has put in a number of hours to educating not only Legislators but the general public about this initiative. I want to rise in support of this Senate Bill 2273 to remove Illinois from the Crosscheck Program because in its inception it sounded like a very good deal. The program was free to the State of Illinois and every other surrounding state, but all things that are free are not fair. This program has been used to, in essence, discriminate against people of color in other states in this country, eliminating thousands of legally registered voters from the roll just before the election in 2016. Because of cultural norms and names, i.e. as Representative Williams pointed out, Jackson, Smith, some names that are common names; people who may be carrying those surnames in Illinois, unfortunately, their names were used to eliminate them in other states like North Carolina. This has resulted, unfortunately, in the disenfranchisement of thousands of voter, largely voters of color. And so, because of historic issues around access to the voting rolls and the outcome that has been proven by digital analysis, as well as by stories of voters all over the country whose states have participated in Crosscheck, we are standing today asking for your support in the elimination of this program for our state and the investment into what is known to be a better system. Not without flaws, but with certain protections in data security as well securing the rights of people of Illinois to clean

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

and clear, fair and accessible elections. And I urge an 'aye' vote in support of Senate Bill 2273. Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "Further... further discussion? Representative Fortner."

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

Speaker Currie: "The Sponsor will yield."

Fortner: "What's the current status of the National Crosscheck Program?"

Williams: "It's my understanding, Representative, that it is suspended, temporarily, but at any given time it could be reinstated."

Fortner: "And do you know why it is currently suspended?"

Williams: "Well, I guess the political answer would be the creator is under some heat. I think he's running for Governor in another state and maybe there's some issues with that. So, there may be some political impacts there. But I would argue that he was concerned or the group behind Crosscheck was concerned about the extreme and abysmal record in terms votes date... voter data security. And we'll note that over eight states have pulled out and it seems to be we hear of a new one every week."

Fortner: "And because it's suspended, Illinois did not participate of the 2018 cycle of Crosscheck. Is that correct?"

Williams: "It is my understanding they have not. But we're concerned about moving forward, making sure that this participation is not an option."

Fortner: "One of the things I saw come across from the Senate was an Amendment that would allow Illinois to enter into bilateral agreements with neighboring states. Is that correct?"

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Williams: "Yes. And Representative, I want to thank you for your hard work on this. You did work closely with the Crosscheck team and the Amendment provides that the State Board can enter into bilateral agreements with neighboring states which include Indiana, Iowa, and Kentucky. States that don't have the ERIC program currently and the inclusion of that was critical. So, thank you for your efforts in that regard."

"And I appreciate the fact that that was picked up. Fortner: Though, I think in that case what it does is it puts us in a box. And let me go to the Bill at this point. Let's first understand some of the history that brought us to this point. And we had not just the debate about this Bill in committee, we had a very lengthy subject matter hearing last year in Chicago with a lot people speaking on this question. And don't get me wrong, when the Sponsor says that there might be data problems here, I think that's correct. But it's not I think due to malice, I think it's due to older technology. If you simply look at it, Crosscheck is an older system. It's built on a platform largely from the early 2000s versus the ERIC system, which is what this legislation speaks to, it's a more modern platform. As I understand, part of the suspension of Crosscheck is in fact due to the problems of the security of the data. That's a good reason to suspend the program. And it would seem to me the question should be, whether or not did they actually fix that problem before we decide, whether or not to go forward, but that's not covered in this Bill. This Bill makes a unilateral decision, it must be ERIC or something bilateral. And in fact, it even closes a door. Suppose that a group of Midwestern states, including our neighbors, but

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

included maybe a state that wasn't directly contiquous with Illinois said hey, we want to put together our own place rather than have, you know, four or five different bilateral agreements, let's put together a clearinghouse. Which of course was the intent of originally Crosscheck and the intent of the ERIC system. It's not covered here. What's also not covered here there are places where data is used in other things. I worked a lot on the automatic voter registration which passed into law. We used the ERIC system in that; but if we were participating with other states at the same level as ERIC, it's not clear how that would work. What I think, again, going back to the testimony of last year, is that the fact that there was a data problem was not the reason this came forward. And I talked to even some of the active opponents and they admitted that the only thing that brought this on the radar was the fact that Secretary of State of Kansas was named to Trump's Voter Fraud Commission. That brought this the level of national attention and it became a political issue. Should we be checking the data of the different systems whether or not they're secure, of course we should. That is exactly what I would expect the State Board of Elections to do. To be able to go through and say, as they are looking at their arrangements with interstate compacts in order to share data, are they secure? By all means, we should be checking that. But for the Legislature to stand here today and say well, today ERIC is good and Crosscheck is bad and that's it. We're going to lock it into law because we're going to make that assessment, one that I believe was driven not so much based on whether or not the systems are appropriate from

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

a data standpoint, but whether or not certain parties had other political agendas involved with this systems. Mark there... might there have been other states that had other ideas of how to use it? Sure there might have. One of the questions I asked of the opponents in the subject matter hearing, I asked, were there the any cases where this data was used inappropriately in Illinois and the answer was, no. The fact that some other state chooses to be a bad actor in how they use the data is not a reflection on the data, it's a reflection on the state that uses it that way. And Illinois doesn't use it that way. It didn't in the past. Again, maybe they can never fix their data problem because they're sitting on older technology. I don't know the answer to that. But what I do know is that we're making this a political issue where we should be looking at it as a data issue. I urge a 'no' vote.

Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Representative Butler."

Butler: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. A few questions of my friend, the Sponsor of the Bill."

Speaker Currie: "The Sponsor will yield."

Butler: "Representative Williams, and I'm going to ask you couple of questions I asked in committee. Does this mandate the State of Illinois to participate in ERIC?"

Williams: "The State of Illinois is already participating in ERIC.

But what it does is it eliminates the opportunity to participate in Crosscheck. Which as I mentioned, it's a free system and sometimes you get what you pay for. We already participate in ERIC."

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Butler: "So, but it... ERIC would be the sole source of this. The state would be only allowed to use ERIC. Is that correct?"

Williams: "Exactly."

Butler: "And is there a cost for participation in ERIC?"

Williams: "You know, I... their fiscal note was filed and it shows no fiscal impact. And I'll read you the language. No significant fiscal impact on the operations of the State Board of Elections. The Board is already a member of ERIC and all associated costs for our continued participation are covered. So..."

Butler: "So, there is a cost to participating in it."

Williams: "...it does cost to participate but it's we're already paying for it. So, all this would say is don't do the free system which happens to... you know, I... the previous speaker mentioned that who cares if Illinois voter data is not being impacted here in terms of our own voters. But the problem is, maybe Kansas, maybe Florida is acting responsibly but they're e-mailing back and forth to Illinois. So, Illinois voter data is being impacted whether it's happening within the State of Illinois or not. So, even if our Board acts responsibly, the failures of the system to properly protect data is jeopardizing the security of our voters' information. Any state that doesn't have as high standards as we are, can jeopardize that data and we have seen it happen."

Butler: "But as the previous speaker pointed out, we have... we have suspended participation in the Crosscheck program. To the Bill, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Currie: "The Bill."

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Butler: "This... this Bill ties the hands of the State Board of Elections to work with our County Clerks and our election authorities to get the data that they need to help manage the voter rolls in the State of Illinois. I think this is a wrongheaded solution, I think it should be more open to allowing us to participate in multiple programs to help manage these databases, and I would certainly urge a 'no' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Representative Wallace."

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

Speaker Currie: "The Sponsor will yield."

Wallace: "Thank you. So, my question is, is there overlap in the use of Crosscheck with states that also were pretty much exempted after the Supreme Court all but gutted the Voting Rights Act of 1965?"

Williams: "Well, as I noted earlier, many states have been pulling out of Crosscheck including most recently Kentucky. I'm not familiar with the nuances of the legislation you mentioned, but Crosscheck, is not providing any value right now. And they are undergoing a security review, but all the data experts have said it takes years to get a system of data protection and data security up to speed. Obviously, the state doesn't have the resources or the IT professional teams that they do in many private corporations and they still are vulnerable to hacking and attack. So, to expect the State Board of Elections to be able to protect our data using this free system that has antiquated security measures is unrealistic. That's one of the reasons why we decided to go

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

with ERIC and one of the reasons that many states are switching as well."

Wallace: "Thank you. To the Bill."

Speaker Currie: "To the Bill."

Wallace: "I believe that we have to ensure that we protect the citizens of Illinois when we see an issue that may also be a national issue. That is why we're here. We have a system of Crosscheck being employed throughout the state, actually, in seven of the nine states that were formerly protected under Section 4 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. However, in 19... or in 2013, that Section was gutted by the current Supreme Court. So, if we are going to make sure that we are going to allow for our citizens to have the greatest access possible to their right to vote, we should be standing against any form of discrimination, any form of disenfranchisement whether it comes at the hand of an individual or at the hand of technology. And so, I want to thank the ... the Sponsor of this Bill. And I urge everyone in this chamber to stand with the citizens of Illinois and make sure that we continue to protect the voting rights of all citizens within this state. Again, Crosscheck is being utilized right now in seven of the nine states that lost their protections under the Voting Rights Act of 1965. We can remove ourselves from being part of other lists or discussions and remove ourselves from being part of the disenfranchisement of the common... individuals with common names and families and individuals of color. I encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Currie: "No further discussion. Representative Williams, do you wish to close?"

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Williams: "Yes, please. Just a couple quick things. First of all, to assert that this was an issue that's political is interesting. The concern about voters being disfranchised should be a concern for all of us regardless of what party we represent. And in fact, some of the data breaches impacted primarily Republican voters. And while I would love to have an optimistic view of someone like Kris Kobach, unfortunately I can't share that perspective about his motivations. Just yesterday, a federal judge held Kris Kobach in contempt of court for failing to follow court orders to register voters. Do we really want to be a part of his voter engagement? I don't think so. Vote 'yes'."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Williams moves for passage of Senate Bill 2273. All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this measure, there are 63 voting 'aye', 49 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having achieved the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Next measure is House Bill 4849, Representative Swanson. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4849, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Swanson."

Swanson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This Bill basically does two things. It was brought to me by the Illinois Department of National Guard... Department of Military Affairs. It corrects a problem causing a National Guard bureau audit finding. It fixes an audit finding. It also allows the DMA... the Department

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

of Military Affairs to use construction fund dollars to rehabilitate existing facilities. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Swanson moves for passage of House Bill 4849. And on that, there is no discussion. All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this measure, there are 110 voting 'yes'... 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this... this Motion, having... this Bill, having achieved the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Then we go to House Bill 5221, Representative Willis. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5221, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Willis."

Willis: "Thank you, Madam Chair. This Bill is an initiative of the Associated Fire Fighters of Illinois. It is a very narrow scoped Bill. What it does is it looks at six small locals in the central and southern part of the state. These locals are Mascoutah, Menard County, Morton, Highland, Troy, and Union County. These are simply EMS locals. And the problem and the issue that we have is these are full-time paramedics that are employed by the units of their government. And they wish to be part of the Public Employee Disability Act so that they are covered for workmen's comp disabilities that could happen while they are on duty. This is an Act that is specifically made for these public employee… employees. And I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Speaker Currie: "Representative Willis moves for passage of House Bill 5221. And on that, is there any discussion? Representative Keith Wheeler."

Wheeler, K.: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Currie: "Sponsor will yield."

Wheeler, K.: "Representative, we had a good discussion on this in Labor Committee last week. We want to just make sure, on the record here. We had talked at that time about there being a couple of Amendments that will bring it together for one kind of consolidated Bill. I just want to make it so our Members understand what the plan is now from where we were before."

Willis: "Actually, there are go... it was decided that it was probably too in... too big of a Bill to consolidate together. So, we'll be bringing forth, in fact, in Labor this afternoon we have two additional Bills that will take care of the situation on other issues besides just including them in the PETA."

Wheeler, K.: "Okay. There... there's one..."

Willis: "So, thank you, Representative..."

Wheeler, K.: "Appreciate the clarification."

Willis: "...for bringing that up."

Wheeler, K.: "Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Representative Batinick."

Batinick: "I'm sorry. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Currie: "Will yield."

Batinick: "I'm... I'm looking through my notes at this quickly. Do you know what the fiscal impact of this is?"

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Willis: "This is a total of only 60... 60 members is what it is. So, it actually would not have... be minimal because all it does is includes them into the opportunity to go for the disability if they get injured on the job. No injury, no fiscal impact."

Batinick: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Representative Breen."

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

Speaker Currie: "Sponsor will yield."

Breen: "And, Representative, I think we were just trying to figure this out because we keep getting Amendments on Bills that all appear to be doing the exact same thing. And now, they're... instead of one Bill, there are about three at least. So, what is the actually global view here? What are... what are we doing?"

Willis: "What it is doing ... "

Breen: "This is like... to deal with 60 paramedics we're... we're running about three or four pieces of legislation."

Willis: "So, there are... there are 60 paramedics. Yes, you're correct. And what it is, is that the reason we have to do it as different pieces of legislation is it addresses the benefits and the... basically it's for the benefits that these individuals have, but it's under a different Acts in the government. And so, it's because of that we have to separate it out. And that... that's where it comes from. So, I understand the confusion on it. But the most important thing I can state is that these are members that are employed by the local units of government. So, they are not contract members. They are actually employees of the local units of government."

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Breen: "And then, it... as I understood it today in the Labor Committee, we have an Amendment posted to add these 60 paramedics to the Public Employee Disability Act. So, it's the exact same Bill, it's not just similar or dealing with different Acts. It's..."

Willis: "What it does is it addresses them in..."

Breen: "House Bill 126."

Willis: "It... it addresses..."

Breen: "Floor Amendment 1."

Willis: "...them in different things. And I'll be happy to clarify that when we get before the labor unit."

Breen: "Just a little concerned about sending over lots of Bills that do the exact same thing over to the Senate because usually that portents bad things coming back to us on short notice in the House."

Willis: "Well, as I... you know, as I told you when we initially did it, it was my intent to incorporate these all together. But it was advised by the Research Bureau that they could not be done together. So, I'm just going by their advice."

Breen: "And then... and then to the merits of this. What do the communities of Mascoutah, Menard County, Morton, Highland, Troy, and Union County believe or think about all of this activity on their 60 paramedics between them?"

Willis: "To my knowledge, they have not weighed in any opposition at all."

Breen: "Right."

Willis: "They obviously are happy with their employees and want to offer the best benefits that they can to them."

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Breen: "And then, I see the Illinois Municipal League is opposed.

Are they opposed on behalf of their members whose paramedics are going to be reclassified here?"

Willis: "Their opposition, if I recall right, was just to the intent that... I actually... I'll tell you, honestly I can't... I'm not going to pull it. I'm not sure what their opposition was. I don't recall exactly anymore."

Breen: "Interesting. And by the way, just on the prior note about the Bills. If they do actually do the same thing, you don't intend to move the exact same language forward to a House vote, right? You're saying these are all different language?"

Willis: "I see no reason to do duplicative Bills. No, I do not."

Breen: "Okay. And then, it just... I guess I should ask for the rest of the state, where we don't really, at least not currently, have... we do firefighter-paramedics out where I'm at. Is that... I mean that's the normal practice throughout the state firefigher-paramed... firefighters-paramedics not paramedics..."

Willis: "Well, there are..."

Breen: "Who don't do fighting?"

Willis: "...there are municipalities that hire out private paramedic services, but that's not what this is addressing."

Breen: "Right."

Willis: "So, the most... the majority of community firefighters are firefighter-paramedics. The majority, but that is not in every place. So, but this is... this is the only six bargaining unit members to the AAFI that are strictly EMS and not firefighters also. And that is because these six municipalities do volunteer fire departments, but they saw

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

the need to make sure that they had permanent EMS in their communities for the safety of their citizens."

Breen: "Fair enough. Okay. Thank you for the answers to the questions."

Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Representative Reick."

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

Speaker Currie: "Sponsor will yield."

Reick: "Kathleen, question?"

Willis: "Yes."

Reick: "These 60 paramedics they are members of the AFFI. Is that correct?"

Willis: "These six locals are... yes. They are locals that are registered with the AFFI."

Reick: "So, are they... is this the same union that represents the firefighters in the same sheds..."

Willis: "They are..."

Reick: "...or the same houses? I'm sorry."

Willis: "There are not firefighters in these houses. That's the whole problem. These locals are strictly EMS. They are not firefighters and EMS. They are only EMS."

Reick: "But they are..."

Willis: "They have... they are volunteer fire departments."

Reick: "Thank you. But they are represented by AFFI?"

Willis: "The paramedics are, yes."

Reick: "Yeah, okay."

Willis: "The EMS people are, yes."

Reick: "If they're represented by a union who could... which could advocate on their behalf to gain these benefits, why are they coming here for us to legislate it? I mean..."

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Willis: "Because they..."

Reick: "...let's let the unions... let's let unions do their jobs and negotiate for their members."

Willis: "No. This is a... because this is a Public Employee Disability Act it... they don't qualify under the definition to be able to get the disabilities that we, as a state, have determined that all firefighters to have. So, it's not an art... it's not arbitration for their wages or their working conditions or anything like that, it just states that they need to be eligible to be part of the Public Employee Disability Act. That's all this states."

Reick: "Thank you."

Willis: "So, it has absolutely nothing to do with the true benefit things. Just allows them that opportunity in there."

Reick: "Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "No further discussion? Representative Willis to close."

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

Speaker Currie: "Representative Willis moves the passage of House Bill 5221. All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this measure, there are 101 voting 'yes', 8 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having achieved the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5553, Representative Zalewski. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5553, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Third Reading of this House Bill."

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Speaker Currie: "Representative Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. House Bill 5553 is the state... as far as I can tell, the state's first Bill dealing with blockchain technology. The ... myself, Representative Andrade, the Gentleman from Oswego on the other side of the aisle, and the administration worked on a task force last fall dealing blockchain technology, the Illinois Initiative. This happens to be an area where Illinois is a thought leader in the United States. This particular piece of legislation would authorize use of smart contracts on the blockchain in Illinois, which grant us great flexibility when it comes to documents allowing for smart contracts to have binding affect. It's, again, I think the first of its kind in Illinois. And if it goes well, this certainly has the potential to continue our reputation as... as a place where these businesses can grow. So, I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Zalewski moves for passage of House Bill 5553. And on that question, Representative Keith Wheeler."

Wheeler, K.: "Thank you, Madam Chair. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Currie: "Sponsor will yield."

Wheeler, K.: "Representative, I want to thank you for bringing this Bill. And also, thank you and Representative Andrade for the work on the task force that put a lot of this in place. Frankly, this is a really one of our rare opportunities where Illinois becomes at the forefront of a technology, forefront of what would be an industry moving forward that can transform how government works and in a lot of ways, how the private sector will work as well. So, I would like to just personally

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

thank folks from the Cook County Recorder of Deeds, DCEO, and all members of the task force as well as the Sponsor and Representative Andrade, again, for their hard work on this. Love to be a part of it. Thank you."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Zalewski moved for passage of House Bill 5553. All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this measure, there are 111 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having achieved the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4317, Representative Unes. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4317, a Bill for an Act concerning military service. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Unes."

Unes: "Thank you very much, Madam Chair. House Bill 4317 is an effort to protect Gold Star families. Many of you may recall last year I did a Resolution on this floor with Sergeant Douglas Riney's family that came to the floor. Sergeant Douglas Riney was killed in the line of duty in Afghanistan. Since that time, I've gotten to know the Riney family even more and I've gotten to know many of his family members. And unbelievably, I learned that Sergeant Riney's widow was put through an unthinkable time after the unthinkable news that she lost her husband. And that was... they were stationed in Texas and the landlord would not let her out of her lease. All she wanted to do was come home to her family. In researching this, and learning a little bit more of it,

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Illinois statute right now allows for military families to get out of the lease once they have been called overseas to active duty, but surprisingly there was not anything in statute that would prevent this very thing from happening in our state. And I don't want any Gold Star family to have to go through what Sergeant Riney's wife and family had to go through during those very dark days. And so, in an effort to say thanks to all of our Gold Star families, I urge an 'aye' vote and request its passage."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Unes moves for passage of House Bill 4317. Seeing no discussion, all in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this measure, there are 113 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having achieved the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. We now go to House Bill 5693, Representative Walsh. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5693, a Bill for an Act concerning wildlife. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. House Bill 5693 is an initiative of the Illinois Trappers Association. Basically, under current statute, a trap must be tagged with the trapper's name and address. All this would do would... require them to identify their trap with a customer identification number that's on their trapping license. They consider this a privacy issue. I know of no opponents and happy to answer any questions."

119th Legislative Day

- Speaker Currie: "Representative Walsh moves for passage of House Bill 5693. And seeing no discussion, all in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this measure, there are 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having achieved the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. We're now moving to Second Readings. And the first... the first Bill, on page 10 of the Calendar, is House Bill 4595, Representative Fine. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4595, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. The Bill is read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. But a fiscal note has been requested on the Bill and has not been filed."
- Speaker Currie: "Please hold the Bill on Second Reading.

 Representative McCombie, for what reason do you rise?"
- McCombie: "It's not on this. It's on a vote."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Martwick, for what reason do you rise?"
- Martwick: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Can the record reflect that on the last Bill that was on Third Reading, I think it was 5693... I'm not sure what the number was... that my... my switch did not function, I... I mean, I wish to be recorded as having voted 'yes'."
- Speaker Currie: "The record will so reflect. Continuing on Second Reading, House Bill 4081, Representative Halpin. Clerk, please read the Bill."

119th Legislative Day

- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4081, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. The Bill is read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Currie: "Third Reading. All right. Continuing on Second Readings. House Bill 4936, Representative Demmer. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4936, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Currie: "Third Reading. House Bill 4900, Representative Guzzardi. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4900, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. The Bill is read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments have been approved for consideration. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Currie: "Third Reading. Representative Guzzardi? Bill's on Third. House Bill 4754, Representative Kelly Burke. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4754, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. The Bill is read... correction... Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Kelly Burke."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Burke."
- Burke, K.: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This Amendment is a gut and replace that incorporates the underlying Bill and then just adds some provisions at the request of the elder law attorneys

119th Legislative Day

- that would allow proceeds from the settlement to be deposited into an ABLE account."
- Speaker Currie: "On the Amendment is... all in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted.

 Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Currie: "Third Reading. House Bill 4828, Representative Cassidy. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4828, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Currie: "Third Reading. House Bill 4288, Representative Hammond. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4288, a Bill for an Act concerning military service. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Hammond."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Hammond."
- Hammond: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Floor Amendment #1 simply adds that Illi... individuals who have served in the Illinois National Guard will have preference over those that have served in the Guard of other states. Appreciate it. Thank you."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Chapa LaVia, do you wish to speak to the Amendment or the Bill? The Amendment?"
- Chapa LaVia: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just want to thank the... will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Currie: "The Sponsor will yield."

119th Legislative Day

- Chapa LaVia: "Thank you. I just want to thank the Sponsor for her integrity and working this Bill out with us for committee. So, thank you. And I suggest that it be adopted..."
- Hammond: "Thank you, Madam Chair."
- Chapa LaVia: "...and we vote 'yes'."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Hammond has moved the adoption of Amendment 1 to House Bill 4288. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Motion is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Currie: "Third Reading. House Bill 5599, Representative Conyears-Ervin. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5599, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Currie: "Third Reading. House Bill 5156, Representative Feigenholtz. Clerk, please read the Bill. I'm sorry. It was 5155."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5155, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Currie: "Third Reading. Representative... House Bill 4885, Representative Wallace. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4885, a Bill for an Act concerning children. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Gabel."
- Speaker Currie: "And Representative Wallace, are you handling the Amendment for Representative Gabel?"

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Wallace: "Yes."

Speaker Currie: "Proceed."

Wallace: "As soon as my system is working appropriately. Thank you. That's okay. So, House Floor Amendment 2 to House Bill 4885 makes some procedural changes to make sure that we are adequately serving families that are needing intact services. I ask for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Wallace moves for the adoption of Amendment 1 to House Bill 4885. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, all in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments...

Clerk Bolin: "No..."

Speaker Currie: "...Mr. Clerk?"

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

Speaker Currie: "Third Reading. House Bill 5341, Representative Gordon-Booth. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5341, a Bill for an Act concerning..."

Speaker Currie: "Wait. Sorry. Excuse me. Out of the record at the request of the Sponsor. House Bill 1010, Representative Greenwood. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1010, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. Second Reading of... correction... this Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Greenwood."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Greenwood. Out of the record at the request of the Sponsor. House Bill 49... House Bill 3418, Representative Harper. Clerk, please read the Bill."

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3418, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Harper."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Harper."

Harper: "I move to adopt the Amendment."

Speaker Currie: "You want to explain the Amendment?"

Harper: "Sure. So, the Amendment makes a couple of different changes. And instead of a county board, the Board of Commissioners forming the board will have the authority to... to grant urban ag zones."

Speaker Currie: "The Amendment, all in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. I'm sorry.

Wait a minute. Representative Breen, do you want to speak on the Amendment?"

Breen: "I just want to clarify with the Representative what exactly... it looks like the Amendment was from the Illinois Farm Bureau, but what were the... a few more of the details on what... what they were doing with that. What's... what's the change?"

Harper: "Sure. We wanted to make sure that we were only referring to blighted areas and metropolitan statistical areas of the state in the Bill. And so, the language was changed to make it... make sure we were only including urban areas."

Breen: "Ah. No... 'cause I see farmland has been removed. So, that's the way that you focus on the urban areas then instead of the more rural?"

Harper: "Yes."

Breen: "Okay. Fair enough. Thank you."

119th Legislative Day

- Speaker Currie: "The Bill is now on Third Reading. House Bill 4165, Representative Greg Harris. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4165, a Bill for an Act concerning health care. The Bill is read for a second time on a previous day.

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

 No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Currie: "Third Reading. House Bill 4866, Representative Wheeler. Clerk, please read the Bill. Oops, misspoke, 4855. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4855, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Barbara Wheeler."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Wheeler."
- Wheeler, B.: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would like to pass the Amendment. The Amendment amends the FOID Act. Number 1, it clarifies the definition for patient. Two, it extends the time for ISP to make a determination on the renewal and the current card will remain valid. Three, it provides by rule for ISP to suspend the card during an investigation."
- Speaker Currie: "All in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Currie: "Third Reading. House Bill 4345, Representative Jones. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4345, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee

119th Legislative Day

- Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Jones."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Jones on the Amendment."
- Jones: "Thank you, Madam Chair. Floor Amendment #1 to the Bill just makes a technical change. It changes the date from the third Friday to... I'm sorry... from May 19 to the third Friday of each year. I ask for its adoption."
- Speaker Currie: "All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Currie: "Third Reading. House Bill 4774, Representative Kifowit. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4774, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Currie: "Out... out of the record. Sorry. Out of the record. House Bill 5109, Representative Lang. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5109, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Lang."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Lang."
- Lang: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. Amendment 2 removes some language from the Bill as created by House Floor Amendment #1 that was recommended by ISAC. I know of no opponents."
- Speaker Currie: "All in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Currie: "Third Reading. House Bill 4661, Representative Martwick. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4661, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Currie: "Third Reading. House Bill 4724, Representative Phelps Finnie. Clerk, please read the Bill. No, wait. Out of the record. House Bill 4669, Representative Stratton. 4469, Representative... Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4469, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #2 was adopted in committee. Floor Amend... Floor Amendment #4 is offered by Representative Stratton."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Stratton."
- Stratton: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. House Floor Amendment #4 makes two technical changes. One that provides language indicating that county sheriffs will facilitate an opportunity for individuals who are being detained pretrial to vote. And it also removed opposition from the Illinois Sheriff's Association. And secondly, there's a clarification that counties with 3 million... a population of 3 million or more are exempted from the vote by mail option."
- Speaker Currie: "Discussion on the Amendment? Representative Breen."

Breen: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. The Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Currie: "Sponsor will yield."

119th Legislative Day

- Breen: "And Representative, I understand... just help me here. You've got... the Bill requires that the pretrial detainees be allowed to vote by mail. No longer having that requirement... what's... what's your Bill changing here? Because I... I guess... for instance, my county is nearly a million people. I don't know if they vote by mail right now, but if they wanted to also add the option of taking them over to vote in person. Can they do that, too?"
- Amendment #4 specifically speaks to counties with a population of 3 million or more. And it clarifies that they would... for example, Cook County is doing on-site... has a temporary on-site polling place. As a county with 3 million or more, they wanted to make sure that it was not including that they also had an obligation to do any other type of... of accommodation for voting."
- Breen: "Okay. But then... but... so, the counties, if any other county though also did on-site voting though, they would still have to provide the vote by mail."
- Stratton: "Any other county can decide what's best for that county. That's what... that's the... I know I'm not speaking to the Bill, per se, but yes..."
- Breen: "I just... just to... just..."
- Stratton: "...under the Bill, they can do whatever they'd like which would facilitate voting for that county."
- Breen: "All right. I'm... I'm just confused 'cause I want to know why... why are we... 'cause I just said, if... if you're required to vote by mail and Cook is now no longer going to be required to vote by mail, if another county decides to offer in person

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

to their inmates, then why are... will they... they'll still be bound by vote by mail though?"

Stratton: "The goal is to make sure that everyone has an opportu...
who is eligible to vote can vote. For populations 3... under 3
million, that can be vote by mail or whatever process they
want to come up with as a county. If it's more than 3 million,
in... as a population, then that's where they do not have to do
the vote by mail if they don't want to. They can just do the
on-site temporary voting... polling place."

Breen: "But for counties under 3 million, they can do it however they like. They can either vote by mail..."

Stratton: "That's the goal of the Bill, yes."

Breen: "...or do it in person?"

Stratton: "Correct."

Breen: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "All in favor of the Amendment vote 'aye'; opposed 'no'... say 'aye'; opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments, Clerk?"

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

Speaker Currie: "Third Reading. We'll now go to House Bill 5786,
Representative Mayfield. Representative Mayfield, are you ready to move... Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5786, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Mayfield."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Mayfield."

119th Legislative Day

- Mayfield: "Let's see. House Floor Amendment 1 just provides a provision that allows for the use of mental health providers."
- Speaker Currie: "Is there any discussion on the Amendment?

 Representative Breen."
- Breen: "Wait. And I'm sorry, Representative. I didn't... couldn't really hear you over the noise. What... what exactly again does Floor Amendment 2 do?"
- Mayfield: "I'm sorry. What was your question?"
- Breen: "So, what does Floor Amendment 2 do as well to the Bill?"
- Mayfield: "House Floor Amendment... oh, actually, House Floor Amendment 2 only changes a word. It changes from... the word from 'shall' to 'may'. That's all it does. It's a one word change."
- Breen: "Ah. Okay. Fair enough. Thank you."
- Mavfield: "Yes."
- Speaker Currie: "All in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. But state mandates notes have been requested on the Bill as amended and have not been filed."
- Speaker Currie: "Hold the Bill on Second Reading. House Bill 4964, Representative Wallace. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4964, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. But a state mandates note has been requested on the Bill, has not been filed."

119th Legislative Day

- Speaker Currie: "Hold the Bill on Second Reading. House Bill 4247,
 Representative McSweeney. Out of the record at the request of
 the Sponsor. House Bill 4688, Representative Kelly Burke.
 Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4688, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Kelly Burke."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Burke."
- Burke, K.: "Thank you, Madam Chair. The 46... the Amendment to 40... 4688 is a Nursing Home Administrators Licensing and Disciplinary Act. We extended the sunset simply at the end of Veto Session. And now, this is an agreed Bill between the department and the... and the nursing home administrators as to some changes in their Licensing and Disciplinary Act. I know of no opponents. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Currie: "All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Currie: "Third Reading. House Bill 5795, Representative Chapa LaVia. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5795, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Currie: "Sorry. Sorry. Out of the record at the request of the Sponsor. House Bill 5157, Representative Feigenholtz. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5157, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day.

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Feigenholtz."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Madam Chair, Members of the House. This
Amendment provides an agreement between the Department of
Children and Family Services and the Public Guardian, who had
some concerns. I'm happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Currie: "On the Amendment, Representative Breen."

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

Speaker Currie: "Sponsor will yield."

Breen: "And Representative, I just wanted to make sure that as we continue down this road with this Bill that the parent... if the parent steps forward, they are still in first position even with a court order on the temporary. The temporary guardian still retai... remains at the bottom of the list. They are only the fallback, not in... they don't in any way jump the line on a surrogate decision maker's?"

Feigenholtz: "If they're... could you... if they are available, if the parents are involved and that's kind of what the Amendment articulates. And it steps through some very, very specific circumstances which ultimately need to be proved up in the juvenile court to a judge."

Breen: "Right. I... I just want to make sure because we've got the list of surrogate decision makers. The parents, if they step forward, they're still ahead. And this temporary guardian arrangement which we've got in a very narrow class of circumstances is... they are still last in line. They are the last line of defense on this. The parents still are the primary decision makers?"

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Feigenholtz: "Of course, of course."

Breen: "Thank you."

- Speaker Currie: "All in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendment... Motions?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Currie: "Third Reading. Let's go back to House Bill 5795, Representative Chapa LaVia. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5795, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Currie: "Third Reading. House Bill 4416, Representative Fine. Clerk... out of the record. House Bill 1439, Representative Gordon-Booth. Representative Gordon-Booth. Representative Gordon-Booth, do you want to move this Bill? Clerk, please... out of the record. House Bill 5196, Representative Greenwood, are you ready with this? Clerk, please read... no. Out of the record. House Bill 5481, Representative Guzzardi. Let's move... Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5481, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Currie: "Third Reading. House Bill 5257, Representative Bellock. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5257, a Bill for an Act concerning juveniles. Amendment... Second Reading of this House Bill.

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

 No Motions are filed."

119th Legislative Day

- Speaker Currie: "Third Reading. House Bill 4346, Representative Jones. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4346, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Currie: "Third Reading. House Bill 1336, Representative Lang. Please Clerk... please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1336, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments have been approved for consideration. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Currie: "Third Reading. House Bill 5497, Representative Martwick. Representative Lang."
- Lang: "Thank you, Madam. I... on that previous Bill, 1336, there's a committee Amendment that I'm going on today. Can we move that back to Second Reading, please?"
- Speaker Currie: "Please put the Bill back on Second Reading.

 Representative Martwick. I don't see him. Let us try House
 Bill 5754, Representative Phelps Finnie. Do you want to move
 the Bill? Out of the record. House Bill 5153, Representative
 Davidsmeyer. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5153, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Currie: "Third Reading. House Bill 4964, Representative Wallace. I think we held that Bill on Second Reading. But has there been a filing of the note? No... okay. We'll keep the

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

- Bill on Second Reading until all the notes are filed. House Bill 5210, Representative Demmer. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5210, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Currie: "Third Reading. House Bill... House Bill 5148,

 Representative Kifowit. Representative Kifowit.

 Representative Kifowit. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5148, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Currie: "Third Reading. House Bill 4583, Representative Halbrook. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4583, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Currie: "Third Reading. House Bill 5636, Representative Meier. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5636, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Meier."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Meier."

Meier: "There is an Amendment on it that needs to be adopted."

Speaker Currie: "You... you had filed an Amendment. And the question is, do you wish us to adopt the Amendment?"

Meier: "Yes."

Speaker Currie: "You want to tell us what the Amendment does?"

119th Legislative Day

- Meier: "The Amendment is... we came to an agreement. It just designates which facilities that they are inspecting. And simple little cleanup. And we came to an agreement on it."
- Speaker Currie: "On the Amendment, Representative Wallace. Do you wish to speak on the Amendment? No. All right. And on... on the Amendment, all in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Currie: "Third Reading. House Bill 5122, Representative Welch. No. Out of the record. House Bill 4944, Representative Sauer. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4944, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Sauer."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Sauer."
- Sauer: "Yes. Thank you. This Floor Amendment just adds a couple of technical changes. The first is we're changing 10,000 to 10,001 pounds and we're exempting school buses."
- Speaker Currie: "All in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Currie: "Third Reading. House Bill 4879, Representative Spain. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4879, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

119th Legislative Day

- Speaker Currie: "Third Reading. House Bill 5167, Representative Unes. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5167, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Two Floor Amendments have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Unes."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Unes."
- Unes: "Thank you, Madam Chair. I wish to adopt Floor Amendment #2."
- Speaker Currie: "Do you want to withdraw Amendment 1? You may withdraw Amendment 1. Let's move to Amendment #2."
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Unes."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Unes."
- Unes: "Thank you, Madam Chair. Floor Amendment #2 is very technical in nature and agreed to that removes opper... opposition. Just adds the word state highways and designated local roads."
- Speaker Currie: "All in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Currie: "Third Reading. House Bill 1010, Representative Greenwood. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1010, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Greenwood."

119th Legislative Day

- Speaker Currie: "Representative Greenwood."
- Greenwood: "Thank you, Madam Chair. House Floor Amendment #1 is a technical change."
- Speaker Currie: "You want to describe it?"
- Greenwood: "It changes references to committeeman to committeeperson and chairman to chairperson throughout the Election Code."
- Speaker Currie: "Sounds very technical. All in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Currie: "Third Reading. House Bill 40... 4081, Representative Halpin. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4081, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Currie: "House... we're back on Third Readings. House Bill 4081. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4081, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Halpin."
- Halpin: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. House Bill 4081 is the Call Center Worker Act. This Bill essentially requires businesses that operate call centers in the State of Illinois to notify the Illinois State Treasurer if they decide to move those operations out of state or overseas. It provides, further, that any company on that list in ineligible for a period of five years from receiving state loans, and grants, and credits and would also have to give back a portion of those credits that it may have earned in previous years. This is a... is an

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

effort to try to ensure that call center workers here in the State of Illinois are protected. And it's also a consumer protection Bill to provide a protection against identity theft, data breaches and other similar issues that we've seen over the past couple years as businesses decide to locate their call centers overseas where the law doesn't protect American citizens the way it should. And so, I'm happy to ask... answer any question on this Bill, but I would ask for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Halpin moves passage of House Bill 4081. And on that question, Representative Breen."

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

Speaker Currie: "He will."

Breen: "Okay. Now, Representative, we had a couple issues on this in committee. First off, your definition of 'call center' is that it's a business enterprise in the State of Illinois or any of its political subdivisions that employ, for the purpose of customer service or back office operations, 50 or more employees. So, there's no limit... you're calling it call center, but it's anybody that works in the back office counts says an employee under this Act?"

Halpin: "This Bill is for call centers. And if you do read the complete Bill, the context of the Bill is very clear that we're talking about incoming and outcoming call center operations and customer service operations that are connecting consumers to the company."

Breen: "But you're using... why is that not in the definition because you're... you've defined... once you define something in the definition Section, that governs for the rest of the Bill.

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

And you've defined call center as just something that's got 50 employees in a back office."

Halpin: "I think when you..."

Breen: "There's nothing in there. There's no requirement the employees be doing call center work. And I would argue... if one person's doing call center work and the other 49 are accountants, and lawyers, and secretaries, and whatever, they're all back office."

Halpin: "I can appreciate that argument, Representative, but that's not the intent of the Bill and it's not the way it's written. The Bill's written to say that if a company intends to relocate the call center and moves at least 30 percent of the prior call volume from the previous year, then that is when the law is triggered."

Breen: "And if they move these employees, they lose every state incentive that they had?"

Halpin: "They become ineligible for a period of five years. And I think if you'll recall, I passed a... or a Bill last year that involved outsourcing of other jobs. And there was considerable complaint from the other side of the aisle that it was a complete bar to receiving benefits. And I want to say, I have listened to you, I have heard that and this is a temporary bar. It also allows the State Treasurer to certify that the eligibility requirement can be waived if it is going to cause a substantial loss of jobs, if there's a national security issue as well. So, there are provisions to avoid that under certain circumstances."

Breen: "Why... why didn't your prior Bill become law?"

Halpin: "Excuse me?"

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Breen: "Why didn't your prior Bill become law if it passed out of the House?"

Halpin: "Our colleague in the other chamber decided that it was not going to be passed."

Breen: "The Senate actually put your Bill down. Wow, okay. All right."

Halpin: "But we... we all know that we can't trust their judgement, Representative."

Breen: "I know. And when they do something intelligent, it... it causes me to... I just... okay. Fair enough. This is only 30 percent of the call center or even a subdivision of the call center and your Bill kicks in to strip all of their protections, to strip all of their state incentives."

Halpin: "So, what it does is, it makes you ineligible for future years' incentives and makes you give back the unamortized portion of any benefits you've already received. So, again, under previous Bills, I had asked those companies to give back the entirety of the benefits that they received. And this... this Bill I took a different approach. And they're only going to have to give back any unamortized benefits that they may have received."

Breen: "To the Bill."

Speaker Currie: "To the Bill."

Breen: "Ladies and Gentlemen, this is yet another mandate from us that makes no sense. An employer could be shifting employees around that have absolutely nothing to do with the state incentives they've received. They could be adding jobs in Illinois. They could be bringing their corporate headquarters to Chicago and we would still take all of their state

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

incentives. Everything they haven't earned yet; everything... all of their unamortized part, and it's only moving 30 percent. And call center is not even defined to include call center employees. It means all your back office staff. I mean, would... this is exceptionally poor policy to deal with our government incentives, which we have to offer to people to try to get them to come to our state because of our poor tax policy and our regulatory environment. But what it does even more is it sends a signal to anyone who's trying to figure out what the Illinois General Assembly thinks about business that we have no idea what we're doing. This... this requirement would make no sense. It's absolutely abusive of the business community. Why would they do business with us? Why would they be a part of this state when they're looking at this dysfunctional government that has no clue how business is done and how money is made and how jobs are created. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Representative Keith Wheeler."

Wheeler, K.: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Currie: "Yes."

Wheeler, K.: "Thank you. Representative, we talked about this Bill a little bit in committee. And I'm going back to fall upon on part of the conversation you just had with my colleague in regard to definition of 'call center'. And I'm reading the exact text here, not analysis, the actual words you wrote that don't have anything to do with bat... it doesn't say 'call center' anywhere in the definition of 'call center'. This isn't... or back office operations. That could be anybody

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

doing anything. It could be accounting, bookkeeping, any kind of clerical recordkeeping. We'd call that... yes, human resources are all part of that. This is too vague. So, my concern, among many in this Bill, but specifically about this definition, is that a good lawyer will look at this and they'll look at the penalty Section. And it says the failure to report a relocation of non-call center workers to somewhere else could result in a \$10 thousand a day fine. That's what is written here. I know that it may not be your intention, but we know what's written and not what the intention is. So, Representative, I'd wish you'd pull this and work on this some more because this really isn't I think what you're trying to do."

Halpin: "Representative, I... is that a question?"

Wheeler, K.: "It is."

Halpin: "Okay. So, I guess to answer your question, (a) when you're defining the term 'call center', putting the words 'call center' into the definition is self-defeating. And I think any good attorney is going to look at the entirety of this Bill and read the statute in its entirety and understand that when you relocate at least 30 percent of your call volume, at a... at a com... at an employer that employs at least 50 people in their customer service or back office operations, that is the standard by which they're going to be judged. It's a very simple standard and it's one that's easily enforceable."

Wheeler, K.: "I beg to differ and I think that's one of the problems of the Bill. Secondly, Representative, are you aware that many companies use internet phone based systems now?"

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Halpin: "I believe so."

Wheeler, K.: "And those internet... internet phone systems allow them to use workers in many different locations and shift call traffic to certain locations when needed based on a load, or available resources, or personnel."

Halpin: "That may be. I'm not... I'm not an expert in that field." Wheeler, K.: "And I guess that's part of my concern because I

think this Bill is treating it like Illinois is some separate island from the rest of the country or the world when it comes to how we do customer service in today's market. In today's market, we work with everybody all over the place all the time. And the idea that we're going to say, well, we're going to have some geographic border that's going to say our call center base is going to be in Illinois for part of this, but not for a part in the other day. This... this makes it almost impossible to track."

Halpin: "So, you say that we worked with everyone in the country and throughout the world and that's part of the problem. This Bill is trying to address a serious concern where companies are looking out of... out of the United States that... with countries that don't have consumer protection laws, they don't have data privacy protections. And you've seen case after case where companies are fined because their call centers have released private data. The Washington Post reported that there was a major security problem with... with Indian call centers."

Wheeler, K.: "Representative, when I said 'we'..."

Halpin: "This is... it's a widespread problem that we need to address in Illinois."

119th Legislative Day

- Wheeler, K.: "Okay. I understand where you're going. That's part of it. As far as the data privacy, I'm a big advocate for that. However, my 'we' that I defined there was 'we' being here in Illinois. 'We' being companies based in Illinois. We reprise call center response to people all over the country. And we may have companies that have different agencies, different departments in different states and different resources in different states. Some are on contract, some are not. There's no flexibility with the Bill you've written here for that part of it. And that's the troubling part of it to me. We are driving people away from using the Illinois as a call center rather than bringing them here."
- Halpin: "If flexibility means taking jobs out of the State of Illinois and overseas then that's not a flexibility we should be giving these companies."
- Wheeler, K.: "What about the other states if..."
- Halpin: "We need to encourage... we need to encourage Illinois companies to continue to employ Illinois workers, especially if they're receiving Illinois taxpayer money."
- Wheeler, K.: "Okay. Representative, the idea is that... that some of these jobs... a company could move jobs to another location, another state, while still growing jobs in Illinois. This will still trigger a penalty based on your language. Is that correct?"
- Halpin: "Representative, I prefer to have a Bill that deals with outsourcing in general, in fact, we tried to pass that Bill.

 We passed it here out of the House. This is identified to address a particular issue in a particular industry and I'm dealing with that right now. If we want to talk about further

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

preventing outsourcing in general, I'm happy to have that conversation and pass that Bill again."

Wheeler, K.: "I appreciate that. To the Bill."

Speaker Currie: "To the Bill."

Wheeler, K.: "Ladies and Gentlemen, this Bill does not hit the target it's trying to hit in the first place. The definitions are poor. The penalties are open to legal interpretation of which could cause great grief for Illinois companies we are actually trying to help. The state... the state incentive programs that are unamortized will be removed from these companies for doing nothing that they don't consider a normal business operation now, even keeping employees here in the state... in the United States. This really is not... this really should be called the Anti Call Center Worker Act because it's going to prevent companies from coming here and actually creating call centers that hire call center workers in Illinois. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Demmer to add to the list of excused absences."

Demmer: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Please let the record reflect that Representative Brian Stewart is excused for the remainder of the day."

Speaker Currie: "Further discussion on House Bill 4081?

Representative Ives."

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

Speaker Currie: "Yes."

Ives: "So, we're attempting to attract Amazon's second headquarters. We're offering up towards of \$2 billion in

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

incentives. The Chicago mayor is highly in favor of that acquisition. What do you... kind of signal do you think this sends to Amazon, if we were to pass legislation like this? Remember, they're not..."

Halpin: "I think..."

Ives: "...here yet"

Halpin: "Right."

Ives: "What does this tell them about our state?"

Halpin: "Amazon's going to make its own decision where it's going to locate its second headquarters. As the State of Illinois, we need to think about the long-term future of the residents here. And I think preventing outsourcing or rewarding companies with huge incentives without any kind of investment... long-term investment in the State of Illinois is the wrong policy."

Ives: "So, did you vote in favor of the extension of the tax credits for businesses last year? Did you vote in favor of that..."

Halpin: "Which Bi..."

Ives: "...EDGE credit extension?"

Halpin: "That's not my Bill. I don't recall which number that
 was."

Ives: "Well, if I recall, that EDGE credit was we reauthorized and there were only five Republicans who voted against it. So, either maybe you didn't go voting, but you certainly didn't vote against it. So, if... if your idea here is that incentives are unfair, we can have that conversation, but..."

Halpin: "I... I would point out Representative, that it's my understanding that that Bill did have a clawback provision if

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

the companies aren't making the jobs, or creating the jobs, or retaining the jobs that they're supposed to, those incentives comes back to the State of Illinois taxpayer."

Ives: "Okay. So, we already have that in legislation. And now, what you're doing is you're taking a specific part of business operations and saying that we're going to... we're going to now fine and penalize you in clawback incentives that were promised. So, my question, again, remains, when Amazon looks at what this Legislative Body is doing, and pays attention to what's recorded in the papers, and is in the process of making the decision on where to locate 50 thousand new employees, do you think that this legislation invites them to come to Illinois? Is it an invitation to success here..."

Halpin: "Amazon..."

Ives: "...or does it sound like we may punish them?"

Halpin: "...Amazon or any other company looking to relocate is going to look at the State of Illinois. In this case it's going to look at the City of Chicago, see the growth in Chicago, see the economic development there, see the trained workforce, see the infrastructure that they need to survive and they're going to make their decision."

Ives: "They're also going to look at this and say that the Illinois Legislature is out of control. They actually believe that they know more about how to run our business than we do. They believe that there's nothing beyond the… beyond… nothing that we do that is beyond their realm to regulate. That's what they're going to believe. And Ms. Speaker, to the Bill."

Speaker Currie: "To the Bill."

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Ives: "I'd like to just note that the opponents, according to our analysis, are the Illinois Manufacturing Association, the Illinois Chamber of Commerce, National Federation Independent Businesses, Illinois Telecom Communications AT&T, Cable Television Association, Communication Association, Chicagoland Chamber of Commerce, Illinois Energy Technology and Manufacturing Association, Association, Illinois Retailer... Retail Merchants, Taxpayers Federation of Illinois, Illinois CPA Society, Verizon. All of these are businesses in and of themselves or they are groups that literally represent thousands of other, both large and small, businesses. So, in the State of Illinois, you can't love jobs and hate job creators. And by passing this type of a legislation, that is the message that we send that we actually don't appreciate job creators. This is the ... one of the biggest antibusiness measures that has come before this General Assembly. If we... the only way that we get out of our \$250 billion in debt, our nearly now \$9 billion in unpaid bills, ratcheted right back up even after we pay some down. The only way we get out of this is through spending controls and taxbased growth. This is not going to grow our tax base. This says that Illinois is not open for business, stay away, relocate somewhere else. I urge the Assembly to send a message to the rest of the nation that, yeah, we do want to ... we do want to have business here. We do want business here. Please vote 'no' on this."

Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Leader Durkin."

Durkin: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Currie: "He will."

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Durkin: "Representative, I'm trying to get my arms around this.

Could you tell me how many businesses would qualify under your definition of a call center?"

Halpin: "I don't have a number of businesses, Representative."

Durkin: "There is an issue of voidness... for vague... vagueness that I am sensing in this legislation. It would be important that we do have an idea of how many of our small large businesses because right now we're not getting a good answer. And I think it would be helpful if we... if you would ponder that. You can take it out of the record, be a little more precise with this because I think we deserve an answer."

Halpin: "Representative, the answer is that any business that operates a call center and has 50... 50 or more employees and relocates at least 30 percent of their call volume from the previous year is... is going to be affected by this Bill. And those businesses will know what... will know who they are."

Durkin: "So, I'll ask the question again. How many businesses would be affected in the State of Illinois on this definition?"

Halpin: "I don't have that number, Representative."

Durkin: "That's unfortunate. All right. Let's get into the Treasurer's issues. It says that there could be a violation of up to \$10 thousand per day for a violation, correct? Is that the ceiling?"

Halpin: "That's correct."

Durkin: "It says also that the Treasurer may reduce the amount for just cause shown, correct?"

Halpin: "That's correct."

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Durkin: "Where would be the proper venue to file a legal action against a call center who is in violation of this law?"

Halpin: "I mean, that's going to be up to the Treasurer. And I would suggest that any business that does have that... that issue would speak with the Treasurer's Office."

Durkin: "Where does the Treasurer have standing to enforce this?

I'm not... if the violation is against individuals, wouldn't it
be proper for the individuals to be the named plaintiffs in
an action on this 'cause it is not the Treasurer who is
harmed?"

Halpin: "I... I guess, I'm not clear on your question, Representative."

Durkin: "The question is..."

Halpin: "The... the Treasurer has the authority to impo... to impose the... the violation... or to determine the violation."

Durkin: "So, the Treasurer will be the named party against the call center who's in violation, correct?"

Halpin: "I believe so, Representative. I..."

Durkin: "Are you sure?"

Halpin: "I... I am not sure."

Durkin: "Okay. Now, that's not good. 'Cause that what the next question was how would the Treasurer... what would be the standards for the Treasurer to establish just cause to reduce the amount? I'm just curious for purposes of legislative intent of what would be an example of just cause?"

Halpin: "Representative, I would leave that to the discretion of the Treasurer. There's already provisions in here regarding the eligibility for future state funds. It involves substantial job losses. It involves national security. And

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

that... those of course would be, I believe, factors that would influence the Treasurer's decision."

Durkin: "All right. Well, I'm... I'm concerned about the lack of clarity that we have in this legislation. And this is no disrespect to you, but there are fundamental questions that still have to be answered with this. And I'm particularly concerned about adding more litigation to the State of Illinois against our business community. We are an overly litigious state. But when I can't get an answer on who would..."

Halpin: "But..."

Durkin: "...of the... where the Treasurer would be able to file this action as you said you wouldn't know. I think that..."

Halpin: "Rep..."

Durkin: "...it does beg the question that this Bill is not ready."

Halpin: "Representative, I would point out that this is a penalty just for failing to notify the Treasurer. If he… if a business is going to relocate, this law… this Bill does not say that they can't relocate. All they have to do is notify the Treasurer within a reasonable amount of time and they avoid… they avoid that penalty."

Durkin: "What's a reasonable amount of time?"

Halpin: "I believe it's 120 days."

Durkin: "Okay. All right. Well, as you've all heard, there are clearly questions that have not been answered. There is so much vagueness in this Bill and its enforceability. We don't know who it's going to apply to, but as my colleagues have said, the message that we are sending with this Bill is that. I'd like to think at some point we'd like to say that Illinois's open for business. But one thing that I hear time

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

and time again... and I do travel the state a lot... is why is the Legislature constantly micromanaging the way in which we do business? Why do we constantly have a target on our back? Why can't we just go about our business and put people to work? This is a Bill that speaks and it's... loudly... loudly and says that we are not open for business. But I also am concerned when I see, you know, any time I see a large penalty that can be assessed against a business I think of litigation that could be over... overly excessive. I think of the cottage industry that could be created in this by hiring out special assistants to collect on these. It just sends the wrong message. And I would encourage our Members not to support this Bill until we are actually able to get answers on the questions we've all asked."

Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Representative Fortner."

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

Speaker Currie: "He will."

Fortner: "We had a lot of discussion about this in committee and I wanted to not duplicate some of the other previous comments. But in one of the answers you gave, I think you pointed out one of the differences in this compared to some of the previous legislation that you have done and said that if this trigger of 30 percent is reached, then at that point all remaining grant monies going forward would be clawed back. Is that... do I understand that correctly?"

Halpin: "If... if this is triggered, and the company notifies the Treasurer that they plan to relocate their call centers, the... it goes on the Treasurer's list and anyone on that list would

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

be ineligible for future benefits for five years. And then would also have to return the unamortized portion."

Fortner: "Thank you. So, here's... this is the situation. And I'm just going to use a hypothetical to make it relatively straightforward. Let's imagine that we have the Acme Corporation and it has a 100-person call center. It certainly meets the threshold as 50 or more employees. And they apply for a grant. And they get a grant to expand manufacturing in Illinois. They're going to build a... a big manufacturing, employs a hundred people. They're going to bring a hundred people to do manufacturing jobs in Illinois. They get a grant. That's what we try to do, we want to bring that in. Then, they realize they're short of space at their facility and so, they take 50 of their call center people and relocate them out of Illinois. Now, my... my math that's a net gain of 50 new jobs, manufacturing jobs, net gain of jobs in Illinois. Certainly meets the terms that we were doing. We... they've They've arown their business in Illinois. created manufacturing in Illinois. But the way I read this Act, and I think based on the response I just heard, they would meet the traitor conditions, they would go on the list, right, 'cause that's more than 30 percent of their call center. They go on the list and what happens? They did exactly what we asked them to do. They built manufacturing, brought it in, net new jobs and we say, nope, give the money back. Like many of the previous speakers have said, we want to make sure our grant money is used for the purposes that it was given out, absolutely, but we need to get it right. And I... this Bill is just not ready yet. I really wish the Sponsor would take this

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

out of the record. And if he persists in keeping it forward, I have to ask that we vote 'no'. Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Representative Batinick." Batinick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Currie: "He will."

Batinick: "Representative, how many out-of-state companies have you talked to as to as to whether or not this would give them incentive or disincentive to come to the state?"

Halpin: "I haven't talked to out-of-state companies, Representative. This is a Bill about protecting Illinois jobs and Illinois workers. This is... this is about stopping a trend for companies that already may be in the State of Illinois from taking those jobs overseas where the workers... a) the workers aren't protected and b) the consumer data isn't protected."

Batinick: "Okay. I'm going to go straight to the Bill. We talk about trends..."

Speaker Currie: "To the Bill."

Batinick: "...this isn't stopping the... the trend that this is creating or continuing is a trend of out-of-state companies not wanting to relocate to Illinois. This is just another barrier, you didn't talk to a single business. I want out-of-state companies to come here. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the road to hell is paved with good intentions and here we are. All these little Bills, all these little mandates on universities, all the day long we were... pension sweetener, after pension sweetener, after pension sweetener, all of a sudden we wake up one day we got a 130 billion short. Little things like this that tell... tell out-of-state companies, you

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

know what, if you come here there's going to be some litigation issues you have. And in and of itself, this Bill isn't the end of the world, but it's another thing to tell a company you're not welcome here in Illinois. I got to go back to one of... what one of the previous speakers said. You can't love jobs and hate job creators. And we really seem to demonize job creators in this state. Mr. Speaker, if this Bill should receive the required number of votes, I would request a verification. Thank you."

- Speaker Currie: "Your request will be noted. Further discussion? Representative McDermed."
- McDermed: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question concerns the name of the Act. I see it's called the Call Center Worker Act. Why is it called the Call Center Worker Act?"
- Speaker Currie: "And the... the Sponsor will yield to a question." McDermed: "Yes. Thank you."
- Halpin: "It called the Call Center Worker Act because we're trying to protect call center worker jobs here in the State of Illinois, prevent them from going to low-wage labor overseas that aren't going to protect your... your data privacy."
- McDermed: "But yet, there's no definition of 'call center' or 'call center worker' in the Act..."
- Halpin: "There... there is ... there is a definition..."
- McDermed: "...other than to say it's an employer with more than 50 people."
- Halpin: "There is... there is a definition of call center in the Act. And it also specifically... and also specific..."
- McDermed: "Yeah. It's an employer of more than 50 people, right?"

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Halpin: "Yes. And it also specifically indicates that when call center volume is the triggering effect."

McDermed: "All right. So, if you're not on the manufacturing floor or filling boxes at Amazon, chances are you're engaged in customer service, correct, if... if you're..."

Halpin: "I don't..."

McDermed: "...if you're not..."

Halpin: " That's not..."

McDermed: "...if you're in... at a desk?"

Halpin: "Well, that's... I mean, that's not necessarily true."

McDermed: "What else would you be doing?"

Halpin: "If you're not on the factory floor?"

McDermed: "If you're not on the factory floor, yeah."

Halpin: "Yeah. I mean, you could....."

McDermed: "And my understanding is..."

Halpin: "...you could be doing accounting. You could be..."

McDermed: "...that you're taking a very liberal definition of..."

Halpin: "You could be management."

McDermed: "...of call center."

Halpin: "Yeah."

McDermed: "And that anyone's engaged in customer service, in other words, people meeting the demands of their customers, whether they're in sales, or whether they're in IT support are a part of the call center."

Halpin: "And you just named a couple of things, if you're not on the floor, you're not necessarily making calls. You could be in the IT department. You could be in the sales department. You could be in the accounting department and you're not..."

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

McDermed: "Yeah, but you're still on the on the phone, right? And isn't that a call center within the definition of your Bill?"

Halpin: "So, this is... it is not. I mean, the ides is we're trying
to protect the call center..."

McDermed: "Well why... why isn't that in the design. Why couldn't the Treasurer take that position?"

Halpin: "So, the fact that you're using..."

McDermed: "Why wouldn't the Treasurer take that position?"

Halpin: "If I could answer… if I could answer your question,

Representative. The fact that you're using a telephone at

work does not make you a call center representative."

McDermed: "Says who?"

Halpin: "And I think... and it..."

McDermed: "Your Bill doesn't say that."

Halpin: "Yes, it does. Respectfully, Representative, I think you're intentionally obscuring the... the language of the Bill. It talks about call center volume. That is... it is... it is clear that is not some management official on the phone that's trying to make a sale to someone that hasn't... that hasn't bought product from that company before. And I appreciate some of your concerns, but that's not what the... the Bill says. It is not that broad. And it is not what we're trying to address here."

McDermed: "That's what you're saying, but that's not what the words of your Bill say. To the Bill."

Speaker Currie: "Bill."

McDermed: "Ladies and Gentlemen, I have no idea in the world why this is called the Call Center Worker Act. This is called, if you're not in manufacturing or farming or filling boxes at

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Amazon, you are not welcome in Illinois Act. And I think this is a terrible, terrible Bill for the 21st century when almost all of our workers and are new jobs are information jobs, which by necessity mean that you're on the phone with your customers. And I think this is absolutely disastrous, completely wrong for the 21st century and should be voted down most adamantly."

Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Representative Manley."

Manley: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Currie: "Sponsor will yield."

Manley: "First of all, Mike, I want to congratulate you. You've pretty much performed a miracle. You've got the entire other side of the aisle siding with the City of Chicago. That's commendable. So, let's go through this... let's do this slowly and clearly so that there's less hysteria. And let's talk about... tell me what... tell me when you first brought this Bill to me and asked for my support, tell me what you said to me."

Halpin: "I said we're trying to protect Illinois jobs. There's no..."

Manley: "Okay. Did we hear that? We're trying to protect Illinois jobs... Go ahead."

Halpin: "We're trying to protect Illinois consumer data."

Manley: "We're trying to protect Illinois consumer... these are wonderful things. Is every... okay, that's easy. Go ahead."

Halpin: "And we're generally just trying to reverse the trend of companies offshoring these jobs for lower wages and for less adequate protections."

Manley: "Let's talk about the state grants and loans 'cause I think that's a real important part of this legislation. So,

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

the… so, the company decides they're going to relocate. They're no longer eligible for state grants or loans for five years, correct?"

Halpin: "That's correct."

Manley: "And why is that important?"

Halpin: "So, it's important to make sure that when... when a company is receiving benefits from the taxpayers of the State of Illinois, and the State of Illinois is essentially investing in their ability to operate in Illinois, that if they decide to cut and run and try to get cheaper labor someplace else and try to go with laxed computer..."

Manley: "Okay. Now, that is the most important part. Say that again because we've been fighting about this for as long as I've been here. Five years we've talked about businesses that come in, they take advantage of TIFs or anything else they're granted and then when that's up they leave. They take our jobs. They take with them the generosity of the taxpayers of Illinois and they leave. This Bill prohibits that basically."

Halpin: "Correct. If they were... if Illinois is going to invest in a business, the business is going to continue to invest in Illinois. And if they don't want to, that's fine. If they want to relocate, that's fine, but they have to say, no, we're not going to keep the taxpayer money that you gave us when we... when we started this."

Manley: "So, they have to notify the Treasurer's Office within 120 days. That's the... that's the major stipulation?"

Halpin: "That's correct."

Manley: "And if... and none of this... the rest of this applies if they don't... if they do that? They..."

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Halpin: "If they notify... yeah. If they notify them within time, there's no penalty. There's no... there's no violation of the Act."

Manley: "Okay."

Halpin: "As I said, companies are not prohibited from making business decisions that off... outsource and offshore our jobs. Sadly, it doesn't do that, but I... I don't think that would be appropriate under the circumstances."

Manley: "And these are... these are businesses that have more than 50 employees?"

Halpin: "That's correct."

Manley: "Full-time or part... or do they include..."

Halpin: "They... it excludes part-time employees."

Manley: "Okay. So, 50 or more full-time employees?"

Halpin: "That's correct."

Manley: "Okay. I think... to the Bill. I think this Bill is long overdue..."

Speaker Currie: "To the Bill."

Manley: "...and much needed. And so, I am in full support of this. Representative Halpin, thank you for this legislation and for bringing this before us and actually doing the thing we keep talking about we want to do, protecting taxpayers from having their tax dollars used up and then taken away along with our jobs. Thank you very much."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Willis."

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

Speaker Currie: "The Sponsor will yield."

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Willis: "So, this Bill does... from my understanding... and please correct me as go through... does a number of things. If I choose to work for the State of Illinois, I have to commit that I will keep all of my employees in the State of Illinois or certainly those that are in the call center. Is that correct?"

Halpin: "I'm sorry. Could you say that again? I had a little
 trouble hearing."

Willis: "If I am a contractor with the State of Illinois, my commitment then to the state states that I will keep all of my employees, certainly those that are on what we call a call center, in the State of Illinois?"

Halpin: "Yes, that's correct. And if I could, Representative. I do need to go back to the prior Representative's question. I did misspeak. Part-time employees are included, if in the aggregate. If they have 50 part-time employees and they work more than 1500 hours in the aggregate per week. So, I just wanted to clarify that. If a... if a company has a sufficient number of part-time employees, then it is triggered."

Willis: "Okay. So, if I just had a small amount, it would not..."

Halpin: "Correct."

Willis: "...qualify for this."

Halpin: "That's correct."

Willis: "Okay. And it doesn't state that any business in the State of Illinois can't move out their call center. It just states that they cannot then get the benefit of a DCEO grant or some other type of state rebate, correct?"

Halbrook: "That's right. It just gives the... the employees the benefit of some advanced notice so they can plan. And it also

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

puts the state on notice that if they did receive any benefits they're going to..."

Willis: "Okay. So, all in all this is a good business, good for Illinois Bill, correct?"

Halpin: "Absolutely."

Willis: "Great. Then I urge this... to the Bill. I urge the entire Body to please support this. We're always spouting on how great Illinois is. Well, put your money where your mouth is. Vote 'yes' on this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Representative Hays."

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

Speaker Currie: "The Sponsor will yield."

Hays: "Representative, I'm holding the State of Illinois economic forecast dated February 2018 prepared for the Commission on Government Forecasting and Accountability, COGFA, prepared by Moody's Analytics. And on page 5 of that document, under business services, it says most of the growth will take place northern Illinois. Downstate Illinois has possibilities in developing well-paying business services jobs such as business consulting. It is more likely to attract lower wage business services such as call centers. And I guess my question to you, in light of an independent third party analysis suggesting that there's real opportunity for areas like my district that have been ravaged... ravaged since the early 1980s, unemployment as high as 20 percent, yet we come here day after day and year after year and we have no meaningful progress on work comp as my community sits on the Indiana border. I have companies who say, if I move my headquarters 3 thousand yards across the state line, I'd save

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

enough money in three years to pay for the new facility. And yet, when we have an opportunity to bring jobs to east central Illinois, we have horseshit like this on the board. What do you say for yourself?"

Halpin: "I say that if Illinois will bring call center jobs... or businesses will bring call center jobs to Illinois to make sure that... and they're going to receive Illinois taxpayer money, they should commit to stay in Illinois. They should commit to paying their workers a fair wage. And they should commit to telling their workers in advance if they're going to leave the state. And just..."

Hays: "I say you're lucky you're not running in my district..."

Halpin: "...just because you say it in a loud voice doesn't make it
 anymore true."

Hays: "...because it will be time to update your resume, Sir, 'cause we are not going to stand for one more day of this nonsense, not one more. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Representative Wehrli."

Wehrli: "I move the previous question."

'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the previous question is moved. Remember that there has been a request for a verification. So, on the... on the issue, Representative Halpin moves for passage of House Bill 4081. All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this Motion, there are 61 voting 'aye', 49 voting 'no'. And Representative Batinick has requested a

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

verification. If the Clerk would read the... the affirmative votes."

Clerk Hollman: "A poll of those voting in the affirmative: Ammons; Representative Representative Andrade; Arroyo; Representative Representative Bristow; Representative Burke, K.; Representative Carroll; Representative Cassidy; Representative Chapa LaVia; Representative Connor; Representative Conroy; Representative Conyears-Ervin; Representative Costello; Representative Representative Currie; Representative D'Amico; Representative Representative Davis; Feigenholtz; Representative Fine; Representative Finnie; Representative Flowers; Representative Ford; Representative Gordon-Booth; Representative Greenwood; Representative Guzzardi; Representative Halpin; Representative Harper; Representative Harris, G.; Representative Hernandez; Representative Hoffman; Representative Hurley; Representative Jones; Representative Kifowit; Representative Lang; Representative Representative Mah; Representative Manley; Representative Martwick; Representative Mayfield; Representative Mitchell, C.; Representative Moeller; Representative Representative Mussman; Representative Riley; Representative Scherer; Representative Representative Sente; Representative Slaughter; Representative Smith; Representative Stratton; Representative Stuart; Representative Tabares; Representative Thapedi; Representative Turner; Representative Wallace; Representative Walsh; Representative Welch; Representative

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Williams; Representative Willis; Representative Yingling; Representative Zalewski, and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Batinick, do you have any questions of the affirmative Roll Call?"

Batinick: "Rep Ford."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Ford. Representative Ford is in the back of the chamber."

Batinick: "I see Tabares. Representative Feigenholtz... sorry. Feigenholtz."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Feigenholtz is in her chair."

Batinick: "Rep Ying... he's right there. We're good."

Speaker Currie: "Thank you. You withdraw your..."

Batinick: "I withdraw my Motion."

Speaker Currie: "Okay. So, on this Motion, there are... yeah. This Motion, having received the appropriate number of votes, this... House Bill 4081 is declared passed. We're now going to get on Third Reading to House Bill 4900, Representative Guzzardi. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4900, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Guzzardi."

Guzzardi: "Thank you, Madam Chair, Members of the House. I rise today to present House Bill 4900. As we know the cost of prescription drugs is burdening families around this state. People, especially our seniors who are on fixed incomes, are forced to choose between paying their bills, buying their groceries, and filling life-saving prescriptions. It's a complicated problem with lots of causes. We're here today to address one of those causes which is price gouging in the

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

generic and off-patent drug industries. You might think of this as the Martin Shkreli problem, the famous 'Pharma Bro', whose company raised the price of a life-saving drug from \$13 a pill to \$750 a pill. We've heard of examples on Epi-pens. We also talk about Legionnaires. You know, it was... it's been in the news a lot lately. Erythromycin is a common antibiotic that's used to treat Legionnaires and it has been... also seen enormous pricing increases, 3,700 percent in recent years. Essentially, this Bill will empower the Attorney General to investigate companies that engage in price gouging. They'll ask those drug companies why they raise their prices so much. If the company can explain it, that's fine. But if the only reason that they raise prices was simply to make money, the Attorney General can bring action in court and seek remedies on behalf of consumers. Most generic drugs do a great job of bringing down prices, but for the ones who are engaging in this price gouging, we need tools to fight back. So, I ask for your 'aye' vote to lower prescription drug prices for consumers and for the State of Illinois."

Speaker Currie: "Rep... Representative Guzzardi has moved for passage of House Bill 4900. And on that Motion, Representative Breen."

Breen: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Currie: "The Sponsor will yield."

Breen: "And Representative, was this... was... did this come back to committee? Did we talk about this in committee? I thought there was some issue that was supposed to come back that we were still working on with the advocates?"

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Guzzardi: "We didn't make a commitment to bring it back to committee. We passed it out of committee in the Human Services Committee. There is an Amendment that I filed that I'm hoping to upend in the Senate which makes a few technical changes. And in fact, makes a concession to the opponents of the Bill around very low cost prescription drugs."

Breen: "But you've not added it here, so we're taking a vote on it without..."

Guzzardi: "Correct."

Breen: "...any sort of low cost prescription drug..."

Guzzardi: "That's correct."

Breen: "...protection? Okay. And your... your Bill would then control the drug pricing allowing the Attorney General to go in and issue subpoenas to any person to determine whether a manufacturer or distributor has violated the Act? The AG has the ability to issue subpoenas to people?"

Guzzardi: "If they believe that that company is engaged in price gouging under the statute, yes."

Breen: "Wow. How many other states have this... this law on the books?"

Guzzardi: "Just one at the moment. It was passed in Maryland last year. We're excited to follow in their footsteps. A number of other states have filed similar legislation this year as well."

Breen: "I think you're the first person to ever say that we are proud to follow in Maryland's footsteps, at least, since roughly the founding of the country. But on to the next point."

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Guzzardi: "They had a pretty good college basketball team for a while, I digress."

Breen: "Wow. All right. Sorry. I know we're both ACC guys. But your Bill would take just a 30 percent increase in the cost of a drug and all of a sudden then impose all sorts of measures on the company to prevent them from doing that. And you had pointed out a \$7 to a \$10 change is a 30 percent increase that then triggers your Bill..."

Guzzardi: "So..."

Breen: "...triggers all of these... these draconian issues."

Guzzardi: "...to be... to be clear, these are all at the discretion of the Attorney General's Office. So, they are going to be looking at... so, the 30 percent increase over the course..."

Breen: "Is that supposed to make me more confident or less confident at the discretion of the Attorney General's Office?"

Guzzardi: "The 30 percent increase over the course of one year.

I... I can't speak to your levels of subjective confidence, but the 30 percent con... increase over one year is a... a considerable increase in the cost of a drug. And so, that begins an investigatory process. So, the drug company is given the opportunity to demonstrate that that increase was reasonable, that it was caused by changes in the course of cost of production or in the cost of marketing. If they can't demonstrate that it was a reasonable increase, then the Attorney General can file an action in front of the courts. And the courts can determine if, indeed, price gouging was undertaken."

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Breen: "But here's the problem. Your... you immediately put the company on the defensive. The Attorney General has subpoena power over them, and that subpoena can be invasive. And then you've got a court process where you have to defend every change in price that is of 30 percent which is, again, 7 to 10 dollars is a 30 percent increase."

Guzzardi: "Well... so... well, we keep hearing from the generic industry as we discuss this Bill over and over is that generics are driving costs down. And for the majority of generic drugs... in fact, they're engaging in healthy open market competition and they're driving costs down. So, if they are in fact acting in good faith as they claim to be, then they won't have any problems running up against the provisions of this Bill."

Breen: "But isn't it a... I mean, it's a core principle, the free market that sometimes the costs can get driven down, occasionally, they get driven up, but in the long run they all go down."

Guzzardi: "Right."

Breen: "But not if you control the prices in the midst of that market shake out process."

Guzzardi: "So, Representative, if your fundamental position is that these businesses should be allowed to engage in price gouging because it's a free market principle, then you and I are going to disagree on this Bill. But the folks who have to buy these prescriptions, your constituents, who have to pay for Epi-pens, who saw a 600 percent increase in the price of that life-saving medication, they might disagree with you."

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Breen: "But the problem is what you've defined as alleged gouging is not actual price gouging. We're not talking... even if you were trying to set a percentage... you're setting it at 30. It's a low percent that, based on manufacturing issues and others, you could cause real problems in the supply chain for the drug. As well, why does this only apply to, you know, generics?"

Guzzardi: "It doesn't..."

Breen: "Why doesn't it apply to all drugs?"

Guzzardi: "It doesn't apply only to generics. It applies to offpatent prescriptions as well. The drugs that..."

Breen: "Off-patent prescriptions are, you know, eligible to be generics."

Guzzardi: "Some are, some aren't. But the... the drug that it doesn't cover are on-patent drugs, patented pharmaceuticals. And the reason it doesn't address those is because those are governed by Federal Patent Law. But I would also say, on that question, you know, put it to you like this. I grew up with an older brother, who's very close in age to me, and when I would do something bad, Representative Breen, I would sometimes say to my parents but he did something worse. My brother did this worse thing. And they would say to me that's not an excuse for the bad thing that you've done. So just because there's bad actors in the on-patent pharmaceutical industry, doesn't mean that these folks should be able to get away with price gouging."

Breen: "And that's not the point, but what it... what we're saying is if this is such a great principle to price fix in the free market, which is something I thought we had left in the 1930s

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

or so. If that's such a great principle, then why not just apply it to everything?"

Guzzardi: "Well..."

Breen: "Why don't we apply it to every product? Why don't we just...

every time anything does up 30 percent in price, boom?"

Guzzardi: "Representative, it's..."

Breen: "Like my iPhone. Apple maybe is price gouging me."

Guzzardi: "Yeah. Well, Representative..."

Breen: "My Apple... my iPhone went up 30 percent in price this year."

Guzzardi: "Sure. Representative, the unfortunate fact is that in many of these medications, which are required for people to survive because they're very ill, there is only a single manufacturer of those drugs and they raise the prices by hundreds or thousands of percent simply to make a profit on the backs of your sick constituents."

Breen: "Except that you..."

Guzzardi: "That to me..."

Breen: "Right."

Guzzardi: "...seems like a reasonable and worthwhile cause..."

Breen: "But you see if..."

Guzzardi: "...for legislative action..."

Breen: "...that you..."

Guzzardi: "...to protect the people of Illinois in your district, and mine, and everyone else's."

Breen: "Why are they raising the prices hundreds or thousands of percent?"

Guzzardi: "Simply to make a bigger profit."

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Breen: "Why? How? How are they able to do that when it's a... when it's a product anyone can manufacturer?"

Guzzardi: "Well, so that's... that's an important point because, as I said, this Bill..."

Breen: "Also, you're at 30 percent."

Guzzardi: "Hold on, Representative. Let me just..."

Breen: "You're not at hundreds or thousands of percent..."

Guzzardi: "Let... let me answer that..."

Breen: "...when we could actually talk about those issues. Is..."

Guzzardi: "Let me answer your question, Representative."

Breen: "Sure."

Guzzardi: "So, there are... this Bill covers two different things, generic drugs and off-patent drugs. Off-patent drugs often only have one exclusive manufacturer, okay? Generic drugs, as a matter of fact, a recent study from the University of Chicago by a health economist named Dr. Rena Conti, she says that 40 percent of generic drugs manufactured in this country also only have one manufacturer. And over 50 percent of them only have two manufacturers. So, the fact is that we're not operating in a robust dynamic free market. There is a very small handful of companies that manufacture these drugs which leads to the potential... as I'm sure as a free market guy you understand... when there's limited competition that leads to anticompetitive practices like price gouging."

Breen: "And the other excuse for this or the other explanation for it rather is that the profit margins are so thin..."

Guzzardi: "Representative, that's..."

Breen: "...that it's not worth anyone else getting into the market for certain of these products."

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

- Guzzardi: "But... but you know better than that, Representative. And if you listened to the testimony in, for instance, in the trial of Martin Shkreli who was recently in the news, you'd know that he has avowed in communications within his company. He says this is an investment opportunity for us. We know there are sick people who need this medication to live. They're charging very little for it. We could charge a... a boatload more and just make profit. This isn't a matter of profit margins, Representative, this is a matter of intentional gouging of the sick people of the state by greedy and rapacious corporations whom we have a responsibility to bring in check."
- Breen: "And I'm sorry. When you said greedy and rapacious corporations, it just... it's... I mean, as I understand it, you define all corporations that way, Representative. So, I'm just... I'm trying to figure out which ones are the greedy and rapacious ones and which ones are the wonderful, virtuous ones."
- Guzzardi: "Well, I think, touring pharmaceuticals I bet we could all agree was in the greedy and rapacious category."
- Breen: "And... and you're... I mean, your citing an insider trading gentleman who was... who was... appears to be, you know, a real actor. The problem is, the presumption here is that everybody in the field is a bad actor and if a price jumps one year, which it is going to do in the free market, that all of a sudden, boom, we've got subpoenas. We've got all sorts of invasive processes. We're not talking about the hundreds and thousands of percents under your Bill. And so, if there's some issue with those folks that could be remedied through

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

our intervention in the General Assembly, I can understand it. The problem is getting at a 7 to 10 per... a price increase of \$7 to \$10 triggers your Bill."

Guzzardi: "So Representative, let..."

Breen: "It is way too invasive as it stands."

Guzzardi: "Let me describe to you the Amendment that... that's filed as House Floor Amendment #1, which we're going to add in the Senate. So I think this may address some of your concerns. And you may... you may say you don't want to hear about it in the Senate, but I figure... I feel the need to disclose it to you anyway. We're going to institute a price floor which will say that if a generic... if a 30-day wholesale acquisition cost of a generic drug doesn't rise above a certain threshold, then it won't be eligible even to be considered under this price-gouging statute. So, that price floor will cover some of those instances you're talking about... about low-cost medications. And I look forward to bringing that back to the House Floor for a Concurrence vote."

Breen: "And then just..."

Speaker Currie: "To the Bill?"

Breen: "Very quickly. The issue of... one of the other issues is this. If generic drug manufacturers say, you know what, it's not worth it for me to sell that particular drug in Illinois, but I could sell it in the other 48 states... and I don't even know how Maryland's law is drafted... 49 states I guess if Maryland... I don't know, again, if theirs is as restrictive as ours, what's stopping them from just saying, yeah, you know what, I'm not going to bother with Illinois because they can't get the price that I can otherwise get in the rest of the

country. And then, all of the Illinoisans have to go out of

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

state to get their generic drugs and then bring them home."

Guzzardi: "That's... that's not how the... the drug marketplace works,
actually. So, these... we're talking about manufacturers
selling to wholesalers, right? And they, then, further down
the supply chain, sell it to distributors, pharmacies,

and choosing which citizens of which states sh... they're selling their drugs to."

hospitals, et cetera. So, these manufacturers aren't picking

Breen: "But there's nothing stopping them from beginning that process now once..."

Guzzardi: "Representative, that's not how the..."

Breen: "...if we were to implement something like this. So, again..."

Guzzardi: "I don't understand what you mean, Representative."

Breen: "So, again, I'll go to the Bill. I know there are plenty of other people who..."

Guzzardi: "Yeah, please, by all means."

Breen: "...want to speak on this issue. Ladies and Gentlemen, again, price fixing is something that should have stayed whether it was in the '70s or the '30s, some other era than this one. This is not the way to address an issue which does exist, but my goodness, you can't take a drug that goes from \$7 to \$10 and say, nope, we're going to start subpoenaing you and you've got to be on your heels and try to explain how you price your product. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Currie: "There are nine people seeking recognition to speak on this Bill. There weren't when we started the debate, but there are nine now. And this is on Standard Debate, so we will begin using the timer. Representative Reick, you're up."

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

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

Guzzardi: "Pleasure."

Speaker Currie: "The Sponsor will yield."

Reick: "Hi, Will."

Guzzardi: "Hello, Representative."

Reick: "Hey, question. A generic drug is, by definition, one that anybody can manufacture and put on the market. Is that correct?"

Guzzardi: "I wouldn't say anybody. I'm not sure you or I could."

Reick: "Well, no. You got to be a drug company, let's say."

Guzzardi: "Right. It's a barrier to entry I'd say."

Reick: "Okay. Well, being a drug company is not a barrier to entry, it's an efficient allocation of resources and capital. But the… but the question I have is if the price goes up to such a degree that somebody like… let's say Merck is making a cholesterol medication on… and it's a generic… and the patent expires and it goes into generic. And they decide they're going to raise their prices 30 percent or 50 percent or a hundred percent. What's to stop somebody like Abbott Labs from making a generic equivalent that they can go in and undercut Merck's price on their… on their product? Isn't the marketplace going to control the price of these drugs?"

Guzzardi: "Well, so, two things. One, you have to remember that we're not only talking about generic drugs in this Bill. We're also talking about sole source off-patent drugs. So, drugs from which there is legally only one manufacturer."

Reick: "Because they're under patent?"

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

- Guzzardi: "No off-patent. These are off-patent drugs. The patent has expired, but a generic version of the drug has not been approved by the FDA. But even..."
- Reick: "Okay. So, this is... this is an issue that the FDA needs to do in order to move drugs faster from off-patent to generic form. Is that correct?"
- Guzzardi: "But let me... let me point this out to you which is that even in the instance of generic drugs, as I mentioned, I can't tell you why 'cause I'm not in that industry, but 40 percent of approved generics only have a single manufacturer. So, the idea that all of a sudden this robust competition is going to drive down the prices, first of all, there's not the competition and second of all, in a number of these well-documented instances, the prices have gone up. So, the theoretical idea that it ought to be going down does not combat the lived reality that the prices are going up in some cases egregiously."
- Reick: "Well, again, couldn't it be due to the fact that we have so many restrictions placed upon drug companies to protect... to create and offer drugs in the market that the cost of even doing a generic equivalent is prohibited? Now, I... you know, I read somewhere years ago that it costs about \$800 million to bring a drug to market. And you got to recover that money or you're not going to be bringing any more new drugs to market."
- Guzzardi: "I appreciate you bringing that point up because these companies are not the ones who are doing that enormously expensive and costly research. Generic manufacturers are taking molecules... prescriptions that have already been

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

patented. The patent has expired. They're not doing new research. They're not doing new testing. They're not doing new FDA approval. They're doing... using existing drugs. So, they're not trying to recoup all the costs of R&D."

Reick: "Which... which leads to our lower pricing of generics, but if the marketplace in any... in any good or service... let's take it away from pharmaceuticals. Let's put it into anything. If there's a... if there's a rapid increase in price of any good or service that is not subject to patent protection, somebody can come in and undercut that price by... by creating a profit... product that is equivalent in use and... and costs less. That's called capitalism."

Guzzardi: "Yeah. But Representative, unfortunately, as you can tell, that's not happening in the… in the present market, right? Instead of robust market competition, we see products that are controlled by monopolies. And, as you know, in monopolies there are the opportunities for market abuses, right, where companies can gouge consumers 'cause they're the only people who control access to the good. And that's a problem in the monopolistic market environments which is why it requires regulation in those environments. That's why we regulate utilities, for instance. They're called regulated monopolies. We give them exclusive control of the market, but we say you've got to be careful about how much you raise prices by."

Reick: "So..."

Guzzardi: "That's all we're doing here."

Reick: "...so, let me ask you... So you know, Will, the 1930s have called and they want their economic policy back, I guess, is

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

what I'm saying to you. The fact is, is that if... if what you're doing is... is in effect regulating at the state... at the government level the price of drugs, which is what you're doing by putting the onus... the onerous burden of... of government..."

Guzzardi: "Of not... of not price gouging. The onerous burden, you know."

Reick: "You're call... you're basically calling the cops to go in and say, hey, what... what's with this price increase? You're asking the State's Attorney to go in and say... or the Attorney General to go in and inquire as to a business practices of a business. You know, we have a Bill before this... before this Legislature to set up a worker's comp insurance program, but we're going to borrow \$10 million of money that we don't have from ourselves in order to set up a worker's comp program so that greedy insurance companies won't have profits. Why don't we set up a generic drug company here in Illinois and borrow a hundred million dollars from ourselves that we don't have so that we can go ahead and make generic drugs and make everybody happy? To the Bill."

Speaker Currie: "To the Bill. You've got two seconds."

Reick: "Two seconds. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Currie: "Good... good job, Representative Reick. Okay. We now have, again, nine people on the Bill. Representative Andersson is next."

Andersson: "Thank you..."

Speaker Currie: "The timer is on."

Andersson: "Thank you, Madam Chair and I will be brief. Will the Sponsor yield?"

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Speaker Currie: "Sponsor will yield."

Andersson: "Thank you. Representative, I noticed you changed the name of your Bill. It now reads the Pharmaceutical and Health Affordability Restrictions on Manufacturer's Amoral Behavior Through Reasonable Oversight Act. That's quite... that's quite a name."

Guzzardi: "Thank you."

Andersson: "Yeah. Are you a fan of acrostics?"

Guzzardi: "Yeah. From time to time I... I like to get acrostics as much as the next guy."

Andersson: "Would... would you explain to the Members of the chamber what an acrostic is?

Guzzardi: "Yeah. It's where you have letters... you run words like this and the letters down the line like this spell something out."

Andersson: "So, if I did that for your Bill or for your title, what would it spell?"

Guzzardi: "By sheer coincidence it would spell the word Pharma Bro."

Andersson: "And who is Pharma Bro?"

Guzzardi: "Well, that's our friend Martin Shkreli who's been mentioned a few times on the floor today."

Andersson: "Well played, Representative."

Guzzardi: "Thank you, Representative."

Andersson: "Well played."

Speaker Currie: "Are you finished, Representative? All right.

Then the next... next we have Representative Keith Wheeler. The timer is on."

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

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

- Speaker Currie: "Sponsor will yield."
- Wheeler, K.: "Will, I know we're going kind of fast here 'cause we only have five minutes, and I wish we had like an hour to discuss this. I love talking with you, you know that."
- Guzzardi: "The feeling's mutual."
- Wheeler, K.: "You've set an arbitrary threshold of 30 percent for this price gouging. Is that correct?"
- Guzzardi: "I think the fees were arbitrary, but yes."
- Wheeler, K.: "Okay. But then there's no... you don't have any data that shows when it goes to that 30 percent you actually have a... a gouging situation or you have a market diminishment?"
- Guzzardi: "Right. Although, again, we do… we have extensive provisions which I think are rather generous to the companies in this case. I'm sorry."
- Wheeler, K.: "I can't vote on those yet."
- Guzzardi: "You... go ahead, Keith. You got a point to make; I'll let you make it."
- Wheeler, K.: "So, you mentioned before about having a small handful of manufacturers being potentially a... a price abuse situation because there's nobody else to retake their spot. Okay? And if you limit these increases 30 percent, which my colleague had mentioned, can sometimes be nothing in their own doing... had anything to do with that price increase. There could be a materials increase. There could be a litigation problem. There are things that they... are outside of their control, but then..."
- Guzzardi: "Right. So... so, that's exactly not price gouging under this statute. If you read the text of the statute, you'll know that that... that does not constitute price gouging."

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

- Wheeler, K.: "I... but the cost to the company still has to... they have in front of the Attorney General defend themselves 'cause they're almost guilty until proven innocent until they can prove the fact that they had real... I'm not just... I'm reading here, buddy."
- Guzzardi: "Guilty until proven innocent, Representative."
- Wheeler, K. "Well, I mean, as far as... if you're a company and you had to spend money, that's just like a tax."
- Guzzardi: "If... if the state believes you violated a law, they can investigate you. It's not guilty until proven innocent."
- Wheeler, K.: "No. But you're not... but you're saying, oh my gosh, I can't go above 30 percent, maybe I should just get out of the market. That's the point that this is going to come to. As well-intentioned that this is, and the person we're referring to created this whole problem in the first place, is already in prison. He's probably not going to do this again right now."
- Guzzardi: "But let me point out to you, Representative, that this..."
- Speaker Currie: "Could... could we have a little quiet so we can hear the conversation. Thank you."
- Guzzardi: "The GAO, the Government Accountability Office, which is a federal agency, did a study of 1,400... 1,400 generic drugs over the course of 5 years. They found that in 300 of those instances in at least 1 of those 5 years there was a hundred percent or more increase of the cost of that drug. So, this is not just a Martin Shkreli problem. With respect to the Representative, from Geneva's comments about my Bill title..."

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Wheeler, K.: "Right. But... but you're making an assumption, you know... the assumption then is that those companies are doing it purely for a profit motive. There's no other cost phases, no other fear of retribution or retaliation, or maybe a better word for it is just litigation, because those things come in that market especially..."

Guzzardi: "Right."

Wheeler, K.: "...especially in that area. So, I understand that..."

Guzzardi: "That's... that's precisely not the assumption of the Bill. In fact, the Bill carves out those instances and says that they're not considered price gouging. I don't know how much more clear the text of the statute could be on that question, Representative."

Wheeler, K.: "Okay. Well, I appreciate the intent, but our analysis shows it to be a little different than that."

Guzzardi: "It... it's not intent. It's verb... it's black and white letters in the Bill."

Wheeler, K.: "So, you can say that I'm... it's going to cost me nothing then to defend myself in those situations? I can say, oh, these materials went up. Those are private... Will, I mean, I'm not trying to be mean to you here, but I'm just saying this... in a business world these are things you look at and go, hey, this could cause me a problem. Why should I stay in this market? And my concern is that if we pass this Bill and it goes into any form like it is right now, that drug manufacturers may consider the idea of just pulling out of that market. And then, we have zero manufacturers providing the drug that we need to help our patients and our constituents, in this state. That's a legitimate concern that

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

I haven't unheard... unwound yet. Now, if you can fix it in the Senate, maybe we can talk about that. But right now, the Bill we have in front of us doesn't help us in that part of it. We have a dynamic... dynamic market in drug manufacturing in this state. Would you agree that the North Shore is filled with drug manufacturers that provide thousands of jobs for Illinoisans?"

- Guzzardi: "I can't speak to the number of jobs they provide. But I would agree that we have some companies engaged in this business in our state, yeah."
- Wheeler, K.: "Well, I'm... I'm very concerned that we protect that market as well. And to the Bill, since we're all short on time. Thank you, Will."

Speaker Currie: "To the Bill, yeah."

Wheeler, K.: "Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen, Illinois is actually a hub of the pharmaceutical industry. My data shows there are over 300 thousand people who work in Illinois in the pharmaceutical industry. And here we are, yet again, taking one more step, well-intentioned, with the potential... with the potential to make these more difficult for a business, for a manufacturer, for a distributor, wholesaler to be caught in how do we avoid this problem? How do we make this so we don't get in trouble with this? How do we avoid the cost of defending ourselves if the accusation is made? If we trigger some arbitrary number comes up and all of a sudden now we're in front of the Attorney General having to explain what we're doing. Using what numbers could very well be ... could very well be numbers that are specific and unique to our company that are trade secrets. These are things we don't

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

want to have exposed. We want our manufacturers to have a solid market to work off of here. Let's not make this bad for Illinois business week. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Representative Carroll. The timer is on."

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

Speaker Currie: "The Sponsor will yield."

Carroll: "I stand in support of this Bill. I appreciate you bringing this forward."

Guzzardi: "Thank you."

Carroll: "As a parent of a child who needs an Epi-pen, of the parent of a child who needs an inhaler, of the parent of a child who needs an inhaled steroid, when I see the price of these projects... of these products skyrocket and I don't really understand why and we... and we limit competition in this state and we allow the pharmaceutical companies to dictate prices. I use the example of Valiant Pharmaceuticals who went from being a company that was innovative at making pharmaceutical products to taking the products they had and skyrocketing the price and forcing families to make decisions of life-saving medications or dinner. And that's unacceptable to me. In this country of innovation, in this country of everything that we have for people to have to make decisions on life-saving medications whether it can be afforded or not is disgraceful. Luckily, my family can afford to give my daughter the medication she needs. I would hate to be that family who can't. So, I really appreciate this Bill. And I thank you for bringing it forward, Representative."

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

- Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Representative Bellock. The timer is on."
- Bellock: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Currie: "He will."
- Bellock: "Oh. Thank you. So, I know I'll keep this short, Representative Guzzardi. And I know you were nice enough to come to me several times about the Bill and you did a good explanation of the Bill. But I have the same concerns. I wanted to ask you first off is IMA and the Illinois Chamber of Commerce still strongly opposed?"
- Guzzardi: "I... I'm not sure about strong. They said in committee that any Bill that regulates the price of anything they're going to oppose flat out. So, I didn't really see a path to lifting their opposition."
- Bellock: "Right. And then, I... I just... I would agree with some of the other comments that have been made. I think, as long as I've been here, the longer I'm here the less government control, I think is a good idea. And in this case, this is absolute government control. And I don't know if anybody has brought up as much about the Attorney General, and not that we don't like the Attorney General, but in this case it gives the Attorney General... she can request confidentiality and proprietary information from the drug manufacturers. Isn't that correct?"
- Guzzardi: "Yeah. And you'll note that at the end of the Bill we have an exemption under the Trade Secrets Act for the Freedom of Information Act requests."

Bellock: "Right."

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

- Guzzardi: "So, we want to make sure that those proprietary and confidential information... that proprietary and confidential information doesn't get out into the public to protect those trade secrets, as Representative Wheeler mentioned."
- Bellock: "Right. Well, I know your intentions are good. Nobody...
 nobody in this chamber, nobody in the United States likes
 price gouging, but at the same time the issue of government
 control is extremely important. So, to the Bill."

Speaker Currie: "To the Bill."

- Bellock: "I cannot support the Bill. I think it's a bad thing.

 Drug pricing should not be controlled by government. The FDA is involved in this right now. The State of Illinois would not be... should not put themselves into that position of controlling drug prices. Thank you."
- Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Representative Wallace. The timer's on."

Wallace: "Thank you, Madam Chair. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Currie: "The Sponsor will yield."

- Wallace: "Am... am I to understand that we're arguing... we're arguing about whether or not sick individuals can have affordable access to drugs that can be life enhancing or life-saving? Is that what we're arguing about today?"
- Guzzardi: "I think that's... that's a piece of it. And I... to put a finer point on it, I'd say were arguing about whether a small handful of bad actors in the drug industry should be able to take advantage of those sick people to pad their profits."
- Wallace: "That... that's an amazing point. So, are you aware of an upcoming speech from our current President on this very issue?"

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Guzzardi: "I know that the President has spoken to the issue of high cost of prescription drugs. I really believe that it should be and is a bipartisan concern."

Wallace: "Or... or a nonpartisan issue."

Guzzardi: "Sure."

Wallace: "I mean, it's life or death, right? To the Bill."

Speaker Currie: "To the Bill."

Wallace: "I... I want to say thank you to the Representative for bringing this Bill forward. Over the last several years we've seen medications that are literally life-saving, one example would be vitamin K. A vitamin that occurs in nature in a number of settings, but the pricing on prescriptions for that have gone up over 5,400 percent. And that's a medication that helps to treat blood clots, helps with heart disease. We have individuals who are sick and on fixed income. The average Social Security income is about \$1,300 a month. And any increase of any essential item for an individual on such a small fixed income can be truly devastating. There was some trivialization over this 30 percent increase and applying it to material items like technology, phones, entertainment, but when it's about whether or not you have the ability to have access to medication that can sustain your health and your life that is not a trivial issue. And we should not be talking about it in a position from... of ... or from a perspective of putting profit over people. And that's what I'm hearing in this discussion. And I think it's very sad that that's where we're at that we are suggesting that some companies should be able to run away with record profits while some people suffer. About 20 percent of all prescriptions go unfilled because

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

people don't have access to the money necessary to pay for their prescriptions. And any measure to be able to help and address that is so greatly appreciated. So, I thank the Representative, again, for bringing this forward. I'd like to remind people of simple math. I was having this discussion with a colleague in the back of the chamber at the beginning of this particular debate that 30 percent of zero is still zero. If you don't have the money, you don't have the money. And we should not allow for people to price gouge and put people who are sick and without resources in a position of not being able to have the healthy life that they deserve. So, I encourage an 'aye' vote. People over profits, people in this chamber, people over profits. Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Representative Demmer."

Demmer: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I actually rise for two purposes. First, could you please let the record reflect that Representative Reggie Phillips and Representative Dan Brady are excused for the day? And to the Bill, I would... actually, would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Currie: "Sponsor will yield."

Demmer: "Thank you. Representative Guzzardi, I appreciate the… we had a good discussion in committee on this. And I know that you have an offered Amendment, but that hasn't been adopted. So, we're still talking about the same Bill that we had when we heard the Bill in committee. Is that right?"

Guzzardi: "That's correct. Although it's our intention to adopt similar language of that Amendment in the Senate."

Demmer: "So, one of the items that I brought up in committee is I think we can all agree first that, you know, when we cite

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

these examples of 5 thousand percent price increases that's pretty... that's pretty crazy. It's egregious. We also talked about how complicated drug pricing can be. And your Bill looks to... to try to impose some... some thresholds at which reviews happen during the drug pricing process."

Guzzardi: "Correct."

Demmer: "Does your Bill look specifically at the wholesale acquisition cost?"

Guzzardi: "That's correct, yes."

Demmer: "So, the wholesale acquisition cost is simply one piece in the long process that leads to what the consumer actually pays at the pharmacy when they get it filled, right?"

Guzzardi: "That's absolutely correct. And I want to make... make it clear that the... what determines the end price for the consumer is the result of, as I'm sure you're about to explain, a lengthy and complex process, right?"

Demmer: "That's right."

Guzzardi: "The increases in the whole..."

Demmer: "So, and let me just walk through that a little bit. So..."

Guzzardi: "Yeah, go ahead, Representative."

Demmer: "So, we have a wholesale acquisition cost. In the... in the course of that making it's way from the wholesale price to the... the price that comes up on the cash register at the pharmacy, you have rebates that are involved..."

Guzzardi: "Sure."

Demmer: "...from various transactions. You have contractual negotiations that give deductions on certain... on certain classes of medications, certain drugs. You have the deductibles that any individual could pay. You might have a

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

copay responsibility. You have different levels of insurance, different types of coverage, different tiers that exist within the drug pricing system. And so, isn't it true that under this Bill the wholesale acquisition price could increase by more than 30 percent, yet the price that's paid by the consumer could actually go down?"

Guzzardi: "I suppose one could imagine such a scenario but..."

Demmer: "That's right. So, we have to acknowledge that even in a situation that to your Bill would trigger these alarm bells of price gouging that may actually be a net benefit for a consumer. And that there is not a direct linear relationship between the wholesale acquisition cost and the price that's paid by the consumer."

Guzzardi: "But... but Representative, you..."

Demmer: "Especially because of rebates."

Guzzardi: "...you have to... you have... I'm sure you would concede that on the whole price increases at the beginning of the supply chain are going to lead to price increases at the end of the supply chain, notwithstanding the possibility one could imagine of various circumstances in the middle. But by and large if there's a vast increase on the front end it's going to result in an increase on the back end. Wouldn't you say?"

Demmer: "All I'm pointing out because of the complexities of drug pricing that's not necessarily true. So, there... I'd also like to look at... and I know we have a limited time here. So, I'd also like to look at, you imply some specific things that the Attorney General is empowered to do upon reviewing... upon reviewing what triggered the price gouging from your Bill.

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

So, a 30 percent change in one year would trigger the Attorney General to review. The Attorney General would then collect... would compel the manufacturer to provide statements and documentation and they would... they have the power to restrain or enjoin the violation of the Act. They have the power to restore to any consumer any money acquired as a result of the price increase."

Guzzardi: "Just... a quick interruption there. That's actually not the Attorney General's power. That's the remedies that can be sought in the court. So, the court can impose those remedies, if the court finds that an instance of price gouging actually occurred."

Demmer: "And one of those things is the imposition of a civil penalty of up to \$10 thousand for each violation."

Guzzardi: "That's correct."

Demmer: "Is this \$10 thousand for each drug? Is this \$10 thousand for each transaction that happened from a consumer? How... what's the instance of violation?"

Guzzardi: "For each sale in the State of Illinois, yeah."

Demmer: "I'm sorry?"

Guzzardi: "Each transaction that occurred in the State of Illinois, yeah."

Demmer: "Each transaction that occurred in the State of Illinois. So, if there's a change of price of 30 percent in the drug and it takes several months for a... for a case to happen, the pharmaceutical manufacturer can be fined \$10 thousand for each transaction that occurred in the State of Illinois in the period of that time. Is that right?"

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Guzzardi: "So, it's one of the number of remedies that's available in the Bill. It's at the discretion of the court to impose those remedies as the court sees fit."

Demmer: "All right. Okay. So, I appreciate that. But let's ... let's understand that that's a potential remedy that could be sought and it could amount to tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands, millions and millions of dollars for a simple 30 percent price change in any one drug over the course of a year. I'd also like to look at... I think it's important that we acknowledge that there are quite a few drug manufacturers in the State of Illinois. There are drug manufacturers that employ tens of thousands of people in the State of Illinois. We've had occasion in this chamber to impose over the course of the last couple of days quite a few Bills that already affect employers in Illinois and affect them in a negative way. Let me pose this scenario to you. So, we have thousands and thousands of people who are employed at manufacturers. Let's say one of them has a person in the product who's..."

Speaker Currie: "Representative... Representative..."

Demmer: "...answering phones who's dealing in customer service."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Demmer, you've used up your time, but my understanding is that Representative Long wishes to offer you his five minutes. Is that right, Representative Long?"

Long: "Yes, I do, Speaker. Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "Then... then why don't you proceed, Representative Demmer."

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Demmer: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. All right. Let's look... look at a scenario where there's a drug manufacturer in Illinois. They have a person up front who's answering customer service calls doing general back office work. And the manufacturer decides, you know what, we need to hire some more people to do research and development to develop landmark..."

Guzzardi: "I have a feeling you're about to speak to a different Bill which I..."

Demmer: "...to develop landmark new treatments."

Guzzardi: "Given the length of this conversation already, I would really appreciate you constraining your remarks to the contents of this Bill and not to any previous Bills we've debated on the floor."

Demmer: "And I'm sure any employer in the State of Illinois would appreciate us... appreciate us restraining our actions to things that don't continually and perpetually ding them for every action they try to do to do business in the State of Illinois. But you get my point on that. We already add burden after burden to manufacturers, to employers across the state and this is yet another one of them. The last thing I want to look at and I think this is incredibly important and I... sort of a save the best for last scenario."

Guzzardi: "I can't wait for the best."

Demmer: "I have a... I have something I really think is... is you'll find interesting. This is a recent article from *The Washington Post*. A Maryland law crafted to deter companies from instituting large price increases on old off-patent drugs was struck down by a Federal Appeals Court last Friday in the decision that could give pause to other states considering

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

similar legislation. Such as, state-based efforts aimed at curtailing massive price hikes on generic drugs in states like Louisiana and Illinois. The court found..."

Guzzardi: "I'm proud to report that that ruling has not given us pause and I'm happy to explain to you why, Representative."

Demmer: "But this should give you pause."

Guzzardi: "If you'd like to continue reading, go ahead."

Demmer: "The court found the law violated the Constitution because it would regulate sales outside of the state. This is reading from the opinion. 'Although we sympathize with the consumers affected by the prescription drug manufacturer's conduct, we are constrained to apply the dormant commerce clause to the Act.' That was the majority opinion. The law was struck down. Our law is based on that. A Federal Court has ruled it's unconstitutional. Madam Speaker, to the Bill."

Speaker Currie: "To the Bill."

Demmer: "Vote 'no'."

Speaker Currie: "Next up is Representative Wehrli."

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

Speaker Currie: "Sponsor will yield."

Wehrli: "Representative, in your Bill it's a 30 percent increase over year 1, 50 percent over 3 years and 75 percent over those 5 years. Is there any relief provided in this legislation that if the manufacturer can show cause for those increases that this would not apply?"

Guzzardi: "Absolutely. It's spelled out quite clearly."

Wehrli: "Give me a... because I'm on the clock, give me a 30 second synopsis of that."

Guzzardi: "So..."

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Wehrli: "What's the procedure for appealing that?"

Guzzardi: "It's not an appeal. The Attorney General reaches out to the manufacturer and says provide us evidence about why the price increased. If they can demonstrate that it was because of, for instance, cost of manufacturer or marketing, other sort of related costs then it's not price gouging. In fact, as I mentioned to Representative... to the Representative from... from wherever you're from..."

Wehrli: "Dixon."

Guzzardi: "It's carved out specifically in the Bill that that does not constitute price gouging."

Wehrli: "So, you're familiar with the court case that was just struck down, correct?"

Guzzardi: "I am."

Wehrli: "Okay. And so, does your Bill specifically only apply to drugs manufactured in the State of Illinois?"

Guzzardi: "It will... applies only to drugs who are ultimately...
that are ultimately sold in the State of Illinois, which I
think should avoid the extra territoriality question that
Representative Demmer brought up in terms of the Maryland
law."

Wehrli: "So, if... if a drug is manufactured, say, in Maryland, your price scheme applies only in Illinois?"

Guzzardi: "Only should the drug ultimately be sold in Illinois.

That's correct."

Wehrli: "So, explain to me how that does in... are you a lawyer by trade?"

Guzzardi: "I'm not, as I suspect you know, Representative."

Wehrli: "Yeah. Well, nor am I, so let's have some fun here."

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Guzzardi: "Terrific."

Wehrli: "So, explain to me how that doesn't violate the Commerce Protection Clause..."

Guzzardi: "So..."

Wehrli: "...the Interstate Commerce Protection Clause?"

Guzzardi: "I... I will... I can only tell you what, first of all, what the Appellate Court in Maryland ruled. What the... so, it was a 2-1 opinion in a panel of the 4th Circuit Court. The dissenting opinion... first of all, the two judges who wrote the opinion said in their decision we know that the other Circuit Courts in this country have interpreted this law differently, but we're striking out on our own in a bold setting of new judicial precedent to decide the extra territoriality applies in this case. So, in fact, this court decision is based on no existing judicial precedent and it's widely believed that when this is appealed en banc to the full 4th Circuit, the 14-judge panel, that the decision will be reversed."

Wehrli: "Okay. To the Bill. Earlier we heard discussion of profits over people..."

Speaker Currie: "To the Bill."

Wehrli: "...but this is clearly also a matter of law. The 4th Circuit was clear in their opinion. This should have a chilling effect not only on this chamber but to the other chambers around the United States. While I'm sympathetic with the cause, and it's a noble endeavor, the rule of law is something that in this chamber unfortunately is too often sloughed off. We need to follow that. It applies here. Please vote 'no'."

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Representative Batinick."

Batinick: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Currie: "Yes."

Batinick: "Representative, I... I wanted to ask about the Maryland case as well. It seems like you think that that could be overturned as it goes down the line. And I expect that will probably... maybe all... go all the way up to the Supreme Court."

Guzzardi: "I'd... I'd say that the job of the Judicial Branch is to interpret the law. The job of our branch of government is to make the laws that are right. That is our job as the Legislative Branch. For us to speculate about what the Judiciary might do in a case that's in the course of appeal seems well beyond our purview as Legislators."

"Well, I'm not against you here. But I think it is Batinick: within our purview to do things properly and not against things like the Commerce Code. And... and sometimes I think we're playing in the wrong sandbox. Something that should be done in D.C., we're trying to do something here in... in Springfield. I do want to bring people on my side of the aisle 'cause I heard some... I wish the political atmosphere here was a little bit different because I don't know... I don't ... I don't necessarily think... I want to listen to the rest of the debate. I don't think your Bill maybe isn't the perfect Bill, but people on our side of the aisle needed to realize that this isn't about going back to the 1930s. There is a case... one of the cases, a pharmaceutical company bought a monopoly that produces a drug that was \$15 that saves the life of a baby in utero and raised that price 5 thousand percent. This isn't about marketplace. This isn't about going back to the 1930s.

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

This isn't about price controls. When you have a monopolistic situation, things are looked at a little bit differently. I'm going to listen to the rest of the debate, but I think this is... this is an example of there probably might have been a way... this is a serious problem. I don't know if it's here or in D.C., but this is a serious problem. And it would be nice if we are working together in a more bipartisan fashion to address this. I don't know if it's a House Resolution."

Guzzardi: "Sure."

Wehrli: "I'm not exactly sure what it is, but some of the debate that I heard, even from my side of the aisle, is... is just wrong. This is an important issue about health care, about the cost of health care and we pay a lot more for it than other countries do. And it's something that needs to be solved. With that, I'm done."

Guzzardi: "Representative, let me just quickly say that, and I hope the folks on your side will collaborate this, I've... I've done my best over the last month or two to reach out to Members of the... of the Human Services Committee from the Minority side and I really done... made what I hope to be considered a god faith effort to engage you guys. I don't think is a partisan issue. I don't want it to be one."

Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Representative Demmer. I don't think you were actually named in debate although..."

Demmer: "I certainly was."

Speaker Currie: "...clearly he was talking about you."

Demmer: "I certainly was and I..."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Demmer."

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Demmer: "...I appreciate it. Thank you, Madam Speaker. To the Bill. As I was named in debate, I want to clear up something that was mentioned in regard to the court case in Maryland. I... in Maryland, the court found that the law was unconstitutional because it regulated a sale from a manufacturer to a wholesaler which may be located in any other state. Prior to that wholesaler then engaging in a transaction that brings it back into the State of Illinois. So, by definition, that is an interstate transaction. That's something that happens between a... maybe a whole... a manufacturer here in Illinois. We're proud to have many great drug manufacturers in Illinois. They could sell to a wholesaler in New York. We're regulating the price of an interstate transaction... that's why the court found it unconstitutional. That's why we should have serious pause in... in implying that the State of Illinois's law, which is based on the Maryland law, should just don't take the same course as Maryland's does and get struck down by court after court. Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Representative Fine."

Fine: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Thank you for bringing this forward, Representative Guzzardi. This is a very important piece of legislation because all of us hear from our constituents how they can either afford their medication or food. And that should not be a choice. The… neither of them are an option. A question for you. Unlike patent drugs…"

Speaker Currie: "He will answer questions. He said he would answer your questions."

Guzzardi: "I yield the pleasure."

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Fine: "Unlike... unlike patented drugs, do generic drugs require the money to put into research?"

Guzzardi: "No, they don't. That's just it that these drugs have already been researched and developed. So, recouping R&D costs shouldn't be a concern."

"I'd like to read a quote I read from an editorial in the New England Journal of Medicine. It says, 'manufacturers of generic drugs that legally obtain a market monopoly are free to unilaterally raise the prices of their products. There's little that an individual consumer can do. Some drug companies offer assistance, programs for indigent patients, but these programs often have complicated enrollment processes and they do not offer an effective general safety net.' So, it's very difficult for someone who needs that medication to be able to get the price break that they may need. I also found a very interesting statistic that said about 77 to 85 percent of all outpatient prescriptions are generic drugs. So, again, I want to thank you for bringing this forward because we need to do something to protect the consumer's health so they can afford not only to feed their families but the medications that they need to survive."

Guzzardi: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Phelps Finnie."

Phelps Finnie: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Thank you, Representative Guzzardi, for bringing this Bill. As a provider myself, I see patients daily that struggle to pay for their medication. And so, this is... we all know this is a serious issue, especially those of us who live in economically depressed areas. Also, I had the opportunity... I worked for a

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

drug company for six years. And it was a great company. They did a lot of good for patients. I very well understand the costs of bringing forth a new medication, hundreds of millions of dollars sometimes spent on one chemical that you only find out after you spent 7 or 8 hundred... sometimes million dollars on a product that it can't be brought forward to the market because it may cause cancer or something and they find out through the research. However, also working for that company for many years, I know firsthand the exorbitant bonuses that many people got. And some at the top that I... I could never ... I couldn't... I couldn't understand being in health care and seeing. So, I don't ... you know, I'm for business. We want businesses to prosper. But, when we can't help people who can't... who have to literally choose... this is not made-up stuff. My patients have to choose, especially sometimes elderly, can I buy my groceries, can I buy a medication that's going to keep me alive. I have a problem with that. And I do not have any sympathy for these companies. Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "And the final speaker, at least at the moment, is Representative DeLuca."

DeLuca: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Currie: "He will."

DeLuca: "Representative Guzzardi, violations could result in penalties up to \$10 thousand per violation."

Guzzardi: "Correct."

DeLuca: "Would you classify this legislation as a penalty enhancement?"

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

- Guzzardi: "I would say... you could maybe classify it as a new offense, Representative."
- DeLuca: "Okay. The... the real question I have though is in regards to the process with the Attorney General's Office. What if the Attorney General rejects the... the explanation by the provider for why the cost went up by over 30 percent or whatever?
- Guzzardi: "So, that's the instance in which they would go before a judge. So, the Attorney General, if they got a satisfactory explanation from the drug company, they could say, okay, it's not price gouging. We're done here. But if they didn't believe the explanation of the company was satisfactory to justify the price increase, then they would go before a judge and the judge would evaluate the evidence on both sides and make a decision based on the statute."

DeLuca: "Okay. Good. Is that... that process is spelled out in the legislation?"

Guzzardi: "That's correct."

DeLuca: "Okay. Thank you."

Guzzardi: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Breen to add to the list of excused absences."

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

Speaker Currie: "The record will so reflect. And Representative Guzzardi to close."

Guzzardi: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Thank you, everyone, for the very robust debate on this issue. Ultimately, the question before us, as I've said in this debate, I don't believe it's

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

a partisan one. I believe it's a very simple question about whether we believe that the sick and vulnerable people who live in all of our communities ought to have access to life-saving medications without having profiteering companies take every last penny they can from them. This is a question of protecting access to affordable medicines for everyone in our communities. Our families are clamoring for us to do something. Our state budget needs the relief. We spend billion dollars... billions of dollars every year on prescription drugs through the group health program and the Medicaid program. We need the relief. Our families need it, our state needs it, your constituents and mine need it. They're asking you for an 'aye' vote and so am I. Thank you."

- Speaker Currie: "Representative Guzzardi has moved passage of House Bill 4900. All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this Motion, there are 65 voting 'aye', 38 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having reached the appropriate Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk Hollman: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 992, offered by Representative Smith. House Resolution 993, offered by Representative Costello. House Resolution 994, offered by Representative Butler. And House Resolution 996, offered by Representative Halbrook."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Lang moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'no'.

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

The 'ayes' have it. The Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Clerk, can we have the committee announcements, please."

Clerk Hollman: "The following committee was canceled: Personnel canceled. Meeting immediately Pensions was adjournment is the Transportation subcommittee of the Appropriations-Public Safety Committee in D-1. The Veterans' Affairs Committee will be meeting in the Senate Committee Room 212. Labor & Commerce is meeting in Room 413. Insurance: Property & Casualty is meeting in C-1. The Executive Committee is meeting in Room 118. Health Care Licenses is meeting in Room 122. Special Needs is meeting in Room 115. Elementary & Secondary Education: School Curriculum & Policies is meeting in Room 114. One hour after adjournment is Mental Health in C-1; Public Utilities in Room 118; Appropriation-Higher Education in Room 114; Higher Education in Room 413. Once... once again, Personnel & Pensions was canceled."

Speaker Currie: "Representative McAuliffe, for what reason do you rise?"

McAuliffe: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Currie: "State your point."

McAuliffe: "Yes. Along with Madam Chairwoman Chapa LaVia, I'd like to invite the whole Body, if they're interested, for the subject matter only for the joint hearing on the Quincy Veterans' Home capital needs assessment. We'll be meeting with the Senate in Room 212. So, if you have any questions about what we're doing down... dealing with the Veterans Home in Quincy and the Legionnaires, feel free to stop in and participate. Thank you."

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

- Speaker Currie: "Thank you, Representative. And now... and now, allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, Rep... Leader Lang moves that the House stand adjourned until Friday, April 20 at the hour of 9 a.m. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the House stands adjourned."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. A

 Member statement by Representative Olsen regarding House

 Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #46."
- "Thank you, Mr. Clerk. I'm honored to be the first making this statement in Perfunctory Session. It's an honor to do this. Today I'd like to speak about House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 46 and slightly about Resolution 995 which accompanies that. House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 46 deals with the issue redistricting reform. And this is a critical issue in our state and not only in our state but nationwide. Gerrymandering has been a problematic issue in our nation since its founding. This first happened many, many decades... centuries ago in Massachusetts. And it is a bipartisan issue; meaning both Republicans and Democrats have used it for their advantage, political advantage, and partisan advantage. And I think currently we've seen more and more technology being used to narrowly focus voters and narrowly target specific households and voters and put them into districts to ensure that one party retains that seat. This is an issue that we need to address. We need, in our American democracy, to have real choice for voters. We need an incentive to work together as people so we can come across the aisle and have real choice about our Representative. I think Legislators need to be

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

making the case to voters. The voters should have the choice of who their Legislator is not the other way around. And this is the issue we're trying to address. Now, House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 46 is one proposal, and I think a very good proposal, that we've put out there. We large group of cosponsors in the Representatives. And I think this is an... a proposal which includes an independent Redistricting Commission, Members of the General Assembly and the Secretary of State in the process. And I think it is a good compromise proposal that makes mapping much more fair in our state. Ultimately, we need to rebuild the trust in Illinois' government. The people of this state do not trust our government to be fair. They do not our... trust our government to make good decisions for the people of Illinois. And I believe that adopting this Amendment, and this new process for redistricting, would help make people entrust Illinois government so that they believe they are fully being represented. Now, I think in this ... as we look at this proposal, we know from polling statewide, regionally that there is overwhelming support across Illinois on a bipartisan basis. This could very well be the most important thing we do as lawmakers to restore integrity and true democracy to our election process. Now, a legislative solution, like House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 46, takes political influence out of the equation and allows citizens and an independent Commission to truly drive the process. And importantly, it also adheres with our State Constitution and the important precedence that sets. Now, in our state we have a long history of addressing this

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

issue in a challenging way. Some ... if you've been around awhile in Illinois, you may remember in 1964 all Members of the General Assembly had to be elected statewide because the Legislature could not adopt a map. Now, that issue was rectified in the 1970 Constitution, but it only put in place a map that can be exclusively controlled for partisan interest. We need an independent process. And this Bill would put in place that independent process that we need in our state. Now, I want to say that this is not an issue where I think Republicans are totally blameless. This is not a Republican versus Democrat issue. We look nationwide, we see examples of Republicans using fair map... using mapmaking process for their political advantage. But in our state, it's been the opposite way at least for this map. And we need to stop that. And I think people all across the political spectrum whether they're Republican, Democrat, or Independent agree that elections should be about choice. Elections should be about the voters. Elections should not be about politicians cherry-picking the people they want to represent them. Ultimately, as young people and as a young Legislator in Illinois, I want to do my part to restore the trust of millennials of young people in Illinois Government. Adopting a redistricting reform plan like House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 46 would go a long way in doing just that for the people of Illinois. And I urge this Body to quickly take up that Resolution and adopt it, so that we can put this issue on the ballot for the people of Illinois this year. Thank you."

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

Clerk Hollman: "Introduction-First Reading of House Bills. House Bill 5864, offered by Representative Wheeler, Keith, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 5865, offered by Representative Feigenholtz, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. First Reading of these House Bills. Introduction and First Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 335, offered by Representative Feigenholtz, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 572, offered by Representative Cassidy, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Senate Bill 748, offered by Representative Sommer, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 1008, offered Representative Parkhurst, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 2313, offered by Representative Stuart, a Bill for an Act concerning animals. Senate Bill 2327, offered by Representative Meier, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. Senate Bill 2380, offered Representative Winger, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 2433, offered by Representative Ford, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 2442, offered by Representative McAuliffe, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Senate Bill 2445, offered Representative Stuart, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 2467, offered by Representative Stuart, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 2486, offered by Representative Zalewski, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Senate Bill 2513, offered by Representative Burke, Kelly, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 2514, offered by Representative Stewart, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Senate Bill

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

2526, offered by Representative Mussman, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 2637, offered by Representative McCombie, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Senate Bill 2891, offered by Representative Bellock, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 2902, offered by Representative Olsen, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 2903, offered by Representative Bryant, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 2940, offered by Representative Moeller, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 2958, offered by Representative Martwick, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 2969, offered by Representative Bryant, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 3400, offered by Representative Butler... correction... Senate Bill 3004, offered by Representative Butler, a Bill for an Act 3031, concerning health. Senate Bill offered Representative Cabello, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 3032, offered by Representative Welter, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Senate Bill 3072, offered by Representative Bryant, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 3082, offered by Representative Meier, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 3084, offered by Representative Olsen, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 3127, offered by Representative Costello, a Bill for an Act Bill 3128, offered concerning finance. Senate Representative Walsh, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Senate Bill 3191, offered by Representative Bryant, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 3192,

119th Legislative Day

4/19/2018

offered by Representative Andersson, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Senate Bill 3193, offered by Representative Bryant, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 3246, offered by Representative Bryant, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 3266, offered by Representative Phelps Finnie, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 3514, offered by Representative Davis, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 3561, offered by Representative Currie, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. First Reading of these Senate Bills. Committee Report. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on April 19, 2018: approved for consideration, referred to Second Reading is House Bill 1190, House Bill 1337, House Bill 1447, House Bill 1858, House Bill 1940, House Bill 2063. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."