124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

- Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on April 26, 2018: recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 4208, Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 4886, Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 5069; approved for consideration, referred to Second Reading is House Bill 1930."
- Speaker Lang: "The House will be in order. We shall be led in prayer today by Abbott Austin Murphy who is with St. Procopius Abbey in Lisle. Abbott Murphy is the guest of Representative Breen. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off cell phones and rise for the invocation and Pledge of Allegiance. Abbott Murphy."
- Abbott Murphy: "Let us pray. Oh God, we start today's Session by lifting our minds to You and asking for Your assistance. Help these lawmakers in their difficult jobs. You entrusted to them the care of the State of Illinois with its people, land and resources. May they approach this task with humility and dedication. Guard them from approaching the goods entrusted to their care as things that they may do with however they wish. Instead, may they see themselves as steward to the goods in their care. As stewards who must respect the purpose of things beyond their own making. Just so Lord, bless these lawmakers. May they enact laws that serve the true wellbeing of Illinois citizens that protect and preserve the land, and that serve the freedom of the people of Illinois to use their resources justly in the pursuit of happiness, Amen."

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

124th Legislative Day

- Spain et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Lang: "Roll Call for Attendance. Leader Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record reflect the excused absences of Representatives Gabel and Hernandez."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reick, are you giving us the Republican list today?"
- Reick: "Mr. Speaker, it appears that I am. And if you'll allow me to put my glasses on, I'll be able to read it. In the meantime, I'd like to make a point of personal privilege. In the light of the kind of weather we're having today, could we turn to... could we move that every Bill be... have the previous question called so that we can get out of here and enjoy it? Please excuse Representatives Morrison, Reis, Sauer and Sosnowski for the day."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, please take the record. There are 111 Members present; we do have a quorum. Mr. Harris is recognized."
- Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Good morning. And a point of personal privilege as we get started, if I may?"
- Speaker Lang: "You may, Sir."
- Harris, D.: "Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to put into the record today that Joliet Junior College in Joliet is one of only six... one of only six programs nationwide that received the National Association of Agriculture Educators Outstanding Postsecondary... Adult Agriculture Education Program. That's one of only six in the

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

nation. The award was made in December of last year. So, congratulations to the folks at Joliet Junior College. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Sir. Representative Hammond is recognized."

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

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Hammond: "If the Body would join me in congratulating one of our colleagues, Representative Avery Bourne, who, on Saturday, will be married to Aaron DeGroot. Congratulations, Avery."

Speaker Lang: "Congratulations. House Resolution 951, Mr. Meier.

Please proceed, Sir."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today, in the Speaker's Gallery I have the All Saints Academy of Breese volleyball team. They won the Southern Illinois Junior High School ... or Junior High Athletic Association Class S State Championship. In the semifinals they beat their nemesis, Albers. And in the finals they beat Altamont Lutheran. Before the State Tournament started, they had never had to go to three matches, but in all their games in the state tournament, it took them 'til three matches. But they were destined to win. They finished with a perfect record of 31 and 0. They won the Germantown Tournament, the Clinton County Conference Tournament, the Belleville Diocese Parochial Division Tournament, the All Saints Academy Regional II. They are coached by Jennifer Jasper, assistant coach, Jenna Ratermann. The eighth-grade members of the Saints are Emma Huelskamp, Sophie Hustedde, Emily Johnson, Riley Kleber, Jenna Martin, Tori Mohesky, Meg Poettker, Annalyse Richter. The seventh grade member of the

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Saints is Alivia Lampe. They are the only school in the State of Illinois that has gone and competed and won the state championship in all three divisions, having won the Class L, the Class M and this year having won the Class S. They had an adventurous ride on the way up here today. Their vehicle blew out a tire. In that process, it took the brakes out on the vehicle. So, when they got here to Springfield, they won't forget their ride. We have with them their parents today up in the gallery behind me. Dr. Robin Booth, Ken Hustedde, Janet Hustedde, Sharon Lampe, Jeanne Mohesky, Jill Martin, Trisha Bedkirk, John Kleber, Gary Johnson, Denise Johnson, Gary Richter, Carol Richter, and Bree... Bree Jasper is the manager. So, I'd like everybody to give these girls a round of applause and wish them the best for the future. Thank you."

- Speaker Lang: "Congratulations. Thank you, Mr. Meier. This Resolution has already been adopted. We're happy to have you here with us today. Mr. Ford is recognized."
- Ford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to also congratulate the volleyball team because, as a father of a eighth-grade girl that plays volleyball, I know it is not easy. The volleyball teams... that's a tough sport. And I think that all of you will probably beat me in a heartbeat on the volleyball court. So, congratulations because it's not easy being a champion of a volleyball team. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Moving to some Second Reading Bills, Members, Second Reading Bills. House Bill 5757, Representative Bristow. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5757, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

- day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. But a fiscal note has been requested and not filed."
- Speaker Lang: "This Bill will be held on the Order of Second Reading. House Bill... House Bill 5282, Representative Bristow. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5282, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Ladies and Gentlemen, we may be switching back and forth between Second and Third Reading-Bills. So, please pay attention for your Bills. House Bill 4412 on Third Reading, Representative Ammons. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4412, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Ammons."
- Ammons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 4412 is a effort to ensure diversity in senior management of the State University Retirement System. There were notes put on it that I wish to rule inapplicable. None of them have a fiscal impact and they've all been returned."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative, this Bill's already on Third Reading."

Ammons: "Oh, yes. Thank you. I'm sorry."

Speaker Lang: "So, this is not a concern."

Ammons: "Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Ammons: "So, this initiative was designed to ensure diversity at the senior management level of the State University Retirement System. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Breen: "Representative, I just want to clarify the scope of your Bill. Your... your Bill only applies to the State Universities Retirement System Board."

Ammons: "Yes. That's..."

Breen: "Is that correct?"

Ammons: "That's correct. That's the system that I represent in the 103rd."

Breen: "And as I understand it, your... your own husband serves on that board."

Ammons: "That's correct."

Breen: "So, you're going to amend his board powers very specifically."

Ammons: "No. This Bill gives oversight. As the State Legislature, gives oversight and financial resources to the five public pension funds... the largest one certainly I'm looking at here... and requires that they do everything in their best interest to ensure diversity at all levels of representation in the State University Retirement System."

Breen: "But is your husband compensated for his service on the board that you're seeking to regulate here with this Bill?"

Ammons: "He is not compensated. It is not germane to adding and ensuring that people of color are included, specifically

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

African-Americans, in senior management of State University Retirement System."

Breen: "To the Bill. I'm told that this is either duplicative of existing law or there's absolutely no reason to be applying it solely to the Representative's husband's own board, who, I'm assuming, has some interest in this legislation. If it's a broad-based change to all of the pension boards, then at least we could look at it. Frankly, I don't understand how this can be done by the Sponsor without it being some sort of a conflict of interest. For that reason, I can't support the Bill at this time."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wehrli."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Wehrli: "Representative, how... how is the makeup supposed to be formed? I mean, is there census data? What's the... what's the data points that we're trying to measure to get representation on the board? How do we know if we've hit the target or not?"

Ammons: "Well, the picture that I would see of the administration wouldn't be lacking diversity. It's a very basic premise. I can pull the data from all of our state agencies, as well as our pension funds, and tell you that diversity specifically for African-Americans is lacking across the board. This is specifically dealing with inclusion and wanting to make sure that whoever the trustees are, whether it's my husband or any other person, that they don't walk us back to 1950 and find ways to exclude African-Americans from all of these positions."

124th Legislative Day

- Wehrli: "Okay. I'm not talking about exclusion. I'm trying to know how we've met success. What is the measure of success under this piece of legislation?"
- Ammons: "Certainly we can take it visually. We can take it demographically. We can ask them to do reporting, which I've not done."
- Wehrli: "So, what are the demographics? So, is it... how many people are on the board? How many... how many people..."
- Ammons: "Excuse me? This is not about the board. This is actually about senior management."
- Wehrli: "How many people make up senior management?"
- Ammons: "In committee, I believe they said eight or nine people."
- Wehrli: "So, if it's two people... or is it seven people? I'm trying to figure out how we... how we measure success here. I understand what you're trying to do and I don't necessarily disagree with that. I just want to know when we... when we are successful in meeting this requirement?"
- Ammons: "There... there are 10 people listed as senior management.

 What we measure success is progress from having similarly one person of color to maybe more than one person of color."
- Wehrli: "So, if there's two, is that... does that fulfill the requirements of your legislation?"
- Ammons: "It certainly would. I didn't give them a number to reach."
- Wehrli: "Okay. All right. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Batinick."
- Batinick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Batinick: "Thank you, Representative. I think it's a noble cause. I just want to review some of the stuff I thought I heard in testimony, and see if you could confirm that. My predecessor, actually Tom Cross is head of the IBAG, which I believe puts him in charge of... of SURS. He said that this is duplicative and it already exists in... in current statute and they're already doing this. That's what he had testified. Is that correct? Representative... former Representative Cross?"

Ammons: "I don't remember what his testimony was."

Batinick: "Okay. I recall it as being him stating that it is duplicative. Maybe you recall... he also testified that, I believe, there is 30 percent minority representation at SURS. Do you remember that possibly?"

Ammons: "I don't recall what his testimony is."

Batinick: "Okay. And I... I recall that the last executive director was also African-American. Is that the case?"

Ammons: "There was one African-American executive director."

Batinick: "Okay. Okay. Well, simply... simply to the Bill. I don't know if this is going to change... change the world since it's duplicative. My understanding... I trust in my predecessor. He had stated that this is duplicative. This is already in law. Thirty percent of the... of the board is... not board... thirty percent of the employees there are minorities, including the last executive director being African-American. Just wanted the Body to know that. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davis."

Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Simply, to the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, if more effort was put into being diverse in a lot of these areas, legislation like this wouldn't be necessary.

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Now, what I've heard is that people trying to pin her down on what that number is. Is it one; is it two? What if it was half? Would you be okay with that? And the chances are you wouldn't be okay if we said half. You know, it should bear itself out some kind of way. But the reality is that, unfortunately, in a lot of different sectors... and we see it all over the State Capitol ... it's unfortunate. We see it in staffs. We see it in agencies. We see it in departments. That's why we ask those questions because of what we don't see. So, as much as the directors and people who run all of these departments, if that part of their real desire in terms of running the agency was to make sure that it was diverse and that it was reflective of individuals throughout the entire state, again, legislation wouldn't be necessary. We wouldn't have to run Bills to make sure that we are being inclusive. It wouldn't be necessary. But unfortunately, when we don't see the effort to try to make those things happen, legislation follows. So, for those of you who don't like to see this kind of legislation, then let's work together on the front end to make sure that across the board that these kinds of initiatives are in place to make sure that we have fairness. When I say 'we', I'm talking about people of color, African-Americans. That there is fairness in all of these different agencies. And I think we've seen examples that, unfortunately, in this Capitol, particularly racism still exists. I'm told about a situation with a person in the Senate mailroom who used the 'n' word to refer to one of his colleagues just this past week. So, it exists. So, let's just

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

be sensitive to our efforts to try to make sure that inclusion is paramount in what we do. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ammons to close."

Ammons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you to all the speakers on this legislation. The intention is this. If it already exists, this would not be necessary. If it was already being implemented, it would not be a piece of legislation that I would work on. I am working on this because it is still, unfortunately in 2018, a very measurable... measurable demonstrable need. And therefore, this legislation is before you this morning. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Members, please record yourselves. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 70 voting 'yes', 26 voting 'no', 5 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Mr. Martwick."

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

Speaker Lang: "Proceed, Sir."

Martwick: "Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if you are... find yourself with a little bit of free time today, I would encourage you to look up *illinoistimes.com*. There is a very fascinating article that involves the gentleman standing to my left here. Many of you might know him as our staffer on pensions, labor and gaming, Joe Miller. He was featured in the *Illinois Times* because he recently completed a 100-mile

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

race. He completed that race in the course of 24 hours without stopping. And pretty amazing, the first 50 miles that he ran he ran it at 9 minute per mile pace, which I'm able to run a hundred miles it would just take me 4 or 5 years to complete it. He did it in 24 hours. Joe also recently won the Springfield Marathon and he finished third. So, there were 47 people that started this 100-mile race. I believe only 17 of them finished and Joe took third place. So, congratulate him. A warm round of applause for Joe Miller, our staffer."

Speaker Lang: "Congratulations, Joe. Thank you, Mr. Martwick. Mr. Olsen is recognized."

Olsen: "A point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Proceed, Sir."

Olsen: "Well, I just have to congratulate Joe on... that's incredible. I, as a marathon runner myself, I think that's incredible. I would like to recognize in the gallery, and I'm not sure where they're at, but we have members of the DuPage Mayors and Managers Conference. Some mayors, elected officials and from DuPage County. And so, I'd ask if they'd please stand. We have representatives from Aurora, Carol Stream, Warrenville, Naperville, Hanover Park, Roselle, Bensenville, Elmhurst, Roselle, Glen Ellyn, Woodridge, Itasca, Wood Dale, Wheaton, Oak Brook, Willow Brook, Addison, Lemont, and Wayne here with us. Let's welcome them to the Capitol."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you and welcome. We're glad you're with us today. Thank you, everyone. Ladies and Gentlemen, a couple of announcements from the Chair. First, the Bills that are on Short Debate I'm going to keep on Short Debate. Second, I'm

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

going to be using the timer. We have a lot of Bills to go through and as you may remember, tomorrow's the deadline. So, to be fair to every Member, to get through as many Bills as we can, we're going to enforce those rules. And finally, every Bill on the Calendar on Second Reading has been read into the record. So, we can run your Bills from Second to Third and then pass them. So, please be available and aware when your Bill is up. The next Bill is House Bill 5104, Representative Ammons. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5104, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ammons."

Ammons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There is a House Floor Amendment that needs to be adopted on this Bill."

Speaker Lang: "So, do you wish to move this Bill back to Second Reading? I do not think your Amendment 3 is out of Rules yet.

But I can moves this back to Second or keep it on Third, as you wish."

Ammons: "I want to keep it on Third."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, out of the record. House Bill 2063, Representative Bellock. Please read the Bill. It's on the Order of Second Reading."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2063, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. The Bill was read a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Bellock."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bellock."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. And House Bill 2063, Floor Amendment #1 becomes the Bill. And what it does it

124th Legislative Day

- creates a new Section in the Code of Civil Procedure on victims of trafficking. And it allows for a victim of human trafficking to bring a civil action against their trafficker."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill for a third time."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2063, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative, please hold one second. The Chair recognizes Leader Currie for an announcement."
- Currie: "Thank you. Please add Representative Turner to the excused absences list for the remainder of the day."
- Speaker Lang: "Thank you. Representative Bellock on House Bill 2063."
- Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. And again, House Bill 2063 Floor Amendment #1 becomes the Bill. And what it does it's to address the issue of trafficking. I said in the committee yesterday there are over 600 thousand young people under the age of 18 that are trafficked this year alone in the United States. It's an unbelievable statistic. And what this Bill does is it tries to address to allow for the victims to have... be able to file a civil action against their trafficker, which they do not have now."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Members, please record yourselves. Harris, Hoffman. Winger. Please take the record. There are 110 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5029... excuse me... House Bill 2040, Mr. Breen. House Bill 2040. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2040, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. The Bill was read a second time previously.

No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Breen."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen."

Breen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment becomes the Bill.

It is... it adds the Soaring Eagle Academy, which is a school for autistic children, to a list of the special education facilities that can support students with IEPs to curriculum related activities through the use of their multifunction school activity bus."

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

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

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

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2040, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen."

Breen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This, as described, as a single school. They've got about 75 students, who all of whom have some pretty significant special needs, but they've got a wonderful group there, a very caring environment. It's

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

located in my district, but it serves 37 different school districts across northern Illinois. So, most of the Representatives in northern Illinois are going to have some... one of their children possibly at this school. So, it's a... they do a great work and I'm glad to stand for any questions."

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Carroll, Crespo, Feigenholtz, Moeller. Please take the record. There are 110 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5029, Representative Bryant. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5029, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bryant."

- Bryant: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of House Bill 5029. As I explained this, day care centers should be perceived as pet day care centers. So, this is a really... really simple Bill. Right now there's no distinguishment between a pet day care and... and a kennel. And so, this... this Bill just actually distinguishes between those. And it's one of the few Bills where we have the Humane Society and Department of Ag on the same page. I know of no opposition and request an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Davis. Please take the record. There are 109 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

hereby declared passed. House Bill 1338, Mr. Carroll. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1338, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. The Bill was read a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Carroll."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Carroll."

Carroll: "Yeah. This is a... this... this Bill basically is looking at the disposal of different medications and just hoping to make sure that we're safely disposing of things."

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

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

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

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1338, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Carroll."

Carroll: "Yeah. Just, again, we're looking at how different medications are disposed of. And making sure that it's done properly in a way of making sure the environment stays safe."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 110 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5177, Representative Kelly Burke. Please read the Bill."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5177, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. The Bill was read for a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

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

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5177, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Burke."

Burke, K.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 5177 permits
Chicago police retiree pension members or it... it allows...
permits the Chicago police annuitant and... benefit fund to
reconsider an application for service credit for certain of
their members who took a leave of absence from the Chicago
Police Department to work... to do investigative work for Cook
County, the State of Illinois or the Federal Government.
Again, it's not... does not guarantee any benefit, but provides
these officers with an opportunity to have a rehearing that
due to a quirk in statute does not allow them today. It's a
limited group of people. I... again, it's supported by Lodge 7,
Chicago FOP. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen."

Breen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move for Standard Debate."

Speaker Lang: "This Bill will be moved to the Order of Standard Debate. You have five minutes, Sir."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Breen: "Representative, I'm reading your language and I see that what your Bill is doing is instructing the board... and I guess, forcing the board 'cause it's a 'shall'... to reconsider an

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

application for credit for service that was submitted before April 1, 2008. Why did you pick that particular date? What's the issue?"

Burke, K.: "So, there was a situation in which there was a decision that... that officers who had this type of experience, which is a... fairly common, were... were denied that addition to their benefits. There was a court case and the court found that... that the fund would have to recognize it, but there was a... a subset of officers whose applications had been denied prior to the court decision that, because there is no mechanism in the statute for a rehearing, were not allowed to have a rehearing based on the court decision. So, it's my understanding that there are 17 individuals who this would entitle to a rehearing. Again, the decision of whether or not to grant this... to grant the service credit is up to the board. This would simply give the officers an opportunity in light of the court case to have a rehearing."

Breen: "Well, I guess... but well, I understand the board has some ability to reconsider... well, we would be instructing them to reconsider..."

Burke, K.: "They... they did not have any ability to reconsider."

Breen: "Right."

Burke, K.: "And that's why the statute is needed."

Breen: "Because the original cases were litigated. They were appealed final, they're final. And that all happened before the Appellate Court changed the case law. Is that right?"

Burke, K.: "Exactly."

Breen: "Okay."

124th Legislative Day

- Burke, K.: "So... so, there was a... so, there are officers who have this exact experience, but because their cases were adjudicated after the court decision, they've received the benefit. And it's this small group who has no avenue to ask for a rehearing in light of the court decision."
- Breen: "And my analysis shows that the City of Chicago is opposed to this and the Illinois Municipal League are opposed to this. Is that it? And what's the nature of their opposition?"
- Burke, K.: "I'm going to double check. The city had slipped in opposition and I checked with them after the committee hearing. And I was told that they had slipped... they meant slip as no position, the city itself as no position, but it came up as opposed and I... apparently they did not correct that. I... I don't know about the IML."
- Breen: "And the... the pension fund has not... did not take a position in committee? I don't know if they do take positions. Do they?"
- Burke, K.: "I... I do... I do not see that they've slipped."
- Breen: "Fair enough. And then is..."
- Burke, K.: "We're... we're double checking, but I... I don't recall..."
- Breen: "...is the nature of the opposition of the Illinois Municipal League... it's a pension enhancement. It's going back and reopening closed cases. Is that the nature of their opposition?"
- Burke, K.: "I've... I've never had a conversation with the IML on this. I... you know, I would guess that that is the nature of their opposition."

124th Legislative Day

- Breen: "Okay. And what's the estimated cost to the Pension Fund of reopening these cases and giving these service credit benefits to these particular individuals?"
- Burke, K.: "Yeah. The Pension Fund did not provide that. They were... it was requested of them and they have not provided it."
- Breen: "And so… again, if your Bill goes and they reconsider, they would get back their service credit time while in county service and they'd use it in their city pensions. Is that right? That's what would happen."
- Burke, K.: "Right. They'd be able to... they would be able to get service credit with the Police Pension Fund for the amount of time that they spent doing investigative work for Cook County, the Federal Government or the state."
- Breen: "And at that time, were they being paid by Cook County and the Federal Government or they're being paid by Chicago?"
- Burke, K.: "Yeah. By the agency with which they were employed at the time."
- Breen: "Okay. And were pension contributions being made by those agencies to the Chicago Police Pension Fund? No."
- Burke, K.: "So, in order to get this service credit, the... the police officer would have to pay the employer portion, the employee portion and applicable interest."
- Breen: "So, the police officer will pay all of the costs: employer, employee and interest, if they get the service credit allowed by the board, all of it, the entire cost?"
- Burke, K.: "That's... that's my understanding."
- Breen: "Fair enough. Thank you for the answers to my questions." Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wehrli."

124th Legislative Day

- Wehrli: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."
- Wehrli: "So, Representative, help me understand... while I understand this doesn't have any fiscal impact to the state, the pension system that these annuitants are leaving and going into, do they provide the same level of benefit comparable to each other?"
- Burke, K.: "Does... does it... I... just one second, Representative. Right. I... I think the issue with these cases is that these police officers took assignments where they were doing investigative work for a different agency and they were of fairly short duration, so they would not be vesting in any other Pension Fund. And..."
- Wehrli: "We... we think that or we know that?"
- Burke, K.: "That is my understanding. I've not interviewed all 17 of the applicants, but that is the general impression that I got from the Chicago FOP."
- Wehrli: "Okay. So, what I'm... what I'm trying to get at is... is, are these 17 officers leaving a system where they don't get a three percent compounding COLA and now, they will get the three percent compounding COLA?"
- Burke, K.: "No, no. They're in the Chicago pension... they're in the... they are in the Chicago Police Pension Fund, which is simple COLA. What they're asking for is service credit for the... in the Chicago Police Pension Fund for the time that they were doing this investigative work for one of these three agencies."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Wehrli: "Okay. And they will meet all current obligations as far as salary, interest, things like that? I believe that was stated earlier."

Burke, K.: "That's... that's our understanding."

Wehrli: "Okay. And does this sunset at all?"

Burke, K.: "Well, it... the... the number of people who would be eligible to do this is 17 people, so it's a finite number.

And again, it gives them an opportunity to go for a rehearing.

What the board does, the board does."

Wehrli: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I'd just like to highlight at this time the critical crisis that we have and when it concerns the Police Pension Fund in Chicago. Currently, they stand about 23 percent funded, if you believe that. It's actually probably lower than that. Last year, or at least in 2016, the actuarially determined contribution would have been an 81 percent cost against the salary of the police people... policemen. That is an enormous tax on the residents of Chicago. It's actually unaffordable. And what you have here in this Bill is just one of many examples of Bills over the last few years that have been done for one off situation where folks either want to move from one pension plan... like I want to be a firefighter after being a police officer or they want to move from a downstate plan to a Chicago plan or they want to go back in adjust some service credit from a different plan. So, what you see here is really the need for massive pension reform, not just at the state level, but really at the local level. Now, what we should be

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

focusing on is how do we solve our pension problems? Our pension problems that are literally... bankrupting... bankrupting local governments, bankrupting. The City of Danville, for example, over the last 5 years, has had 112 percent increase in the cost of the local pension plans. They're on the verge of bankruptcy. They have no idea how they're going to pay back \$105 million in debt that they've accumulated. Chicago's far worse off. So, I understand that this is a narrowly focused Bill on a pension reform and giving some service credits back in the Chicago Police Department, but that plan is headed to insolvency. It is headed to insolvency and we are neglecting the bigger picture here of solving this pension crisis of giving these policemen and firefighters the flexibility and... and actually the responsibility for their own... their own pensions in the future and allowing them to take control of their own lives and not be subject to politician's whims on whether or not they funded a plan accurately. So, I appreciate this... Representative Burke's Bill. I will be voting 'no', however, because the plans are so massively underfunded you can't go back and readjust for everybody's nuance. But I really want to highlight to this Body that we are neglecting... neglecting our biggest looming problem in the State of Illinois which is our pension crisis that is crowding out everything else we need to do at the state and the local level. And for us to just passively pass these Bills on without talking about the bigger picture is just doing a disservice to every single taxpayer in the state. Thank you."

124th Legislative Day

- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Skillicorn, your time... the time to... has expired on this Bill. Representative Burke to close."
- Burke, K.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will just make a point that COGFA had requested the pension impact note from the fund some time ago. They've had plenty of time to answer if there was going to be an adverse impact and they have not. And we will double check my assertion about the employer-employee and if there is a discrepancy, it is certainly something that we can... the Sponsor can look at in the Senate. I appreciate the discussion and I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? DeLuca, Thapedi. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 77 voting 'yes', 30 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5558, Mr. Carroll. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5558, a Bill for an Act concerning health. The Bill was read a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5558, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Carroll."
- Carroll: "Yes. Thank you. This Bill just provides that every mental health and developmental facility post in public areas contact information for the Guardianship and Advocacy

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Commission. And the agency... and it's under Section one of the protection and advocacy for persons of the Developmental Disabilities Act."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Burke. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 110 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4685, Mr. Connor. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4685, a Bill for an Act concerning children. The Bill was read for a second time previously.

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

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Connor."

Connor: "Yes. The second Amendment it... to this Bill took care of some liability and immunity issues that were requested by the Trial Lawyers Association. I'd ask that..."

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

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

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

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4685, a Bill for an Act concerning children. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Connor."

Connor: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the chamber. In April 1997, I lost my younger brother, Matt Connor, to malignant melanoma. He did not catch it early enough. And as a result,

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

it had reached Clark's stage III by the time he was diagnosed. This Bill asks that schools allow children to bring sunscreen and sun protective clothing to school without requiring a doctor's prescription. And my hope is, is that with this legislation in place, schools will not hesitate to allow children to protect themselves so no other family has to go through the loss of a child, and a brother, the way my family did. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Breen: "And Representative, I just want to confirm that there are no opponents to your Bill, correct?"

Connor: "That is correct."

Breen: "Okay. And is this a mandate on the local schools or merely a requirement that they allow a student to use these products, which seems like such a no-brainer. Is that..."

Connor: "Yes."

Breen: "Okay."

Connor: "I would call it a no-brainer as well."

Breen: "Yeah. Right. In fact, shame on anyone of these... I mean, they're actually..."

Connor: "Okay."

Breen: "...rejecting the ability of a child to use sunscreen in these schools."

Connor: "Correct. That's it."

Breen: "That's insane. Absolutely insane. Thank you for your Bill."

Connor: "Thank you."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Speaker Lang: "Representative McDermed."

McDermed: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I guess great minds are thinking alike because I also had a very similar Bill which I filed which never came out of Rules. But the point that Rep Connor is making that right now when we send our children to school with sunscreen, it's in violation of Federal Law and we're putting our schools in a bad position. We definitely need to remedy that. As someone who has that... as my dermatologist calls it... cheap Irish skin, it's really important for all of us to be conscious about skin cancer and to make sure that we protect our children while they're under our supervision and while they're at school also. Please vote 'aye'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Brady."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Brady: "Representative, just a quick question. In preparing this legislation, did you have any opportunity to talk to any schools? I just... I wonder what they do now in this situation. Is there some..."

Connor: "Most of my communication was with SUNucate, who has run similar Bills here and the Society of Dermatological Surgeons. And it basically had to do with the idea that they were requiring prescriptions. I don't have numbers here in Illinois, but I do know other states. Some of the schools got skittish and were requiring prescriptions."

Brady: "Okay."

Connor: "For what reason, I don't truly understand."

Brady: "Thank you very much."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Scherer. Please take the record. On this question, there are 110 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4887, Representative Cassidy. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4887, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. The Bill was read a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

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

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4887, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Cassidy."

Cassidy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 4887 is an initiative of the Foster Care Alumni Association of America and is a very simple piece of legislation that... that puts into our statute the right of these youth who are in our care to, at the time of emancipation, receive... Mr. Speaker, it's really, really loud. To allow these youth in care, at the time of their emancipation, to receive all of their identity documentation, all of their medical history, all of the history of... of their time in our care so that they can begin their adult lives with everything they need and not have to spend time reconstructing those documents. I know of no opposition and I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen."

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

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Breen: "And Representative, I just want to make sure. There are no opponents to your Bill including... you know, the... the relevant agencies are not opposing your Bill, correct?"

Cassidy: "No, they are not. This is their current practice. And they support the idea of this being our... an ongoing practice."

Breen: "So, we're merely codifying what they are already doing?"

Cassidy: "Which is what is seen as best practice. Yes, we are codifying that."

Breen: "Fair enough. Okay. And then, I see on your immigration citizenship or naturalization documentation, if applicable. So, there's no... there's no issue here with illegal immigration or anything like that. This is really..."

Cassidy: "No. That's simply among the menu of documents that might be associated with one of these youth. And if that... if that documents exists, they should have a copy of it."

Breen: "All right. Thank you."

Cassidy: "Thank you."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Burke. Kelly Burke. Please take the record. On this question, there are 109 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3909, Representative Conroy. Representative Conroy. Out of the record. House Bill 5599, Representative Conyears-Ervin. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5599, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Third Reading of this House Bill."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Speaker Lang: "Representative Conyears-Ervin."

Conyears-Ervin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the General Assembly. Parents with children need child care to work. The Child Care Assistance Program has allowed many working families, and single parents, to have affordable child care while they work to make ends meet. We should help parents who are working to provide for their families. This Bill does not expand income eligibility beyond the current statutory level of 185 percent. So this Bill will cost us no additional funds. What this Bill does is prevent in the future the devastation that occurred to the Child Care Assistance Program in July of 2015. I will answer any questions at this time."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen."

Breen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move for Standard Debate."

Speaker Lang: "The Bill will be put on the Order of Standard Debate. Please proceed, Sir."

Breen: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield? Representative, I..."

Speaker Lang: "I'm sorry. The Sponsor yields, Sir."

Breen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, I'm trying to figure out exactly what your Bill does. Is the idea that we currently have an Administrative Rule that sets the limit at 185 percent of federal poverty level? Your Bill would require that level in statute to never go below 185 percent."

Conyears-Ervin: "Unless the Members of the General Assembly approves otherwise."

Breen: "And will... would that action change the law though to approve otherwise, I mean, it wouldn't be... It's not something we could do merely by Resolution. We could... we would have to

124th Legislative Day

- actually change this 'cause this is going into statute, so it would overrule any rules or administrative regulations."
- Conyears-Ervin: "So, back in 2015, Representative, the Governor cut child care assistance where nearly 50 thousand children across the State of Illinois, 25 thousand families lost child care assistance. In addition to that, we have small businesses, our day care providers that did, in fact, close because of that stand still."
- Breen: "Right. Oh, I remember it. I was here, yes. But just wanted to make sure that we've got the information there. So, and I see there's, in terms of opposition, the Department of Human Services and the Governor's Office are opposed. What is... what's the nature of their opposition as you... as you understand it?"
- Conyears-Ervin: "Neither one of those organizations have reached out to me."
- Breen: "Fair enough. Do we have any estimate of the cost? I'm not even sure what level is... actually, let me say this. Do you know what... what level do other states set as the lower level?"
- Conyears-Ervin: "Good question, Representative. As I mentioned in the introduction, this is the current statutory level today, so there will be no additional cost."
- Breen: "Okay. I was wondering if you knew what... what do our neighboring states set as a lower limit or do they have a statutory limit? Do they, as well, do rule?"
- Conyears-Ervin: "I don't have that information regarding the other states."
- Breen: "And I... I had a concern raised to me which is if we don't appropriate an adequate amount of money to serve these folks

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

who are at 185 percent, what are they supposed to do? What is the department to do if there's not enough money appropriated by the General Assembly, which is something we do pretty regularly?"

Conyears-Ervin: "So, in statute, they're still allowed to raise copayments, create waiting lists or take such other actions during a fiscal year as were necessary to ensure that the child care benefits paid under this Article do not exceed the amounts appropriated for those child care benefits."

Breen: "Fair enough. To the Bill. This is an interesting piece of legislation. Certainly one that deserves some significant... significant look. We don't know quite what the other states around us are setting. And again, the impact of what do we do if we under appropriate for this agency, which is something that we, the General Assembly, have done repeatedly. That... that makes... makes this of some concern whether we are over... overregulating the ability of the agency to serve the families and kids of the state. So, thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Halpin."

Halpin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. One of the things I think this Bill addresses... to the Bill, I'm sorry... is that there's an uncertainty among people that are eligible for this program now because they haven't had... because they've had this bad experience in the past where the Governor unilaterally makes this decision. We need to encourage people that are eligible for this program to participate in this program. We need to... we need to encourage providers that are providing these services to use this program. And right now, they're afraid

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

that these kind of cuts can happen at any time. So, I strongly encourage support of this Bill."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves, Members. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 75 voting 'yes', 31 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Davis is recognized."

Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May I have a brief point of personal privilege?"

Speaker Lang: "Of course, Sir."

Davis: "Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to welcome a group of women from the south suburbs. And they are the Democratic Women of the South Suburbs for their annual Lobby Day. This is their fifth year doing so. They're behind me in the gallery, if they would please stand. With them are Sheree Henry and Sheena Patton. And they also have students from Bloom High School, Bloom Trail High School, Homewood-Flossmoor High School, IIT, Perspective Math and Science Academy, Rich East High School, Rich Central High School and Thornton High School, all in the south suburbs. Please give them a great round of applause."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome. Thanks for joining us on the House Floor today. House Bill 4512, Representative Conyears-Ervin. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 45..."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Speaker Lang: "Excuse me, Mr. Clerk. Out of the record. House Bill 4513, Representative Conyears-Ervin. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4513, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. The Bill was read a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

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

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4513, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Conyears-Ervin."

Conyears-Ervin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the General Assembly. House Bill 4513 is an opportunity to address the lack of jobs and unemployment that exists in certain communities or areas of poverty. By requiring construction companies who receive state contracts to allow 10 percent of the man hours to be performed on the construction project by individuals who will reside in areas of poverty. I will answer any questions at this time."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen."

Breen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move for Standard Debate."

Speaker Lang: "Already on Standard Debate."

Breen: "Great."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Breen: "And... Representative, how many... what percent do we currently have of folks who are working on these projects who reside in what you're defining as areas of poverty today?"

124th Legislative Day

- Conyears-Ervin: "Right now, Representative, that is not being tracked. So, we do not have that answer."
- Breen: "Now, you're going to require, under your Bill, that all of these various agencies collect a census tracts of all of the workers on construction sites. So, that's a new requirement that we're imposing here."
- Conyears-Ervin: "It's not all these agencies. It's IDOT and Capital Development Board."
- Breen: "That's a... those are some pretty decently sized agencies.

 So, the... is the tollway also involved? I see they're opposed to the Bill. That's why I was wondering."
- Conyears-Ervin: "If they work on state construction contracts, I quess so."
- Breen: "Right. So, the tollway as well. Now, all of these contracts require the payment of prevailing wage. So, anyone who's actually living in a census tract that would even apply to your Bill, they are already not in poverty because they're making prevailing wage, right?"
- Conyears-Ervin: "Actually, that would be great, Representative, if those living in the poverty stricken areas would have access to prevailing wage. This intent of this legislation would mean those individuals would be able to actually rise out of poverty."
- Breen: "But part of the problem is, too, isn't there an issue about lack of access to apprenticeship programs? So, we don't even have folks that are necessarily trained to go to these projects. Isn't that part of the issue and one of the objections that you're kind of... you're not actually bridging... you're not really fixing the problem? You're just making an

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

- imposition, which we have no basis to know about, you know, what's it going to do? How's it to even be implemented?"
- Conyears-Ervin: "So, actually, that was not one of the objections.

 And we believe that this will help to fix the problem of poverty."
- Breen: "And then, have you provided a map to the Members of the General Assembly so they can see which Legislative Districts would be im... or impacted and which census tracts would be part of your... your definition of areas of poverty?"
- Conyears-Ervin: "So, after this legislation is passed, we can work to provide that if you would like."
- Breen: "But that can't be provided today?"
- Conyears-Ervin: "I don't have it on me right here today, no. And actually, we're asking CMS to do that, which is a part of this legislation."
- Breen: "And again... and you don't have an answer to how many working age people in Illinois reside in the 'areas of poverty', which is the 20 percent or more of the individuals who live in the census tract have lived at or below 100 percent of... 150 percent of federal poverty level for the last 30 years. You don't have a number for how many working age adults we even have eligible to be qualified as that?"
- Conyears-Ervin: "And that research is a part of this legislation.

 That is what CMS will be providing."
- Breen: "And is it... am I correct in saying it that they have to have lived at... that census tract has to have been at or below 100 percent... 150 percent of the federal poverty level for 30 straight years, the last 30 years?"
- Conyears-Ervin: "That is what the Bill states."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Breen: "Okay. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, we certainly need to do something to deal with the issues of poverty and other related issues of race in terms of contract work for the State of Illinois. The problem is we have absolutely no idea what this Bill will do. Requiring that a.m. that at a particular census tract... so, that is a very small little area that that be our measure is entirely unworkable. And as well, so someone could move across the street, they're not eligible. If they move... if they stay in their house, they are eliqible. It's going to be nearly impossible to even measure who lives where, do they continue to live there. And we're not even getting at the root issue which is we need training for these folks so that they can be lifted out of poverty. And this is just a very poorly crafted Bill. It's a well-intentioned Bill, but it... it just... I can't support it and would urge folks not to support it in the current form that it is today."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wheeler."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Wheeler, K.: "Representative, how are you?"

Conyears-Ervin: "I'm good. Thank you."

Wheeler, K.: "Good. Good. I have some questions for you. Looking through our analysis... excuse me the... there's a phrase in here about where practicable. Can you help me understand how that's going to be interpreted and what the definition of that is?" Conyears-Ervin: "So, the reason that we have that in the legislation is because the agency will really need to define 'to the extent practical', so they will be able to defend

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

their stance on the contract as they do now for any other goals they have."

Wheeler, K.: "Okay. So, if I'm a contractor and I want to bid on a particular contract that is being offered by CDB or IDOT, right. Those are the two agencies you're trying to work with here?"

Conyears-Ervin: "Correct."

- Wheeler, K.: "Then I've got to be able to understand how I'm going to meet these guidelines and whether or not it's practical or not and how I'm going to navigate those waters with workers that I already have under my contract or I have the to pull out of labor hall or where am I going to get them? Help me understand how that would work from the contractor's perspective. How would I bid that?"
- Conyears-Ervin: "So, just like any other legislation in the past,
 Representative, that's new, you have to work through it. The
 agency and the contractor will be able to build that
 relationship and be able to identify those parameters."
- Wheeler, K.: "Well, here's... here's my... here's my concern. When you're bidding on a contract, you don't get to have a relationship with IDOT or the management team or the consulting team. They give you a set of plans and you've got to figure out how you're going to accomplish what those plans dictate you're going to do in the time frame given. And whether you're going to use your own staff you currently have employed or you have to pull in other staff that will affect what your price is going to be and how you're actually going to do this job. So, understanding how this would impact that

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

is going to be vital for contractors in the real world to understand how they actually try and be in compliance."

- Conyears-Ervin: "So, first off, Representative, meeting goals is not new to contractors. Second of all, meeting goals should have nothing to do with the price as far as staffing goes for the contractor."
- Wheeler, K.: "I differ on that. Being a former contractor, having your own staff be able to do something you work with for years to understand their skillset, okay, versus people that you don't know and have to train and get acclimated to how they approach things, they're different. You cannot use the same team mindset 'cause you're bringing people in. And that's part of reality."

Conyears-Ervin: "I disagree with that, Representative."

Wheeler, K.: "So, again... What's that?"

Conyears-Ervin: "I disagree with that."

- Wheeler, K.: "Well, I did that. And as I'm trying to figure out how this would work. I'm not... I'm not trying to put down the goal of what you're trying to accomplish. I'm trying to figure out how we can actually do it. So, I mean, there's other ways we..."
- Conyears-Ervin: "And just like you've done that, Representative, and I respect that, I've worked with plenty of contractors in my prior employment so I understand as well. And I do disagree with you."
- Wheeler, K.: "Okay. Then you're effectively implying that any contractor can hire anyone to do the job, pay some same prevailing wage and the job's going to turn out the same either way. That's not..."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Conyears-Ervin: "That's your statement, not mine."

Wheeler, K.: "What's that?"

Conyears-Ervin: "That's your statement, not mine. I'm not implying that."

Wheeler, K.: "Okay. I'm implying... I'm trying to interpret what you just told me because I'm saying that if I can't use my own team I've got to hire a new team. Then, frankly, I can't accomplish the same thing the same way. That's just common sense. So, we'll see. I'm trying to understand how would a contractor interpret this in trying to and comply with what your goal is here. That's my question. And then what penalty would..."

Conyears-Ervin: "The goal is to... to provide opportunities for those that are in poverty stricken areas to be able to gain willful employment. That is the goal."

Wheeler, K.: "I agree. I understand the goal. I'm talking about the legislation presented and how we achieve that through this. It seems like to me it's not quite ready for a contractor to be able to use what's in front of us to practicably put together. I just used the exemption word. That's why I was asking what that exemption means and how it's defined so that people would understand what they're really up against and they could actually try and comply with what you're doing. That's my... that's my question really. So to the Bill. I do laud the Sponsor's approach and the goal of putting people to work in poverty areas that need those opportunities. There are many efforts we tend to take that are bipartisan in how we accomplish those things. Yes, we need more success in those areas. Yes, we need to keep working

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

together to do that. I intend to work with the Sponsor in future opportunities. Unfortunately, this particular version to me doesn't quite come together the way it needs to. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Riley."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Riley: "Representative, there's been some... some statements made that I just want to clarify with you in terms of the intent of your Bill. One that was said was that a census tract is... was a very small area and, I guess, the inference was that there was a lot of information that's very difficult to get. Wouldn't you agree with me that a census tract is not that small? A census tract is about, roughly speaking, 4 thousand people."

Conyears-Ervin: "That is correct, Representative."

Riley: "And a census tract isn't even the smallest denomination in terms of a census area. We have census blocks, block phases and so forth. Isn't that correct?"

Conyears-Ervin: "That's correct."

Riley: "And the issue about poverty, which is really abject poverty, areas that have been at a particular poverty level for 30 years. I would hazard a guess to say that there are many places on the... on the west side of Chicago that at least in the last 30 years have been at that poverty level that you state."

Conyears-Ervin: "That is correct as well as many areas downstate Illinois."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Riley: "And frankly speaking, the ability to get this information just isn't that difficult. You're talking about CMS providing this information. And I'm sure that CMS has programs like ArcGIS and ArcInfo and you could actually go to American FactFinder, which is a census website, and probably get this information and put it in the form of a map. So, it would be that difficult for a state agency as large as CMS to get this information."

Conyears-Ervin: "That is correct."

Riley: "Isn't that correct?"

Conyears-Ervin: "That is correct."

Riley: "Thank you very much. To the Bill. This is a good Bill. It's a great start. But not only that is that we know that there are areas in this state, certainly in the City of Chicago, but as the Sponsor said all over the state that have been in abject poverty for a long period of time. But that's one of the things that narrowly tailor her legislation. This is a good Bill. And I hope you will join me on voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davidsmeyer."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Davidsmeyer: "So, as a small business person, if I have 10 employees and 1 of my employees lives in 1 of these poverty areas, they work for me for a couple years and do well, move out of that poverty area. If I only need 10 employees, at what... what do I do at that point? Do I let him go and hire somebody new out of a poverty area and have that person out on the street looking for work?"

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Conyears-Ervin: "Representative, when contractors have contracts with the State of Illinois, this is... this is not anything new as far as goals are concerned. So, I guess that question would apply, what are contractors doing today if they have a female or minority goal? I mean, I don't know. And that person moves out of the State of Illinois, not able to work and they have to go find another possible female or minority. I just don't really see this being any different than any other goals contractors are able to meet."

Davidsmeyer: "You're... in this, you're talking about not the business itself. You're talking about the employees."

Conyears-Ervin: "Correct."

Davidsmeyer: "There's a complete difference because when... when there's a minority requirement as far as minority business, it can be a minority-owned business that hires all white men.

There's no requirement that they have..."

Conyears-Ervin: "I'm speaking about the workforce."

Davidsmeyer: "I know. I know."

Conyears-Ervin: "Okay."

Davidsmeyer: "But I'm saying you're comparing apples and oranges in that... in that statement."

Conyears-Ervin: "No. I'm speaking about the workforce when I'm talking about apprenticeship goals."

Davidsmeyer: "And... so, I'm just saying as a... as a small business person with 10 employees, if... if my 1 person does well enough to move out of an area of poverty, if... because... because my company when we do well, we give bonuses to our employees. We take care of our employees. And so, when that 1 person does

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

well enough to move out of an area of poverty, I have to let
them go and hire somebody new because I don't need 11 people."
Conyears-Ervin: "So..."

Davidsmeyer: "You know, that... that's an additional..."

Conyears-Ervin: "No. So, first of all, Representative, that is the intent of this legislation that the person that you hired is now able to come out of poverty. And we would hope that you will be able to find another individual, in your example, that will be able to fall within these guidelines."

Davidsmeyer: "But..."

Conyears-Ervin: "But also... but also understand..."

Davidsmeyer: "No. And I only have a certain amount of time."

Conyears-Ervin: "Okay."

Davidsmeyer: "So, I'm going to continue really quick. My... my point is that the person that got out of poverty is now out of work because they're the low man on the totem pole. I hired them to get them out of poverty and now, I have to let them go because I don't need 11 people. I need 10 people to work on... on this job. Right? So... so, there is, you know, there... there is a direct impact on small business. You know, the large businesses, the large construction projects, this would not have a huge, huge impact, but on small businesses this makes it almost impossible for them to bid and compete on state works. So, I want to yield the rest of my time to Grant Wehrli."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wehrli."

Wehrli: "Thank you. So, this Bill, according to our analysis, adds \$1.8 million in spend at the state level and it requires the hiring of 8 people to oversee small businesses practicing

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

in the State of Illinois. It misses its target in the regard that it doesn't do anything to promote business, to actually get the jobs in the state, the construction jobs to lift people out of poverty. This Bill is counter-productive to what your... your desired goal is. And I'm speaking to the Bill. If you want to get employment opportunities back in the State of Illinois, we need to decrease the regulatory burden. We need to grow our economy. We need to have new roads, bridges, schools and things like that built. You don't do that with more regulation. You do that by demanding that we prosper and then these jobs come naturally. And then, everybody benefits from it. This is a bad Bill that has negative consequences on our economy. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Wallace."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Wallace: "So, because there's been so much discussion of hypotheticals and what would be considered outliers what exactly does your Bill require?"

Conyears-Ervin: "So, House Bill 4513 states that contractors that receive state contracts be able to allow 10 percent of the man hours to be performed by those that live in poverty stricken areas where 20 percent or more of the individuals had lived at or below 150 percent of the poverty level for the last 30 years."

Wallace: "So, it is state contracts, not any random small business. You're asking small businesses that wish to do work, using the peoples' money, to implement this guideline."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Conyears-Ervin: "That is correct. This is legislation for the people of the State of Illinois."

Wallace: "Thank you, Representative, for bringing this. To the Bill. The arguments, again, are not about what is actually in the legislation. The legislation says that if you wish to do work receiving taxpayer dollars that you should also be wishing to make the economy around that work stronger. Individuals who live in poverty are also taxpayers. They're actually more burdened by the taxes that we place in our regressive tax-based system in the State of Illinois. And we say on this Bill that we shouldn't have some intentional measures to make sure that they are lifted out of poverty. There was also the argument about small business versus big business, however, most of the businesses in the United States of America are small businesses. Most of the businesses in the U.S. are small businesses. And that means that then the small businesses also have a responsibility to make sure that we're not walking away from particular communities completely divesting from those communities impacting the over burdensome unemployment rate of African-Americans particularly African-American men. And this is one measure that is intentional about undoing the intentional forms of discrimination or the legacy of that discrimination that we see today. So, I ask that everyone vote in support of this particular measure. And I, again, thank Representative Conyears-Ervin for bringing forth the measure that is about putting individuals back to work. It is about trying to address the attitudes that we know we can't legislate, but we can certainly set a standard that says discriminatory

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

attitudes and practices against individuals in poverty or individuals of particular racial or ethnic groups is not going to be tolerated if you're going to do business with the State of Illinois and if you're going to use the peoples' money. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Conyears-Ervin to close."

Conyears-Ervin: "I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Kelly Burke. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 61 voting 'yes', 47 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5689, Mr. Costello. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5689, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. This Bill was read a second time a previous day.

No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Costello, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Costello."

Costello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Floor Amendment 1 represents a compromise between the mining industry and labor. I ask for its adoption and makes it an agreed Bill."

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

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

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

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

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5689, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Costello."

Costello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Bill codifies Federal Law for mining and it puts us on parity with all other states in the United States. I ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wheeler."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

- Wheeler, K.: "Representative, we had a pretty good discussion about this in committee with some testimony and other things that we got to... the goal here is an agreed Bill, which you think you have now. Is that correct?"
- Costello: "It absolutely is. It's agreed between the mining industry and labor. And as I said, this Bill codifies what all other states in the United States do as far as mining safety."
- Wheeler, K.: "So, we're thinking of a miner safety Bill and making Illinois actually more competitive in some respects?"
- Costello: "I would absolutely say so. It puts us in parity with our surrounding states."
- Wheeler, K.: "Excellent work, my friend. Vote 'yes'. Thank you." Costello: "Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Burke. Stratton. Please take the record. On this question, there are 109 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1190, Leader Currie. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1190, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."

- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. Under current law, cities can operate combined water and sewer systems, but sanitary districts can't. And what this measure does is to say that a sanitary district may operate a single combined system. This comes to us from the south... South Stickney Sanitary District. Their concern is they have the same employees doing the work on both systems, but it makes for more paperwork, more red tape. And it seems to me that this would be a good solution to the problem. It doesn't require anybody to operate a combined system, but it makes it possible for by ordinance existing sanitary districts to do so. I'd be happy to answer your questions. I'd appreciate your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 108 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 128, Mr. DeLuca. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 128, a Bill for an Act concerning government. This Bill is read a second time a previous day. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative DeLuca, has been approved for consideration."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Speaker Lang: "Mr. DeLuca."

DeLuca: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now, Amendment #2 is still in Rules. Is that correct?"

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #2 is still in Rules."

DeLuca: "Okay. I move to adopt Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 128."

Speaker Lang: "A brief explanation, Sir."

DeLuca: "This is the Bill that would allow the state... it would allow the Village of Crestwood to use the property for private purposes as opposed to public purposes."

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

Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments have been approved for consideration. And no Motions are filed."

Speaker Lang: "Do you wish the Bill to go to Third Reading, Sir?"

DeLuca: "Yes. Move it to Third, please. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Do you wish the Bill called again?

Do you wish it called..."

DeLuca: "Not at this time. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. House Bill 5347, Mr. Evans. Out of the record. House Bill 5000, Mr. Frese. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5000, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. This Bill was read a second time a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

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

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5000, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Frese."

Frese: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 5000, an initiative of the Department of Human Services. It kind of streamlines a process after an investigative report establishes that there is abuse or neglect. That report... a redacted copy of that report can be then sent to the victim or the victim's advocate. Currently, they would have to submit, in writing, a request for that. This would bypass that need. I would be happy to answer any questions. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ammons."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ammons: "Representative Frese, can you explain again why we would bypass the process in this regard. What are you trying to do with this?"

Frese: "It was explained to me that at no time has a written request been denied. Currently, an automatic redacted copy would be sent to the person who was being investigated for the abuse or neglect. This, again, just simply streamlines it so that the victim or the victim's advocate could... would get a copy of that redacted copy of that report."

Ammons: "So, they would get the full... they would get the redacted copy of the report without having to submit a request for the redacted copy of the report?"

Frese: "Correct. Correct."

Ammons: "All right. Thank you so much for clarifying that."

Frese: "You bet."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Evans. Harris. Stuart. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 110 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Returning to House Bill 128, Mr. DeLuca. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 128, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. DeLuca."

DeLuca: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, we had previously conveyed state property... State Police property to the Village of Crestwood to be used for public purposes. They now wish to use it for private purpose. And that's what this legislation authorizes them to do. The way it's worked out that any of the proceeds, after the expenses that Crestwood would incur, would be split with the State of Illinois, 50-50. There will be another Amendment coming. The change will probably be made in the Senate that the 50 percent that would go to the... the 50 percent that would go to the state is now going to be directed to the Capital Development Board to be used for capital within the State Police. So, that will be the change that will be made in the Senate."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen."

Breen: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Breen: "Thank you. And then, Representative, I see you've got a...
a second Amendment which appears to be a typographical error.

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

And so, is that going to be corrected in the Senate or that Amendment will be added in the Senate as well?"

DeLuca: "That's correct. That would be part of the... the change."

Breen: "And then, just to confirm. The State of Illinois's going to get half the proceeds of conveying the property to the... the private party."

DeLuca: "Yes. And the change that will be made in the Senate is it will be specific to the Capital Development Board."

Breen: "Fair enough. Thank you."

DeLuca: "So, yes. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Davis. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. There are 109 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4949, Representative Feigenholtz. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4949, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, House Bill 4949 is an initiative of the Illinois Behavioral Health Association designed to get unscrupulous actors out of Illinois. It amends the Consumer Protection Act. And I'm happy to answer any question."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen."

Breen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll move to... for Standard Debate."

Speaker Lang: "Standard Debate is approved. Continue, Sir."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Breen: "And Representative, I know we spoke a bit about this before. You had an Amendment that... that added a few items to the Bill, but don't appear to have changed it to... really too much substantively. Is that... is that correct?"

Feigenholtz: "Correct."

Breen: "Okay. In your Bill, we have no problem... at least, I don't have any problem with the part where we talk about deceptive business practices and all that. But there's a part of your Bill that then requires every one of these facilities to include a certain set of disclosures. And it's on page 6 line 10, your requirement for any marketing, advertising, promotional or sales materials directed to Illinois residents. Then you have a whole list of items that they have to provide, which is full physical address, statement of whether it's licensed in the State of Illinois, whether they have locations in Illinois, whether services provided by the treatment service are covered by an insurance policy issued to an Illinois resident, whether they are in network or out of network and then a link to an internet website. And then that the treatment may be available at a reduced cost or for free for Illinois residents within the State of Illinois. So, just to unpack that Bill, what does it mean to have a material directed to Illinois residents?"

Feigenholtz: "Well, I..."

Breen: "So, if I put up a website and I know Illinois residents are visiting it, is that what we're talking about?"

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Feigenholtz: "Yes. The magic of geolocation on our computers allows companies who advertise to direct certain information to residents of the State of Illinois. And I also would like to mention, Representative Breen, that these are... this is a... a not... there's no opposition to this Bill. This is an industry that wants to define who they are and as you know, this is a national trend. Many states have enacted this and there are all kinds of disclaimers and disclosures on websites. And the industry supports that. So, I just want to be clear that this is a self-directed profession wanting to get unscrupulous actors out of substance abuse treatment that are predators, which is why they're putting them in this Act."

Breen: "And then... but just... just so that I'm clear. So, I... say, the Barnes Center in St. Louis might direct a Facebook ad at folks generally in the geographic area, do they have to put all of these disclosures in the Facebook ad?"

Feigenholtz: "For Illinois residents."

Breen: "In the Facebook ad, itself?"

Feigenholtz: "I believe that it... what we're requiring..."

Breen: "I mean, that's... that's how I read it."

Feigenholtz: "Yes."

Breen: "Okay. I don't know that that is physically possible. It's kind of a reason, you know, when... when we have our Facebook ads, we don't... we're not required to use disclosures on them for political purposes 'cause you can't really necessarily fit everything in there and you can't see the disclosure."

Feigenholtz: "Well, the print would be very small. It would be a small font, but you know, they would have to include it."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Breen: "So, it'd be under... so, just for that purpose then the print could be exceptionally small, but it would still meet the terms of this... this particular Bill?"

Feigenholtz: "Yes."

Breen: "Okay. And then, how are they to know if they are directing their services at Illinoisans? It's... so if they on their website. So, if an Illinoisan goes on their website, again, say, it's a facility in St. Louis... so obviously, they're going to have plenty of consumers from Illinois, do they just have to put this set of disclosures on their website even though they've not gone out to... they know that Illinois folks will come and they know Illinoisans are coming to receive their services. So, they're just going to have to put these disclosures on their website, generally?"

Feigenholtz: "These are substance abuse treatment providers out of state, not Illinois licensed."

Breen: "Right. But I'm concerned that we're regulating them. Look they're bad actors, we've all seen the stories about the folks in Florida who are just horrendous. People are dying in these places. The problem is we've also got plenty of good actors who are just over the border in St. Louis. They might be in Milwaukee or they're, you know, some national entities. Just in the same way that we may have experts here in Illinois, whether it's at Northwestern, University of Chicago, or other facilities around the state. So, I'm trying to figure out how do they even... those out of staters... even comply with the law?"

Speaker Lang: "Please answer the Gentleman's question?"

Feigenholtz: "I don't really know what the question was, Speaker.

I... I think that Representative Breen is asking questions that

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

are legitimate, but I believe I've already answered them. I think that this is a self... a self-guided... you know, I'm... no legislation we do here, Representative, is perfect. And we are here to remediate. This is an initiative of substance abuse providers and have... who have worked closely with the Attorney General's Office. I'm not sure what your concern is."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen, your time has expired. Mr. Andersson is recognized."

Andersson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll speak to the Bill. Number 1) the debate that we seem to be having is completely tailwagging the dog. The technology exists to answer the Representative's questions about how it's going to work. If your computer or if your phone is in Illinois, the pop-ups occur... the disclaimer information. If you're not, they're not going to pop up. This happens on medical websites all the time. We heard it in committee. It's simply not an issue. But I want to talk about what is an issue, which is the evil that this Bill is seeking to solve. I don't know... I know you weren't all in committee, but this is what the evil is. We've got a couple of bottom feeders in state... the states of California and Florida who troll people who are looking for substance abuse recovery centers. These are families in desperate times. These are people who have a very small window where they might be willing to go in. Remember, that's hard. They don't necessarily want to. So, finally, someone has convinced them to go into a recovery center and they do it. So, now, they look frantically and quickly, without a lot of information, on the internet. Hoping maybe to find one in the

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

area, but these bad actors pretend... pretend to be an Illinois or a Chicago organization only to find out that they're not. But here's where the evil begins. The people go into the facility and the person who sold them on it gets a contingent fee. They go into the facility. They may even benefit in the facility. It might not be a bad facility in the sense of they're receiving bad treatment, but the evil happens when they get out after 28 days. They're encouraged to go to AA meetings. That is a standard across the board whether you're talking about substance abuse for narcotics or alcohol or whatever. They go to AA meetings. And here's the evil. Those sales people who make a contingent fee troll the AA meetings. They troll those meetings to induce those people that they sold to... to relapse. And it's... and it's really easy to relapse. So, now, you've got these sales people sending in trolls to the AA meetings to destroy these people, to make another 28 day sale. I'm sorry if you couldn't hear me before. I got ahead of my microphone. This is evil. So, do not worry about the tail-wagging the dog technology issues. That's not an issue. Worry about what's actually happening to our people, to our children because of these evil... and I don't use that word lightly... these evil actors. Please vote 'yes'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Demmer."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Demmer: "Leader Feigenholtz, I... we had a good conversation in committee about this. I appreciate your indulgence as I had many questions about... about this Bill. And we... we talked about many of them. Just to clarify a couple of points that were...

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

that were made before. Previously, it was asked about, you know, in a situation for a Facebook ad or let's say, some other type of... of internet advertising where space is very limited, where the number of characters are limited. It would be acceptable for these disclosures to live on the website that those ads directed you to, right? You click on the ad, it brings you to a website that has plenty of space, plenty of information that can be granted by the organization. That's where you can put these disclosures, correct?"

Feigenholtz: "Correct."

Demmer: "The other point I wanted to make is that we're amending here the... the decepter... or the Consumer Fraud and Deceptive Business Practices Act. In Sections b and d of the Bill, specifically call out what are unlawful practices. And those are the things that I think everybody had agreement on. Making false or misleading advertising, signing up with these patient brokers where there's a bounty on patients. Those are... those are very different. Both of those are specifically listed as unlawful practices. This marketing aspect alone failure to, you know, put the zip code on an address. Under... under this Bill is not something that we intend to be construed as a fair... unfair deceptive business practice. Isn't that correct?"

Feigenholtz: "Representative Demmer, if you read the Consumer Fraud and Deceptive Practice Act of this Bill, the Section... the first Section of the Bill... I'm not sure that the Attorney General's Office, who will ultimately be the arbiter of whether or not a practice... a business had... has created a

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

deceptive act, is going to, you know, put handcuffs on a... on somebody who hasn't included a zip code."

Demmer: "I agree. And I... I think that's an important distinction for us to make. There are two Sections in this... in this Bill as proposed that specifically enumerate what is an unlawful practice for a business. That... that does not include the marketing and advertising section that we're talking about today. So, I think we need to have some delineation between the things that we intend to say. This is a deceptive business practice to do misleading or false advertising. We all agree on that. What we're getting sort of caught up in right now is some of the disclosure sections, which I think we need to make a... we need to make a distinction between those two aspects. I understand some of the concerns about this. I think, you know, maybe there's an opportunity for us to clean some of this up, but all in all this is a... this is a good Bill. This is a positive Bill. We should move forward with it. Perhaps there's an opportunity to work in the Senate doing a trailer Bill to make crystal clear what we're talking about, but I don't think we should get hamstrung by what is very minor and incidental aspect of this Bill, when there are two sections that we really have strong agreement on. I encourage a 'yes' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wheeler."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Wheeler, K.: "Representative, I just want to clarify one thing.

With respect to the language regarding the in (c) regarding
any marketing, advertising, promotional or sales materials

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

directed to Illinois residents. The intention is to use some
 kind of geolocation feature to know where they are, right?"
Feigenholtz: "Correct."

Wheeler, K.: "So, it's not your legislative intent to say that it would be outside if you're outside... if an Illinois resident is outside of the State of Illinois, that you're trying... and make that a loophole situation. You're just trying to say that any Illinois resident wherever they... in the State of Illinois because we can't know if they're outside the State of Illinois. That's..."

Feigenholtz: "Correct. There's no way of knowing if... if somebody... if you're an Illinois resident outside of the state, and you're on the internet, you're not going to get this pop-up."

Wheeler, K.: "Exactly. So, where it says... when it says directed to Illinois residents, we're not trying to make that distinction? We're trying to..."

Feigenholtz: "That's correct."

Wheeler, K.: "That's my goal. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Feigenholtz to close."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. I think that we've had many robust conversations about this. I appreciate the comments of Representative Demmer and he has... and the caucus has my commitment that we will continue to work on this. The effort is to really try and make sure that our families, who are in desperate need of substance abuse disorder, go to appropriate licensed providers and not get stuck in a web of predators. Please support the Bill."

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

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. There are 110 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4146, Representative Fine. Mc. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4146, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. The Bill was read a second time previously.

Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2 lost. No further Amendments. A state mandates note has been requested on the Bill and has not been filed."

Speaker Lang: "And the Bill will be held on the Order of Second Reading. House Bill 456... Excuse me. House Bill 5202. No. The Chair's in error. House Bill 4516, Representative Fine. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4516, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Fine."

Fine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This legislation would provide relief for families who have children that require hearing aids. What it does is it requires insurance... health insurance to cover one hearing aid per ear for every child under 36... under 18 years old every 36 months."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Breen: "Yes. And Representative, I see you brought back Floor Amendment 1, which dealt with the issues of the insurance companies."

Fine: "Correct."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Breen: "It didn't obviate the objection of the Department of Insurance, the Chamber, the IRMA, IMA, NFIB, et cetera, but at least you have gotten rid of the objections of the insurance companies themselves."

Fine: "Yes. We were able to come to some agreements on what could be covered and what could not be covered."

Breen: "Right."

Fine: "And working with the insurance industry, they looked at what... what other states do and this is how we came to this conclusion."

Breen: "And... and as best I can tell, this is a covered treatment that if you went through the appeal process you're going to win because there's physical issue with the child. So, they need these implants. It's just something that now we're kind of short-circuiting that appeal process because we don't want to require everyone in the state, when they need these vital services, to have to go through it over and over again."

Fine: "Correct. This was... as if it's medically necessary, then it would be done."

Breen: "Right. Okay. Well, thank you. It seems like you... you've done your work and it looks like a pretty good Bill. So, thank you."

Fine: "Thank you. I appreciate it."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Lilly. Please take the record. There are 108 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority,

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5202, Mr. Ford. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5202, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. No Committee Amendments. Two Floor Amendments have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Ford."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Ford."

Ford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I move for the adoption of only Floor Amendment #2."

Speaker Lang: "Do you wish to withdraw Amendment 1, Sir?"

Ford: "Yes, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, Amendment 1 is withdrawn. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Ford."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Ford on Amendment 2."

Ford: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Floor Amendment #2 becomes the Bill. And it will establish the creation of a Youth Budget Commission."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ammons, do you rise on this Amendment? Please leave your light on. Mr. Breen, do you rise on this Amendment?"

Breen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "You are recognized."

Breen: "Thank you. And Representative, I just wanted to check. Is this the… is this the Amendment that was promised to remove the Governor's Office of Management and Budget opposition?"

Ford: "Yes."

Breen: "Okay. Thank you."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

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

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

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

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5202, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Ford."

Ford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 5202 creates the Youth Budget Commission with the purpose of creating a yearly analysis of a state budget across the six development goals that's stable, safe, healthy and educated, employable and connected that all youth need to build an exceptional life. The Youth Budget Commission will utilize the fiscal scan to advise the Governor, the General Assembly and the state agencies on a ways to improve, expand existing policy, services, programs, and opportunities for youth and young adults age 8 to 25. The Bill has been worked out. There's no opposition. I move for passage of House Bill 5202."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Crespo. Please take the record. There are 107 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Chair recognizes Representative Ammons."

Ammons: "Thank you, Mr. Chair. I rise on a point of personal privilege."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Speaker Lang: "Proceed."

Ammons: "Thank you. Behind me in the gallery, on the Democratic side, if the students would stand, from the University of Illinois who are in the gallery right now. We passed a Resolution that says the University of Illinois is one of the world's best research institutions in the nation. And today, is Research Institution Day and we want to acknowledge our students from the University of Illinois, who have a display in our Capitol today. And acknowledge them for their excellent work in research that they do, not just for our state but for the world and particularly for me in the 103rd District who has built a strong internship program with students of the University of Illinois. And I bring to you today our students that are visiting with us in the gallery from the University of Illinois. Welcome them... welcome them to their State Capitol."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome. Thank you for joining us today. We appreciate it. House Bill 5341, Representative Gordon-Booth. Out of the record. House Bill 1439, Representative Gordon-Booth. Out of the record. House Bill 5196, Representative Greenwood. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5196, a Bill for an Act concerning education. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 1 and 2 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Greenwood."

Speaker Lang: "Ms... Representative Greenwood."

Greenwood: "Am I speaking on the Floor Amendment? I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Floor Amendment #1."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Greenwood: "Okay. Floor Amendment #1 made no changes to the underlying Bill. It simply reiterated the language."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment... saved by Mr. Breen. Do you wish to speak, Sir?"

Breen: "I believe both Floor Amendments, #1 and 2, become the Bill. So, are we proceeding on 1 or 2?"

Speaker Lang: "Well, the Lady wants... she just moved 1."

Breen: "Okay. Is she going to move 2?"

Speaker Lang: "And we'll see what happens on 2."

Breen: "Has 2 been released from Rules, though? Are we... it's proper?"

Speaker Lang: "The Clerk is nodding his head, yes."

Breen: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of Amendment 1 say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Greenwood."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Greenwood."

Greenwood: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #2 changes the license renewal fee for paraprofessional educators from \$50 to \$25."

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

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

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

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5196, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Speaker Lang: "Representative Greenwood."

- Greenwood: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the Assembly.

 House Bill 5196 deals with the license renewal fee for
 paraprofessional educators changing the current fee from \$50
 to \$25. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves, Members. Carroll. Connor. Feigenholtz. Moeller. Flowers. Please take the record. There 109 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4771, Representative Hammond. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4771, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Hammond."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Hammond."
- Hammond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to adopt Floor Amendment #1. It is agreed language among the long term care industry to address the backlog of Medicaid applications."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4771, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Hammond."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Hammond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I mentioned, this is agreed language among the long term care industry to address the backlog of the Medicaid applications and to bring the state into compliance with the recent Federal Court ruling Koss v. Norwood. Appreciate your support and happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Riley. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. There are 110 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr... Leader Durkin is recognized."

Durkin: "A point of personal privilege, Sir."

Speaker Lang: "Go right ahead."

Durkin: "Thank you. I have often said over the years that while we're all blessed to be in this position we're even more blessed by the staff that we have on both sides of our aisle, who work tiredly for us and make us look good even when we don't deserve it, which is often. But also, the staff that works in our agencies, the Governor's Office, they work tirelessly to make this process as good as it can be. So, we often see new young men and women come and go, but we know that the reason they're here is for noble purposes, but we want them to succeed, gather and learn from the experiences they've been able to learn over their time in this... in this process and prosper afterwards and use this knowledge to make something whether it's in the private or public sector. So, it's with bittersweet feelings and thoughts that I am going

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

to... we will be saying goodbye to a very good friend of ours who's worked for the past three and a half years in the Governor's Office and this is the young lady just in front of me, Jane McEnaney, who many of you have known. She will be... as I said, her last day will be tomorrow. And she is going to use the experience and the knowledge that she has gained to become the executive director for a group called Midwest TechNet, which is a tech company trade association. So, I just want to say on behalf of our caucus and this Body, good luck. We will miss you, but we're very proud of you. And future endeavors, we are always here to help you."

- Speaker Lang: "Congratulations. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Durkin.

 House Bill 5721, Representative Harper. Please read the
 Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5721, a Bill for an Act concerning education. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Harper."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Harper."
- Harper: "I move to adopt the Amendment which just makes some technical changes in the language to clear up opposition."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Mr. Breen, I apologize. I did not see your light. Did you have something you needed to say?"
- Breen: "I... I just can't hear what Representative Harper said. So, it's a..."
- Speaker Lang: "She said it was a technical Amendment, Sir."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Breen: "Is it actually a technical Amendment, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lang: "We'll find out. The Bill's on Third Reading. Mr. Clerk..."

Breen: "Fair enough."

Speaker Lang: "...please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5721, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Harper."

Harper: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased to present House Bill 5721 which simply makes changes to the CPS Facilities Planning by requiring more community input, more transparency and budget accountability. I encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen."

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

Speaker Lang: "Of course."

Breen: "All right. Representative, I see Chicago Public Schools is opposed to your Bill even as amended. And I know that you had agreed to hold the Bill on Second to work with the opposition on an Amendment. But it doesn't look like they actually withdrew their opposition. Is that correct?"

Harper: "So the… no. The opposition that I was trying to clear up with the Amendment was with the charter schools and not with CPS. And I do understand that there still is some opposition from CPS, which the nature of the Bill, they're just going to oppose it anyway. And we are actually continuing to talk as the Bill goes through in the Senate and there may be some more changes in the Senate."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Breen: "And then, could you just give me a brief explanation of what... what we would be mandating that the Chicago Public Schools do..."

Harper: "Sure."

Breen: "...with your Bill?"

Harper: "So, the Bill's specifics include simply that all schools be notified if there is a considered action. Meaning if there are going to be school closures in the community, it also asks that there be community hearings and even an input process on a CPS capital budget and building repair needs. And it also provides that CPS consider accommodating the special academic needs of schools to prevent utilization rates that may penalize strong academic programs that just have unique population needs."

Breen: "Fair enough. To the Bill. I understand what... I understand what the Sponsor's trying to do to prevent school closings in the Chicago Public Schools. The problem is, is that the... because of the poor... the poor actions we've taken here, and by other units of government, we've seen significant moves in population in the City of Chicago and so they've changed their needs for schooling. To tie the hands of the Chicago Public Schools in this way, when they are adamantly opposed to it, would seem to be poor policy legislating from here in Springfield. Certainly, none of us would want our local public schools being told what to... which schools to open, which ones to close, which ones to move. And so, for that reason, again, respecting what the Sponsor is trying to do, but this is a bridge too far in terms of... of allowing the Chicago Public Schools to govern themselves and to try to, in the most

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

effective way and cost effective way especially, to educate the children of that city."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I want to echo the comments of Representative Breen as it related to this Bill. I'll tell you what, there's no reason that CPS should not be engaging its parents in its communities when they make these far-reaching decisions about the schools and how they transition people into different schools as well, how they select folks for particular enrollment. They absolutely should be doing this. It's just... it's just not something that we should putting in state statute, but I absolutely support the underlying premise of the Bill that communities should be involved in many of these decisions. Now, understanding that we almost unanimously, if not unanimously, passed out the provision to have an elected school board in Chicago and hopefully some of this will be solved when that board is actually seated and that ever happens because community involvement in public schools is really important. It's really important. It just... there's no reason that this should ever be put in state statute. And it would have farreaching effects long past the time that we are here as Legislators. That... for that reason alone, do I vote 'no'. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Wallace."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Wallace: "So, this Bill is an initiative of a community-based organization?"

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Harper: "Yes, it is."

- Wallace: "And what was the emphasis of that organization coming together, Blocks Together, Chicago?"
- Harper: "Well, the leader of that organization and myself are both mothers who live in a Englewood community who had six of our schools close without any input from us in a neighborhood that already suffers from a host of other negative things."
- Wallace: "And so, in Englewood, you said there were six schools that closed. I believe in Bronzeville there were... do you know how many schools closed in Bronzeville?"
- Harper: "No, I'm not sure of that number, but they've also gone through a rash of school closings. And what's happening is the leadership of Chicago, because we don't have an elected school board, is choosing to go neighborhood by neighborhood and doing... and completing what we call racist school closings."
- Wallace: "I was going to... to get to that because this is happening in particular neighborhoods on the south and to some degree the west sides of Chicago."
- Harper: "Only the south and west side of Chicago, Representative."
- Wallace: "So, in districts or... I'm sorry... in schools where the overwhelming number of students are black and Latino, those neighborhood schools are the schools that are being closed?"
- Harper: "Yes. And CPS loves to use under enrollment as an excuse, but as we're seeing, they're closing schools in neighborhoods which population now... population is... is increasing very fast. And they're even closing level one fully enrolled schools where students are... have the highest level of academic

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

achievement. The only thing that's different about these schools is that they're predominantly African-American."

Wallace: "Okay. So, yeah, I was actually going to ask that because there were some discussion on the other side of the aisle about the school district being able to do what's best based upon a number of issues which might include an... an achievement and other things. But we're seeing that across the board there's really one factor, or maybe two actually, the race and ethnicity of the children who are at the school and the socioeconomic level of the community that those schools sit in. Would I be wrong in that assertion?"

Harper: "You're correct, Representative."

"Thank you, Representative, for indulging me. To the Wallace: Bill. There's a lot of irony when the discussion becomes a discussion that can support Chicago Public Schools, which we just heard from the other side of the aisle. But it's extremely frustrating to know that we have children in the largest school district in the state who cannot walk to a neighborhood school because their neighborhood school has been ripped away from them without any input from the local individuals who live in that community and in that neighborhood. We know that schools are anchors communities. When schools close, then we see other things start to close such as stores. They're economic drivers, our schools are. And it also then impacts what the real estate looks like in that particular area and before long you have a very destitute neighborhood and a very destitute area. And it is of my opinion that this happens because some individual, some families, some communities, are looked upon as

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

expendable. And their voices are intentionally silenced. There's no such thing as silent people, but there is such a thing as peoples' voices being intentionally silenced and because of that intentional silencing, this legislation is necessary to amplify the voices of the women, the children, the parents of those communities that deserve to have a neighborhood school that these children can walk to. And it is for those reasons, and the underlying reason of the racism and the classism that has existed in this particular system of school closure, that everyone in this chamber should vote 'aye'."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Flowers."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Flowers: "Representative, according to the analysis, it says that House Bill 5721 requires additional information regarding Chicago Public Schools. So, your analysis also states that it is already State Law. Currently, it is State Law that CPS is required to produce an educational facility master plan every five years. So, what you're doing is currently State Law already and you're adding to it."

Harper: "That is correct, Representative."

Flowers: "Because when it was first done, the problems that we are experiencing now we did not have. So, you're adding to State Law and... and basically as a taxpayer, who fund the Chicago Public Schools, you should know about the dirty, filthy schools that our children are being forced to go to as a taxpayer. And... and you should know that. And... and you should

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

know what the school board is doing to correct that. Am I right?"

Harper: "You're right."

Flowers: "And is... is this Bill addressing some of those issues? Are you trying to address the access to transportation? Other school districts are still reimbursed for the transportation with the tax dollars from the State of Illinois, but for some reason the school districts on the south and west sides of the City of Chicago those parents are no longer reimbursed and neither is transportation reimbursement or transportation for these students. Our students are forced to walk in a so-called safe school zone. And there's nothing safe about it, not even the sign is safe because we've seen some of the signs shot up. Am I right about that?"

Harper: "You're correct."

Flowers: "And so, as taxpayers of the City of Chicago and we have to send our children to these schools, we should have some input. They should respect the taxpayers of the State of Illinois. So, with that being said... to the Bill, Ladies and Gentlemen. This Bill is... this legislation is, quite frankly, already current law and my colleague... our colleague is adding to with an organization that have come together from the south and west side of the City of Chicago, and other parts of the City of Chicago, for what is best in the interest of our children, not what is best in the CEOs and the contracts of the Chicago Board of Education want to give to their friends and families. So, I'm asking you to respect what it is that we would like to have in our school districts the same way you want us to respect what it is that you know that is needed

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

and important in your school district. And I would urge an 'aye' vote. And thank you, Representative, for this legislation."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andrade, the number of speakers in favor of the Bill has already been... we've already reached our limit, I'm sorry, unless you're speaking in opposition."

Andrade: "Okay. I just have a concern with the language."

Speaker Lang: "You may ask your question. The Lady yields."

Andrade: "I just... real quick. The Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "She yields."

Andrade: "On this Bill, it just says create a request proposal for joint use of the school within intergovernmental rental or other outside entity rental. My concern is other outside entity rental. I just... I would really like to see when it goes over to the Senate that there be a description... a definition of outside rental entity because that could be for-profit. It could be... I just don't want a... I do not want our... our schools being opened up to the public and being who knows what that entity rental is. I just want it very clear that that's a very grave concern of mine."

Harper: "I understand your concern and that's something..."

Andrade: "Thank you."

Harper: "...that we can further define in the Senate. Thank you,

Representative."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Harper to close."

Harper: "This Bill is designed to have district leadership work with schools that have low enrollment and not wait until it's too late. I am hoping to continue to work with CPS to put the needs of our students first, but in the face of no elected

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

school board in the City of Chicago, this is something that we have to do to protect our most vulnerable students and parents. I encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Members, please record yourselves. Yingling. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. There are 79 voting 'yes', 28 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4096, Mr. Harris. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Mr. Harris, you have a Floor Amendment. We'll move the Bill back to Second Reading. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4096, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Greg Harris."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

Harris, G.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Floor Amendment #1 becomes the Bill. It removes the opposition from the managed care organizations. It sets a sunset on the… on the Bill. I know there is still a concern from the Department of HFS, which we have agreed to discuss in the Senate. I would ask for your approval."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bellock on the Amendment. She does not wish to speak. Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

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

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

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4096, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

Harris, G.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This issue addresses the preferred drug list in the Medicaid system as we move into managed care. It sets minimum floors for the preferred drug list. MCOs... the individual MCOs are free to add above that list as best suits their client's needs. We had... as I said, the Amendment addressed concerns of the MCOs. It removes their opposition. Director Norwood said this morning she had... still had some concerns. We've agreed to work on those in the Senate. I would ask for your support."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bellock."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

- Bellock: "Thank you very much, Representative Harris. And I know that your intentions are good on this Bill, but HFS is still opposed to this Bill, aren't they?"
- Harris, G.: "Yes. As I said though, Director Norwood and I talked this morning. She said she still had some concerns and that we would address those in the Senate."
- Bellock: "Right. Okay. Well, I'm still going to be opposed to it at this time, but I look forward to working with it on the Senate and getting, you know. And thank you for all your work that you have done on it."
- Speaker Lang: "The Bill is on Short Debate, but I'm going to give Mr. Demmer the remaining time that Representative Bellock didn't use."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Demmer: "Representative Harris, we had a good conversation in committee this morning about this Bill at which time I brought up the issue that I think we still have with the Bill about not really understanding the fiscal impact to the state. So, under... under the current setup we pay a specific amount to MCOs for the prescription drug benefit component that's calculated based on current statute and costs. And then the state is able to negotiate drug price rebates that help offset some of that cost. Under this proposal, the MCOs would be a... would be given flexibility to choose different drugs and therefore, they will be in a position of negotiating prescription drug price rebates that may help us reduce our prescription costs. But we don't fully understand yet what the net fiscal benefit is. Do you have any projection about what the net benefit to the state?"

Harris, G.: "Actually, I've thought about that since we talked. Before we go to that, I would just like to thank the Speaker for giving you extra time, you know, I'm very grateful. So, that being said, you know, if you look at the language of the Bill, the minimum requirements for the PDL include all the drugs that are currently in the fee for service PDL. So, we will continue to get the rebate from those. So, there would really be no change. What would happen is if an MCO wished to add different drugs that the state did not have, they would negotiate a price and it might include..."

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

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

- Harris, G.: "That would not detract from what the state is currently getting."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Demmer, your time has expired, but I'll let you complete your comment."
- Demmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And thank you, Representative Harris for that clarification. I still think we have some questions about exactly how an MCO complies with the... this Bill versus the universal PDL. I mean, there's some big costs... there are big questions that remain. This is a program with significant fiscal impact to the state. And so, I appreciate your comments about continuing to work on this in the Senate. At this time, though, I don't feel ready to support it and encourage a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris to close."

- Harris, G.: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. I think this is important for our constituents to guarantee continuity of care and access to drugs, particularly for folks who have, you know, highly specialized diseases or behavioral health concerns, cancer, epilepsy, HIV, heart disease. I would ask for an 'aye' vote."
- 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. There are 70 voting 'yes', 37 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1940, Mr. Hays. Mr. Hays. Please read the Bill."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1940, a Bill for an Act concerning education. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Hays."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hays."

Hays: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #1 of House Bill 1940 is a Illinois Community College Board omnibus Bill that modernizes the Public Community College Act. The Amendment makes various technical changes to the Act to remove outdated language and programs that no longer exist."

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

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

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

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1940, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hays."

Hays: "Thank you. As I stated earlier, this is an omnibus Bill that really does modernize the Public Community College Act. It's an agreed Bill. The Illinois Community College Trustees Association, the Illinois Council of Community Colleges Presidents, as well as the ICCB all concur. This really cleans up programs that are no longer in existence, language that is grossly outdated, et cetera. I thank Representative Welch and his committee. And then, thank him for his support in this initiative."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wehrli."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Wehrli: "Is there a casino for Danville in this piece of legislation, Sir?"

Hays: "There is not, but there probably should be."

Wehrli: "Thank you."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Currie. Flowers. Jones. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 109 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4278, Representative Kifowit. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4278, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Kifowit."

Kifowit: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 4278 provides for a comprehensive notice in our veterans homes to include infectious diseases that have a high mortality rate in the elder populations."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Harris, Hoffman. Please take the record. There are 110 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4836, Representative Ives. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4836, a Bill for an Act concerning health. No Committee Amendments... no Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Ives."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives on the Amendment."

Ives: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment allows the facility licensed by a local unit of government... gives them the authority to have four or five other adults unrelated to the adult with the mental disability, to provide... to actually participate in the Home Based Services Program."

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

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

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

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4836, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

Ives: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill will allow us to provide for additional services to those who wish to participate in the Home Based Services Program under our Medicaid Waiver from the Federal Government. It'll expand options for families to put those with... those adults with mental disabilities into a home based program. And it'll... actually, it will cost nothing more to the state in order to do this. These folks are already getting this... the money from the Medicaid services. This just allows them another option to provide for home based services."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Riley."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Riley: "Representative Ives, I see that there's opposition from DHS. What... what's their opposition all about?"

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Ives: "They have been nonspecific about their opposition. Quite frankly, their... they're considering going to a model such as we already have in Wheaton where we have two facilities operating with six each. And they've not been specific really about their opposition. According... if you make this statute change it's completely compliant with federal... the federal Medicaid Waiver. And actually... actually, they're investigating going to this model they've just been dragging their... feet for two weeks. So, we're going to try and make this happen via statute."

Riley: "Well, you know, there's a number of types of facilities."

Ives: "Yes."

Riley: "You know, there's the state facilities, IC/FDDs, CILAs and so forth. Would this be considered a CILA?"

Ives: "This would not be considered a CILA. A CILA would be licensed from the state. Currently, the way it works is you can have four developmentally disabled adults living together as a family in a family-type of environment. It doesn't have to be in their own home. They could literally rent another establishment or their family... family members could get together and build another establishment and those four members could live together."

Riley: "So, what... okay. Go ahead."

Ives: "So, we're moving that up to six, if they are licensed locally. Now, every one of these homes must be quarterly inspected by DHS, so they're inspected and now, they would be licensed. And it... it's just another... another way to, you know, decrease the number of people that we have on our PUNS list, which is 20 thousand. These highly functioned developmentally

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

disabled would not even be eligible, quite frankly, under the current rules to even get into a CILA. So, this provides for them to have that care under the provision of one's own home by simply moving the statute from four to six."

Riley: "Would DHS be... you know, still be responsible for oversight like they are over CILAs with this?"

Ives: "Yes, that is true. They... they still must inspect quarterly, per person. So, if you had 6 in a facility, literally, DHS could be in there 24 times a year."

Riley: "Okay."

Ives: "So, they are still inspected."

Riley: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Willis."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Willis: "Jeanne, can you just clarify one thing on this. So, if you have a home that has three individuals in it but not... and this Bill passes... they would still be able to get those services. You're just saying that the home can expand the number of people that live in it up to... is it five? Is that what your Bill says?"

Ives: "Well, the way... the way this actually works is it's... the actual individually mentally disabled person plus three more unrelated adults. That's how the statute reads. And so, you already have homes operating with the maximum of four in this model. And in this case, they receive \$28 thousand in Medicaid reimbursement, disability payment, to provide for this home environment for these 4 individuals."

Willis: "Okay."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Ives: "Okay? Now, if they were to go to an operating CILA, it would be 48 thousand to \$92 thousand would be this... the cost to the taxpayers instead."

Willis: "Right."

Ives: "So, these are differentiated models of giving adult developmentally disabled an option to live together."

Willis: "I understand that."

Ives: "Okay."

Willis: "My question is I just want to make sure that we don't increase the home to be able to get the assistance. It won't matter. The lower..."

Ives: "Right."

Willis: "...threshold can still always be there."

Ives: "But yeah. The lower threshold... nothing changes with the
 lower threshold."

Willis: "It will never ... so, it doesn't say they have to have ..."

Ives: "That's right."

Willis: "...a higher number in order to qualify?"

Ives: "Right."

Willis: "It just says that they have the option..."

Ives: "That's right."

Willis: "...if they feel they're able to handle more, they can take
 more in, correct?"

Ives: "That's... that's case. So, one of the... one of the complaints from DHS was, well, they're not licensed. Well, you're right. Four and under, currently, are not licensed at all. So, what we offered them was that they're going to be at least locally licensed, if you have five or six. And so, we gave them that

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

option in this Bill. Locally licensed, five or six regardless...

regardless they always have to be quarterly inspected by DHS."

Willis: "I never thought I'd say this Jeanne but I really like

Willis: "I never thought I'd say this, Jeanne, but I really like your Bill and I support it. So good luck with it."

Ives: "Thank you. Thank you so much. I like my Bill too."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Ford."

Ford: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ford: "Jeanne Ives, now that you have my attention..."

Ives: "Yes."

Ford: "...I have a question for you. Does this Bill only serve DuPage County or Cook..."

Ives: "No, no. This would be statewide."

Ford: "And there was no way you could get the... the department to support your Bill, the Department of Human Service?"

Ives: "The department has been, for example, what happened is, actually, when I stood on Wheaton City Council, we approved two standby... standalone, side-by-side homes in, you know, in one of our neighborhoods. And they were built by a model based off of what the STARS Program is. Now, the STARS Program is a not-for-profit serving the developmentally disabled. They built these homes for adult developmentally disabled. They built them for a capacity of six each relying on the Department of Human Services study that came out... came out after the Ligas Decree saying that essentially six would be an ideal number, one you get better economies of scale. So, they built these homes and they were fully operational. They've never had a problem. They've never had any incident. Nothing's ever happened to them. However, somebody,

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

basically, told DHS, hey, they're operating with six and they should only be operating with four. So, DHS wanted to, basically, close them down which is an absolutely horrific idea considering we're 48th in delivering services to developmentally disabled and we have over 20 thousand people on a PUNS list waiting for services. These are fully operational homes that the families have chosen to put their developmentally disabled in, but the families are using their own dollars to help support. So, DHS wanted to shut them down. Well, they went to court over it. And the federal judge said, DHS, you're going to fund them. You will keep these guys funded. You will... you will for the lifetime of these seven families currently under this situation, you will absolutely... you must fund them. And by the way, that funding right now is coming out of GRF. We move this funding... we change this one little statute in law, this funding now is eligible for the 50-50 match on Medicaid. So, DHS is shooting themselves in the foot because after that court decree they then went through a process where they said, well, guess what, we're going to have to look at how we differentiate services among folks. And actually, when DHS actually wrote out their opposition to this Bill, they flat out said it's very possible that the model such as the STARS will result from our efforts to be collaborative and engage other stakeholders. So, they know that this is a viable model. And I have no idea why they are now in opposition to it, but truthfully, this is a great model. It's... and we've got 20 thousand people on the PUNS list desiring to live independently to some extent in the fully licensed and inspected environment."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Ford: "And... and with the adoption of House Floor Amendment #2, if this Bill does not pass or become law, what happens to the... your... the clients?"

Ives: "Well, the seven clients that are currently in there, they are... they are... the court said for the life of those clients they will be allowed to stay in that thing. What happens though is that they can't bring in new people to fill that capacity. So, if somebody dies, somebody leaves, they can't actually operate those homes then because they lose the economies of scale at six. So, we're going from a model four to five or six, something that the families self-select."

Ford: "So, they would not be able to bring private insurers in or Medicaid?"

Ives: "They... they would just basically have to fund it on their own or..."

Ford: "Okay."

Ives: "...shut them down. That's right."

Ford: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andrade."

Andrade: "Mr. Speaker, will the Lady from Wheaton yield, please?"

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Andrade: "Representative, as I sit here and hear the Bill, I've always had a great relationship with you and this... I know your... this is your last term and I just wanted to... it wasn't a request personally. I thought I was hearing Greg Harris speak for a second there, if I close my eyes. So, I just wanted to say I stand in support of the Bill. And if you may, there's not many Bills I can join you as a chief co, but if... if you can put me on as a chief co on this Bill. I think this

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

is a great addition to help the disabled. Thank you very much."

Ives: "I will absolutely do that. Thank you."

Andrade: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Lilly."

Lilly: "Will the Sponsors yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Lilly: "Thank you. Representative, with this idea, is there an accreditation body that keeps the home up to standards and review so that the... the family member or the client is in a safe environment?"

Ives: "First of all, this is a family-orientated program. So, the families request and place these... these adults together. This is something that's already happening. It's just happening in groups of four; we're moving it to six. But when we move it to six, there's two things that must happen. One, these... these homes must be locally licensed. They must be licensed. And number two, DHS already has the responsibility and must inspect quarterly. So, there's ongoing inspections and there's licensing that occurs. And there's family involvement from the ones own home definition."

Lilly: "With that, what is DHS opposition, again? I'm sorry."

Ives: "I literally... other than what they've said to me, that they're working on the issue and they want to... they want to look at all different models. They've said no other reason for the opposition. They mentioned that they want licensed, so we added they had to be locally licensed. But this is in... once we change the statute, it's in full compliance with the Medicaid Waiver."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Lilly: "Okay. I just asked the question 'cause it is..."

Ives: "Yeah."

Lilly: "...when you have CILAs, you have these accreditation bodies that just really kind of protect the child. But I'll... I'll wait to see what DHS real opposition is. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ammons."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ammons: "Thank you. Can I clarify how the additional revenue would be used for this program, if this Bill is passed and signed into law?"

Ives: "I'm sorry. What was that?"

Ammons: "Did I hear you say that this would allow us to get additional revenue for this program?"

Ives: "There is... the potential of this... that this would pick up at least in the cases of the seven families that were grandfathered in, you could start to get a Medicaid match on it."

Ammons: "So, this doesn't do anything about increasing the base pay of the workers for the developmental services area of... for these families?"

Ives: "These folks operate under a... under a different program than a CILA with... with, you know, government employees or a not-for-profit employee. They operate different. They operate as if it is one's own home. And so, what we're moving it is to... is from... and these are Medicaid dollars that come into that family. And that family can determine what services... what menu of services they want to. It's a differentiated care program that we put in as a Medicaid Waiver. It was an

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

application for a 19... a 15(c) Home and Community-Based Services Waiver. Here's the entire packet of information that's required for it. This is one of many options to allow families to define where their adult developmentally disabled folks can go. Some of them choose a CILA, some of them choose institutional care, others choose one's own home. So, in one's own home, you know, you're not necessarily getting a... somebody... some, you know, you're having maybe a... you have a home parent, somebody who's there to oversee things, but you... the services that are provided are provided in... either in the home or outside of the home or however thy want to come up with it. So, it's not the same thing."

Ammons: "How... how many families are impacted by this Bill?"

Ives: "Well, actually, this would open up an option for a number of families that have wanted to follow this same model that the STARS Program has instituted. The STARS Program itself has 140 members who, when they age into this system, will want to go into the similar homes like this where you have family involvement in it, but you have adult developmentally disabled living together as if on their own. So, it could be... I don't know how many will affect it, but it's another option when we have 20 thousand folks on the PUNS list who need services."

Ammons: "So, this Bill would impact a small group of people that will be paid basically in their own home for these services... of their family member. In essence, that's what this Bill would do."

Ives: "Well, the way it works right now is, at least in this situation, is they get about \$28 thousand in. And then, they

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

get some disability money in. And what they do is they have pooled that money together to... to have their... their adult developmentally disabled join together in a family sort of setting in one's own home. And from that, they... they are provided services. They are taken out. They run a... a resale shop actually. It's one of the things that they do. In order for these adults to, you know..."

- Speaker Lang: "The Representative's time has expired Representative, will you continue... complete your answer."
- Ives: "I guess the point is this is not like a CILA environment.

 This is a separate different program that is authorized already in state statute. We're just moving it from four to six."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Ammons, your time has expired.

 Representative Flowers, we have completed our debate on this

 Bill. Representative Ives to close."
- Ives: "I ask sincerely for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Harper. Mah. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 93 voting 'yes', 13 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5069, Representative Jesiel. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5069, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #3 is offered by Representative Bellock."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Bellock on the Amendment."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

- Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Amendment number... is it... 3 just sets an immediate effective date."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5069, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Jesiel."
- Jesiel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 5069 is an initiative of the Department of Public Health. It would repeal the End Stage Renal Disease Facility Act. These facilities are already regulated by the Federal Government. And the department believes an Illinois specific license would be duplicative and burdensome to existing facilities. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. There are 109 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5309, Representative Lilly. Representative Lilly. Out of the record. House Bill 4927, Mr. Martwick. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4927, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Martwick."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Martwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 4927 requires the Chicago Public Schools to provide copies of teacher evaluations to the Chicago Teachers Union within 7 days after issuing the evaluations. This would put the Chicago Public Schools in line with other school districts who are... turnover teacher evaluations as part of the RIF reduction in force policy. I know of no opposition. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen is recognized."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Breen: "Yes. And Representative, our analysis shows that the Chicago Public Schools is opposed."

Martwick: "And I apologize, Representative. I... I looked at this yesterday and that wasn't there, but it's there, today, so."

Breen: "Right. And the issue is that apparently today teachers have the ability to provide their evaluations to anyone they see fit. And instead, this Bill would require that a teacher's evaluations be provided to the Chicago Teachers Union apparently even... even if the teacher's not a member of the union. Is that how... am I reading this correctly?"

Martwick: "So, I can't honestly answer the second half of your question. The first half is, is the assertion that you make is correct. Any teacher can provide it voluntarily and you can do anything you want voluntarily. School districts outside of CPS have a uniform reduction in force policy. And so, as part of that reduction in force policy, those teacher evaluations and ratings are turned over to their unions as part of that process. CTU... or CPS has a different reduction

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

in force system, but it does take the ratings into account for the order of dismissal. However, the… the notice for the layoff can come before…"

Breen: "But wait... forget... forgetting about a reduction in force.

I mean, this is just whether they're reducing the force or not, they just have to... every single evaluation of every single teacher in the district has to be provided to CTU.

That's how I read this."

Martwick: "Well, Representative, the evaluations are used as part of the reduction in force process, right. So, that is a labor issue, right? And so, the union would be representing the teachers that are being reduced."

Breen: "All right. I'm going to go to the Bill 'cause I have 15 seconds. Ladies and Gentlemen, I just don't see the need to mandate this on CTU or on the Chicago Public Schools. The teachers have the right to share their evaluations with CTU if they'd like. They should maintain the ability to keep their evaluations confidential..."

Speaker Lang: "Please complete your remarks."

Breen: "...if they so choose. And in this case, there's no reason to be imposing this mandate on the teachers of the City of Chicago, some of whom aren't even in the Chicago Teachers Union, that they have to share their personal evaluations with the union. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Martwick to close."

Martwick: "So, the rest of the teachers in the state their evaluations are turned over to their unions as part of the reduction in force process. That is part of the labor process so that the unions can represent the members that are being

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

reduced. CPS is not required to turn those over before the reduction in force. This, by getting the evaluations to them timely, they can be used in conjunction with it. It just helps the union represent their members during these reduction policies, which is... that's what we're here for. That's what the... that's what the whole point of the... of a labor union is supposed to do is just stand up for their members. So, this just puts CPS on par with every other district in the state. It's something I've been trying to do with some other measures as well. So, I would respectfully ask for an 'aye' vote."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Greenwood. Mayfield. Please take the record, Mr. Clerk. There are 90 voting 'yes', 18 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Returning to Representative Lilly's Bill, House Bill 5309. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5309, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Lilly."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Lilly."

Lilly: "Yes. I'm looking to adopt Floor Amendment #2."

Speaker Lang: "Brief explanation."

Lilly: "Yes. We... it was some language cleanup and we added some definition to the word 'hospital'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen does not wish to speak. Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it.

And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

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

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

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5309, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Lilly."

Lilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I'm... this Bill came to our Body from a revenue rally hosted in my district. And one of the constituents thought it was an idea that would help the budget line item for our great state. It prohibits the state agencies to grant bonuses and prohibits them to grant bonuses to employees and contractees."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Breen: "And then, Representative, I just want to make sure that... that... so, your Bill prohibits the state from ever paying a bonus to an employee. And you define 'employee' to not include persons subject to a collective bargaining agreement. Am I reading this correctly?"

Lilly: "You are."

Breen: "Okay. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, the whole point of this Bill is to say that anyone who is a nonunion employee of the State of Illinois, they don't get bonuses. So, if you're in the union, you can get a bonus. If you are not in the union, you don't get a bonus. This would seem to be just self-evidently unfair. Really, just one of those things where you'd sit there and go, why in the world would we do something like this. As well as just basically, sometimes folks deserve a bonus. If they have done an exceptional job, if there's

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

some reason for it. So, you're pretty much destroying the ability of the state, at least as to its nonunion employees, to do any sort of merit-based recognition of good work. And so, this Bill is... it's just transparently unfair. It is entirely attacking those employees who are not part of a union, for whatever reason, because maybe State Law requires them not to be part of the union, maybe they decided not to join the union. I don't know if we've got First Amendment concerns because they're actually conditioning your job duties based on whether you decided to join the union or not. But again, this is just a horrendously bad and terrible Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Wallace."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Wallace: "Thank you. Representative, was there any... what were some of the reasons that you felt necessary to bring this Bill forward? Was there any agency controversy that might've informed the need for this Bill?"

Lilly: "When our constituents FOIA our information about our budget and how it is implemented and they look at the ticket of what we're spending in different departments and different agencies they question these millions of dollars that go to line items beyond what was budgeted and it was explained to be bonus structure. I'd just like to clarify, the departments can have bonus structure; they cannot use taxpayer dollars to implement the bonus. The taxpayer is indicated they can't afford to pay bonuses because we have no money to do so. The Governor has introduced a budget with \$1 billion worth of cuts. The taxpayer is saying to the Representative we can't

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

afford bonuses, which... averages up to millions of dollars to the different departments within the state."

Wallace: "Thank you. I seem to recall there was an issue with the Department of Children and Family Services around gift cards and investigations were... was that considered a bonus?"

Lilly: "It would fall under that category, yes. And that was...

there was questions about the implementation and the cost and
the parity of that program."

Wallace: "Thank you. To the Bill. Unlike this idea that this has some impact on the First Amendment right to free speech, or an individual's autonomy as to whether or not they want to join the union or other form of organized employee unit while they're working for the State of Illinois, I don't believe that that is the impetus. The impetus is the fact that we actually lost children on our watch, children died when investigators when... within the Department of Children and Family Services were competing for gift cards which were the carrot for closing out cases or for saying that certain things had been accomplished within a case. And as a result, our DCFS was embroiled in a large scandal last spring. We now have a different director, but we can't bring back those children who were impacted by this idea of racing to get some gift card or some bonus. I would encourage support for this Bill throughout the chamber. Please vote 'aye'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davis."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Davis: "I... I think in reference to the Floor Leader from the other side and his characterization of this particular Bill with

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

regard to merit increases and things like that, is there a distinction to be made between a merit increase for an employee versus a bonus as you are thinking about it, Representative?"

Lilly: "Thank you, Representative. The distinction is a merit increase is what you earn from your merit and your performance and your evaluation. A bonus would be on top of that merit that you have received."

Davis: "So, you're trying to... in this particular Bill, you're trying to limit or eliminate bonuses, correct?"

Lilly: "I'm trying to eliminate a structure... a bonus structure that the taxpayer cannot afford."

Davis: "Okay. And relative to... how would I describe it... relative to costs that may be associated with this, what is your estimation about how much those bonuses may cost the State of Illinois?"

Lilly: "Each department that we have here in the State of Illinois, millions are being attributed to performances that we're already paying for. So, it's millions across the state."

Davis: "Millions of dollars?"

Lilly: "Yes."

Davis: "Particularly in... now, while I don't necessarily feel this way that the state is broke, as many people like to characterize it, but I know we've got some financial difficulties. So, in the midst of our financial difficulties, here's an opportunity to save the state millions of dollars that could then be reinvested in the state to do some of the necessary programming and... and other things that I think we'd like to do as a Body, correct?"

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Lilly: "That is correct."

"Okay. To the Bill. I appreciate the Representative Davis: bringing this forward. And I hope everyone can understand the intent. It's not an attack against state employees or nonunion state employees to prevent them from working hard or what have you and I think there are pay structures that come along with that. But again, as she's trying to... identify and define bonuses are something on top of that. And as much as we... and I'll say we even on this side of the aisle, but particularly on that side of the aisle... are always talking about how we should not be doing certain things with money. There's a lot of back and forth, but here is an effort to say, well, here are millions of dollars that could be put in place or put in other programs or do other things with or saved. I mean, right now, we are facing a \$1.2 billion shortfall from the previous years when the Governor, instead of working with the Legislature, in the right way, decided that... he didn't want to pass a budget and wanted to spend that money anyway. So, now, we've got to figure out how to fill that hole some kind of way that he created. And so far there's no... how would I describe it ... nothing coming from his office or his administration relative to trying to fix and fill that hole. So, I'm of the opinion, particularly in this case, if there's a way to save a few million dollars, then why are we not talking about ways to save a few million dollars? And if there's a need to better define what a bonus is versus a merit increase, then, fine, let's work with the Sponsor, move this Bill out, send it over to the Senate and continue to work on it so we can have the better definitions. It's just saying so

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

this is an attack against nonunion state employees that we don't want them to work hard and ultimately achieve additional resources as a result of that hard work. I don't think that's what this is about. And I would encourage a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davidsmeyer."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Davidsmeyer: "Representative Lilly, I want to assure you this is not me coming after you. I understand we had a good debate yesterday. So, I do have a questions. I... I have concerns because I know people that have worked up through the ranks as union members, worked up and worked to the level where they're management and they can no longer be a member of the union. My concern is can those people receive a merit-based bonus, if your Bill passes?"

Lilly: "Representative, what is real clear is from the idea of the revenue rally is we, the state, the people, can't afford to pay bonuses on top of salaries. What's happening within the departments is not a uniform process, not a monitored process, not a parity process with the bonus structure. So, I'm not sure if they can at this time or not. This particular Bill says the bonus structure can exist, but you can't use taxpayer dollars to do so."

Davidsmeyer: "So, you want to use private dollars to pay people in government bonuses?"

Lilly: "Well, when the people are saying we can't afford to pay bonuses, and salaries, and resign bonuses and all of those, I would call, expenses, it's difficult. We have no money. We have a budget that's cut \$1.4 billion. We have to figure out

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

how we can continue to meet the needs and the services that we're currently providing. And I understand your point, but the people are saying they cannot afford it."

Davidsmeyer: "So... but you're okay with bonuses for one class but not another class, right? So... so, if the person works hard to get ahead and becomes... you're ... you're kind of making it a dis... a disincentive to step up into management and take the responsibility of those roles. This specifically makes it a disincentive because if I stay, you know, status quo and don't do anything more, I could sit here and possibly get a bonus if I don't move up into management. So, it's a legitimate concern. I... I understand what you're trying to do ... trying to get rid of possibly incentives for doing certain things with your job. I understand some of that at the lower level. But you know, I think we really have to think about this. 'Cause if somebody works really hard and finds a way to save the state money, I... I think they should be incentivized to go above and beyond and do that. So, I appreciate what you're trying to do, but I think we may want to start with not making any more new promises before we take away the opportunity for encouraging people to do better. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bryant."

Bryant: "So, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Bryant: "Just a... question of the Sponsor. So, this comes from personal experience. So it's really a question in that regard. So, merit comp people... I don't remember what year it was... it did happen to be under Governor Quinn, the merit comp, who are not under collective bargaining agreement, went five, six

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

years some of them even more than that with no raises at all. So, under the Quinn administration, they came up with what amounted to a bonus paid like at the end of the year and it was nonpensionable. So, in essence, they got a small amount of money that they would have gotten had they gotten a raise, but because they did it the way they did it wasn't pensionable. So, my question is, is thought given to that in regard to this Bill?"

Lilly: "We haven't necessarily addressed that, but that is some of the reasons why this Bill is coming forth."

Bryant: "Okay. As it is right now, I can't support it today. If you make... I would like to see you maybe make some of those kind of changes, if it goes over to the Senate. When it comes back to realize that sometimes that type of a bonus can be given and it actually saves the taxpayers money. When people go five, six years just 'cause they don't have a collective bargaining agreement, and don't get a raise at all, sometimes that's the better way to do it for the taxpayers. And Mr. Speaker, the amount of time that I have left, I'd like to yield to Representative Reick."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reick, for her remaining time."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Reick: "My... Representative, my understanding of a bonus is something that's paid out of performance for having achieved certain goals, certain benchmarks, efficiencies and cost savings. So, under most circumstances, bonuses are issued not as an extra cost to the entity that's paying the bonus but as a way of compensating for greater efficiencies. And the... and

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

the bonus generally comes out of cost… out of costs saved. How do you respond to that?"

Lilly: "With those cost savings be not... not... that sounds private sector. Would those dollars be considered taxpayer dollars?"

Reick: "No. But the efficiencies that are being derived by state employees for doing their job in an excellent fashion would also be considered taxpayer dollars."

Lilly: "This piece of legislation brings forth bonus structure being dollars... taxpayer dollars being used in bonus structure. What you describe, and if it's private dollars, then it's... it's okay. But we're talking about taxpayer dollars not being used for the bonus structure."

Reick: "But what we're talking about..."

Lilly: "So, that's an example."

Reick: "...is taxpayer... is state employees creating efficiencies and saving taxpayer dollars and getting a certain portion of that as additional compensation for having done so. I don't see the... don't go private sector on me, here. Let's... let's continue in the public sector."

Lilly: "No. I'm just... I am... I am answering your question based on what I'm understanding you're asking me. If it's private dollars, then they can have a bonus structure with the private dollars, yes."

Reick: "You're missing my point completely. You know, I would say that, you know, if... somebody better contact Lovie Smith real quick because he's starting to get a lot of really good players in at Illinois. And if we go 11 and 1 next year and he gets a bonus as a result of his performance, he may decide he... and is denied him as a state employee, he may go ahead

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

and move elsewhere. You know, we've got a situation where people are saying that, you know, the football coach can't make more than the President of the university. So, what we have are situations where these football contracts are dealt out to private individuals and organizations like Nike and all that, and which are subjects to the abuses that we see every day in the newspaper. I am telling you that I'm talking about saving public money and giving the person the bonus out of that public money, a bonus that... out of money they've saved. This is all public money; this is not private money."

Lilly: "As I'm understanding university, those are endowments they have dollars by private entities supporting those and they... that's how they handle that particular structure."

Reick: "But if you're in... to the Bill."

Lilly: "I don't understand."

Reick: "To the Bill. I think that the situation here... I think we're... the Representative is confusing the notion of public taxpayer savings with paying bonuses out of savings of taxpayer money. I would urge a 'no' vote on this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "We have already had three people speak in favor of the Bill and three people in response. Representative Lilly to close."

Lilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. The people..."

Speaker Lang: "Turn on Representative Lilly. Thank you."

Lilly: "Thank you, Speaker and the Body, and thank you for the questions. The people of Illinois cannot afford to pay bonuses on top the salaries. We do not have the dollars here in the state. The Governor introduced a \$1.4 billion cut. We need to

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

be able to pay the employees that are here what they are due. It is important that we can keep our services to the people afloat. The... the tax people have spoken. We cannot afford to pay bonuses. Please 'aye' vote."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Evans. Flowers. Riley. Please take the record. There are 64 voting 'yes', 45 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5308, Representative Lilly. Want a second one? Out of the record. House Bill 4404, Representative McDermed. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4404, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative McDermed."

McDermed: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 4404 concerns mortgage loan processors. Mortgage loan processors are the folks that take that giant stack of mortgage paperwork and put it together. The other thing they do is verify your employment, verify your wages, check your credit rating and so on. It's a very clerical job. They are not funding the mortgages. They are not getting any benefits for procuring mortgages. Following the crash, the Federal Government created the Safe Act and required the states to create regulations and laws consistent with the Safe Act in their... each in their own state. Illinois was the only state that took the position that mortgage loan processors had to be regulated as brokers. Mortgage loan brokers have a very high

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

level of regulation and have to have a very high level of net worth. As a result of which, there are very few mortgage loan processors in Illinois and mortgage loan processing is outsourced to other states. After three years of negotiation, I have managed to get the Illinois Attorney General's Office and IDFPR on the same page. And they have agreed that it is correct to have mortgage loan processors regulated as mortgage loan originators. So, they are regulated by IDFPR. They are subject to putting up a bond. They are subject to paying a licensing fee every year, but it is a much less stringent procedure than as if they were treated as a mortgage loan broker. This is a good Bill. It will add jobs to the State of Illinois. It is an agreed Bill. And I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Wallace. Please take the record. There are 110 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4882, Representative Mayfield. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4882, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

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

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4882, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Mayfield."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Mayfield: "Thank you so much. This Bill just makes a slight change to the Grow Your Own Program that allows them to use their existing funds for dual credit programs. There are no additional state funds that are being used in this program. It's just a allocation for their existing dollars."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hays."

Hays: "So, Representative, can you... can you kind of walk me through A to Z. How does this work?"

Mayfield: "How does what work?"

Hays: "The program that you're talking about."

Mayfield: "I cannot give you all the ins and outs of Grow Your Own. You'd have to call the director."

Hays: "I'm sorry?"

Mayfield: "You'd have to call the director for an A to Z on the program."

Hays: "I mean, you're running the Bill though. I mean, you can't give me kind of a..."

Mayfield: "I'm running the Bill for a very specific portion of the Bill... of the program, not the entire program. I'm not looking to make massive changes to the entire program. My... Grow Your Own is an education program that allows low-income students to obtain an educators license. So, what this Bill that I'm running allows them to do is to use some of their existing funds for dual credit courses. So, that when their students graduate, they will graduate high school with an associate level degree. They only do two years of college with Northeastern Illinois and then they're able to graduate and become teachers within a two-year versus a four-year university period because they will be taking two years of

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

college courses while in high school. That is... so, my Bill just makes it simpler for them to do that."

Hays: "So, and I want to make... I'm just trying to kind wrap my head around the distinction. So... and forgive me if I mischaracterize what you just said. So, if someone goes to a local community college while in high school gets dual enrollment credits..."

Mayfield: "Yes."

Hays: "...that already count at the community college."

Mayfield: "Correct."

Hays: "Then they... I guess my question is, does this still add up to kind of a four-year degree or not exactly?"

Mayfield: "Well, those... if a student is enrolled in dual credit courses, all of their courses are then transferred into a college..."

Hays: "Right, right."

Mayfield: "...into a four-year university. Right."

Hays: "And..."

Mayfield: "And there are several... schools across the state that offer dual credit courses."

Hays: "Well, and my own son graduated from high school with... with, you know, 36 credit hours at his local community college. I guess the piece that I want to make sure I'm understanding is the conduit. So, let's use him as an example. He graduates from high school. He's been going for a couple of years to the local community college earning credits that count both towards his high school graduation and for college. Now, he goes forward either to that community college or to the four-year university, run me through the conduit again when he...

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

when he kind of pushes off the dock of he's graduated from high school, he has these hours that are dual enrollment. Take me the rest of the path. I want to make sure I'm clear on..."

Mayfield: "Okay. Well, for the education program through Grow Your Own, there is a partnership with Northeastern Illinois University where they will take those dual credit hours that they earned while in high school, apply them toward an educator license and then after two years at Northeastern, they can become teachers."

Hays: "Even if the dual enrollment credits don't equal the... could
 it..."

Mayfield: "That is why there's a partnership with Northeastern Illinois to ensure that the credits that they are taking are transferrable. That is why you have to partner with a... a university that offers that same program because otherwise you're just taking courses for the heck of it and you need to take courses that are going to be able to directly transfer over."

Hays: "So, that I understand. And I appreciate... I guess my question is what is the threshold? If I've taken dual enrollment credits in high school that now transfer to wherever... it's a community college; it's a university..."

Mayfield: "Northeastern."

Hays: "What is the credit threshold that allows me to in two years earn my teaching certificate? In other words, right now..."

Mayfield: "You need a bachelor's degree to become a teacher."

Hays: "Right."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

- Mayfield: "When you graduate high school... on a dual credit course, you will have half of a requirement. So, you'll basically had graduated with an associate's degree. You then apply those credits that have already been pre-negotiated through Northeastern, so you knew which courses you needed to take in order to get the appropriate credit hours for your educator's license. So, you're not just taking any class. You're taking very specific classes for an educator's license that have already been predefined through the program."
- Hays: "And the credit hours then perhaps would be something less than the 60 credit hours that I would earn as a kind of more traditional student earning my associate's degree and then going to whatever the four-year university you're suggesting. This new curriculum might add up to less hours than are required now. I guess, that's really what I'm getting at."

Mayfield: "I guess, I'm not understanding."

Hays: "Well, I mean, so if I graduate from high school, I have dual enrollment credits. I go to my local community college, for example. They accept all of the credits and they certainly will accept them if they're from their own college. So, my son has 36 credit hours. He would be required to earn 60 credit hours for an..."

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

Hays: "...disagree on anything. And then he would transfer to Eastern or Northeastern or wherever it is to earn his teaching certificate. I guess what I'm saying is... and what I'm asking really and I'll sit down... the program that you are contemplating has a different threshold in terms of hours earned. I mean, it sounds like you have to a... these specific

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

courses that lead to this pathway to become a teacher, which I appreciate. But I guess I'm suggesting, right now I have to take the 60 hours at my local community college when I... before I transfer or something less. And is yours different, I guess is what my question, Representative?"

Speaker Lang: "Please a brief answer. The Gentleman's time has expired."

Mayfield: "Okay. No, there is nothing different because you actually have to ... the community college that you would have normally went to is actually the one that is certifying the classes. So, you're still getting your credit hours through your local community college. In my area, it will be the College of Lake County. That's our community college. So, all of our dual credit courses are registered through our community college. A fee is paid to the community college, so they're not losing any money. And then, the student just doesn't have to do those two years after high school. They can do them while they're in high school and then it just shortens the amount of time, the amount of student loans they have to take out, all of that to become a teacher. We're just trying to streamline that process so to get kids involved earlier into becoming teachers and finding a mechanism in which they can do that."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Breen: "Now, Representative, I see in my analysis that the Board of Education... or Board of Higher Education staff was trying to work with interested parties to reorganize this program.

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Is your Bill the result of the effort of the Board of Higher Education to reorganize the program?"

Mayfield: "I have not had any conversations with the Board of Education. The organizations themselves has done a lot of restructuring. So, I believe that they had to put a lot of controls into place based upon their conversations with the Board of Higher Ed..."

Breen: "Okay."

Mayfield: "...as far as how they were administering their programs, their grants, that type of thing."

Breen: "And in my analysis..."

Mayfield: "So, I believe that's in place already..."

Breen: "Okay."

Mayfield: "...outside of this Bill. This Bill has nothing to do with that."

Breen: "But then, in my analysis, it also says that the *Chicago Tribune* reported in 2015 that the state has spent more than \$20 million on this program since its inception with the goal of producing, you know, thousands of teachers, but it only actually produced 102 college graduates and only 80 of them are teaching in Illinois. So, there's \$20 million for 80 teachers. So, we're talking \$250 thousand per actual teacher generated out of this program."

Mayfield: "Okay. In defense of the program, I would just like to say that they did not have control over the funds. The money from the General Assembly did not go directly to this program. It went to the grantee. So, the grantees would apply. The money went to the state... to the Board of Education... the higher board... the Board of Higher Education. The money went into

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

their pot. The grantees then applied to the Higher Board of Education. They did not apply to Grow Your Own, but Grow Your Own had to take the brunt of the mismanagement from those programs, even though they had no oversight over those particular programs. They did not control the money that went to them. So, I believe that was part of the conversation that you had brought up earlier when you said that the Higher Board of Education was having conversations with Grow Your Own. And it is my understanding that things have been put in place to address those concerns so that Grow Your Own would have more authorization over the programs even though they are not the dispensers of the money, the Board of Education is. And they really should have had some more checks and balances in place since they were administering the money."

Breen: "But not... and to checks and balances things. It... your Bill also, right, last line of it, says the Board of Higher Education may not adopt rules regarding candidate eligibility that are more restrictive than this Section. So, if part of the Board of Higher Education's idea was to say, hey, maybe we should do a little more vetting on the frontend for folks that might get us a little better return on our investment on the backend, they can no longer do that if we enact your Bill."

Mayfield: "Well, they haven't done it now, which is part of the problem. And one of the things they're saying, they cannot put anything more restrictive then what's already there. I would just like to point out that for our education programs we have a 63 percent fail rate for... for our individuals who go through the complete four years of college to become a

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

teacher and that is doing the traditional program. What Grow Your Own is trying to do is put something in place to ensure that when children graduate from college they will already have a majority of the skills that they need. They will not need to take remedial math. They will not need to take remedial English or have other assistance because they're going to be there on the frontend to ensure that these children have all the tools that they need to be successful going into the career. Sixty-three percent fail rate in a traditional program is not acceptable. It is totally unacceptable. Many of the students cannot pass the test. Grow Your Own is trying to put a program in place to ensure that the students can pass the test."

"And then, to the Bill. I... I appreciate what the Breen: Representative is trying to do. The problem is we've got a ... we have a program here with a troubled history. We've spent over \$20 million on it. We've gotten a return of only 80 teachers. So we're spending over \$250 thousand per teacher, which is certainly not what... that was not what was sold to the General Assembly when we started this program back in 2006. So, but again, there's public attention to the problems of this program. And so, it's something that, as we hear, that the Board of Higher Education was not consulted on this particular Bill. It would seem to me that a more prudent way of going about this is to get the Board of Higher Education in the room with the other stakeholders, get their support for the Bill, get a Bill that can all work... that can be worked together. I know the Republicans voted against this in the committee and I think it's probably because of the waste of

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

money and the… we don't have assurance that we're not going to continue to waste these funds going forward. And then, of course, there's some aspect of this Bill that ties the hands of the Board of Higher Education in fixing the program. So, again, I appreciate what the Representative is trying to do in trying to fix the program, but it feels like one of the major stakeholders in the… in that discussion is not present and really has to be present in order for us to have an effective solution that we can fund with confidence as a General Assembly in the years to come. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wehrli."

Wehrli: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. So, President Ronald Reagan, who hailed from this great state, once said... I'm paraphrasing here... said, if you ever want to live forever, come back as a government program 'cause even the bad ones are impossible to kill. This is an example of a program that started with great intentions but has failed miserably in its outcomes. One of the things we've failed to do here as a state is measure outcomes and reward successful programs and... and defund those that aren't successful. So, in 2006, this program had a goal of producing 1 thousand teachers. And the outcome was it produced 102 teachers, 80 of which are still in the State of Illinois at the cost of \$20 million. So, lofty goal, great metrics on what we were trying to get to. We never got there. So, instead of defunding this program, what are we doing here today, we're going to extend it and broaden it. This is a... a idea that is not fully fleshed out yet. It has a history of failure. I strongly urge a 'no' vote'. And it's time for this program to just go away."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Speaker Lang: "Representative Greenwood."

Greenwood: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to stand in support of this legislation and talk about specifically the East St. Louis School District 189 was a recipient of the Grow Your Own program. And as a result, we have produced approximately 10 teachers who are currently working for our school district. So, we find that the program works. And it is successful in providing a pipeline for teachers of color and minority teachers to represent the classrooms in which they serve. Also, Representative Mayfield, is there any opposition from IBHE?"

Mayfield: "There is absolutely no opposition from the Illinois Board of Higher Education. In fact, I'm not sure what's showing on your analysis, but Jamie Ray, from the board, has indicated that she meant to slip in support of the Bill not opposition. So, the former speaker's statement that IBHE should have been part of the conversation, that they had issues, is not accurate. There is no opposition from the board, especially from IBHE. This is a good Bill. It prepares students, and it saves money for both the students, the taxpayers and their families."

Greenwood: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Mayfield to close unless that was your close."

Mayfield: "I recommend a 'aye' vote. This is a really good thing we're doing."

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

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Crespo. Please take the record. There are 63 voting 'yes', 47 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Fine is recognized."

Fine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to introduce my two very special Pages of the day and their mom. This... I think most people know Shiva, my chief of staff, who is here today, and graced us with the presence of Ashkaan and Kiyan. So, keep them busy today. They're great kids from Glenview. So, please welcome them to the House Floor."

Speaker Lang: "Thanks for joining us. Good to see you. Thanks for coming today. House Bill 4742, Representative Mayfield. Representative Mayfield. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4742, a Bill for an Act concerning education. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Mayfield."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Mayfield."

Mayfield: "Okay. This Bill allows for third-party substitute teaching within our school districts. The second Amendment that we put in removed CTU and IFT opposition from the Bill. This Bill does not... school districts... I'm sorry. The genesis for this Bill is that we are... we really cannot find subs for some of our schools. So, what this Bill would do is that it would allow for third-party substitutes. So, that means that a... an employment agency, essentially, could go out and do the recruiting, do the background checks. They would pay for everything, essentially, find these teachers and then, only if the school district desired to use them, there is no mandate here, there's no pressure anywhere that says that you

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

have to do this, then they will be allowed to use these teachers. I'll look for questions."

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

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

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

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4742, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Mayfield, did you just explain the Bill?"

Mayfield: "I just explained it."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please record yourself, Members. Guzzardi. Kifowit. Rita. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. There are 90 voting 'yes', 9 voting 'no', 9 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4247, Mr. McSweeney. Out of the record. House Bill 5573, Mr. Mitchell. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5573, a Bill for an Act concerning crime victims. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mitchell."

Mitchell, C.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

This is a clean-up Bill to the... following on the crime victim's rights Bill that we passed after the Amendment a couple of years ago. It's an agreed Bill as far as I understand. The Amendment that we adopted a few days ago

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

removed the opposition of the State's Attorneys Association who were concerned about the order in which a support person would have to be called. So this basically does a couple of quick things. Creates two new rights for crime victims: the right to not have substantive issues heard or decided at status hearings, the right to have a support person present and eligible to testify at trial, a process for advocates to testify, and then also clarifies some definitions. I want to thank everyone in committee for their help and support. I want to thank Representative Cabello for his advocacy in helping with this. It's an initiative of the Attorney General. And I would welcome any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen."

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

Representative..."

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Mitchell, C.: "Yes."

Breen: "Thank you. Representative, the Cook County Public Defender, are they still opposing your Bill?"

Mitchell, C.: "I'm not aware of that, Representative, but I wouldn't be surprised. I would say my understanding of their objections is that they are all objections to things that have been law for really a couple of decades in most cases."

Breen: "Okay. And I see a specific objection to the provision about persons impacted by the crime ruling out victims to present statements at a sentencing in juvenile court. 'Cause apparently it goes against the current limitations on public access to juvenile court. Is that something that your Bill

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

allows? So, you got third parties that are allowed to come into the juvenile court who are not victims?"

Mitchell, C.: "My understanding, Representative, is that that is already current law and this Bill does not change that. That's my understanding."

Breen: "All right. Fair enough. Thank you."

Mitchell, C.: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mitchell to close."

Mitchell, C.: "I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Moylan. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. There are 110 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. And the Majority Leader in the Chair."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Moeller, are you ready on House Bill 5164? Out of the record. Representative Moeller, are you ready on House Bill 5163? Out of the record. Representative Moylan, are you ready on House Bill 1620? Are you ready? Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1620, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Moylan."

Moylan: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Members of the General Assembly. House Bill 1620 simply caps the amount the Tollway Authority can charge a vehicle with a small trailer. I met with the executive director. They were... are attempting to come up with another category. And I will... I plan on

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

addressing that in the Senate. And I respectfully ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Moylan moves do pass on House Bill 1620. And on that, Representative Lilly."

Lilly: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Currie: "Wait until the Bill is done and we'll get back to you."

Lilly: "Yes, Ma'am."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Fortner."

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

Speaker Currie: "Sponsor will yield."

Fortner: "We certainly had a lot of robust conversation about this in committee. And as you know, and for the benefit of the chamber, what the actual Bill we're passing does is it sets a cap on the fees that would be... the Toll Highway Authority could charge for vehicles pulling a trailer. That's... that's the way your Bill is right now before any further Amendment. Am I correct?"

Moylan: "Correct."

Fortner: "And the concern is that I certainly don't feel that we should be in the business of telling the Toll Authority what fees they should establish for the different types of vehicles. However, as also came out during the conversations in committee, the open road tolling technology is a technology that counts axles. And then they match that up with the transponder and they have a table of fees based on the axles. And that's your understanding as well. Is that correct?"

Moylan: "Correct."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Fortner: "And back before we had open road tolling, what we had were categories that included things such as passenger car with trailer. And also correct, Representative..."

Moylan: "Right."

Fortner: "...that we use to have that? And I believe the State of Indiana still has that category on the Indiana Toll Road, but because of the way it counts axles, technologically that category went away with the advent of open road tolling. I understand what the Representative's trying to do. I certainly appreciate that we're getting to the Senate. I regret that we couldn't do it while we were still in the House and simply specify that we want to see the Toll Highway Authority reestablish a category for passenger vehicle with trailer. I think that's a... that's a laudable goal. I regret that we've hit deadline and we can't do that. But I just wanted to make sure the Body was aware that your commitment is to do that change over in the Senate to make it for a specified category and not for a cap on the fees. Is that correct?"

Moylan: "Correct."

Fortner: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Moylan, do you need to close or shall we just go to the vote?"

Moylan: "Yes. Just ask for an 'aye' vote, please."

Speaker Currie: "On House Bill 1620, all in favor vote 'yes'; 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 Motion, there are 104 voting 'yes', 3 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

reached the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Lang, are you ready on House Bill 1336 on Second Reading? Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1336, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Lang."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr... Madam Speaker. This Bill... Amendment becomes the Bill. If we could discuss it on Third Reading."

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. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1336, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Some time ago we authorized private cars doing ambulance services in local communities. There are some such of those cars in my community. This Bill would say that if a private car was in an accident the car insurers cannot increase their insurance rates or cancel their policy solely... solely because the vehicle was involved in an accident while responding to a call as a volunteer EMS provider. I don't think there are any opponents to this. I don't recall any in committee. I would ask your support."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Lang moves do pass on House Bill 1336. All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this measure, there are 109 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Lang, are you also ready on House Bill 4873? Representative... please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4873, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you. The Amendment... oh, we're on Third Reading. I'm sorry, Madam Speaker. When we passed the Payday Loan Reform Act some years ago, which was agreed with all the advocates, and all the parties, and the Attorney General at the table, it was required that there be verifiers. These are folks that make sure the proposed loan agreement is permissible under the Act. And it was allowed that they charge a fee. This simply increases that fee slightly because their costs have increased greatly. We're not making any changes in the Payday Loan Reform Act. We're not making any substantive changes that affect borrowers, just a small additional fee. Ask your support."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Lang moves do pass on House Bill 40... 4873. Seeing no discussion on that Motion, all in favor vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. Representative Lang... on this measure, there are 48 voting 'yes', 57 voting 'no'. And Representative Lang moves for

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Postponed Consideration. Representative Phelps Finnie, are you ready with House Bill 5754? Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5754, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Finnie."

Phelps Finnie: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This Bill allows DOC... individuals who worked in DOC that have taught to then be eligible for principal endorsement. This was a part of the Code but was taken out in 2011. We're just asking that this Code be put back in."

Speaker Currie: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, Representative Finnie moves do pass on House Bill 5754. 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 109 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this measure, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Meier, are you ready on House Bill 5440? Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5440, a Bill for an Act concerning wildlife. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Meier."

Meier: "Yes. 5440 simply states that resident youth and non resident youth hunting license will be at the same price for the State of Illinois for archery and trapping. This brings it in line with our other hunting permits in the State of Illinois."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Meier moves passage of House Bill 5440. And seeing no discussion, all in favor vote 'aye';

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

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 108 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this... this Motion, having received... Bill, having received the appropriate Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Rita, are you ready on House Bill 4433? Representative Rita? Out of the record. Representative Scherer, are you ready on House Bill 4707? Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4707, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 3 and 4 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #3 is offered by Representative Scherer."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Scherer on the Amendment."

Scherer: "Thank you, Madam Chairman. So, I have Amendment 3 and 4? So, I would like the adoption... do you want me to take them each separately?"

Speaker Currie: "Yeah, if you would."

Scherer: "Take the adoption of Amendment 3."

Speaker Currie: "If you would."

Scherer: "Okay."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Scherer moves do adopt on Amendment 3. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. And now, Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #4 is offered by Representative Scherer."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Scherer on Amendment #4."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

- Scherer: "Thank... thank you, Madam Chairwoman. Yes, I would like the adoption of Floor Amendment #4 to 4707 regarding a drug task force."
- Speaker Currie: "...you to explain to the Body what the Amendment does."
- Scherer: "Each of these Amendments is just added a little bit more. I worked extensively with all the parties involved. And this one actually adds the pill manufacturers to the task force. And it adds the sentence that will be unique to the skills of the members."
- Speaker Currie: "All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments, Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Currie: "Third Reading. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4707, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Scherer."
- Scherer: "Thank you, again, Madam Chairwoman. So, as I said earlier, this creates a drug task force. We worked extensively with opposition to get it to this point. And it is now a task force for prescription drugs only."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Scherer moves do pass on House Bill 4707. Representative Breen."
- Breen: "Thank you... thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Currie: "She will."
- Breen: "Thank you. And Representative, I'm... I know we love to create task forces, but occasionally it seems like we're

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

creating overlapping task forces. In our analysis, it says in October of 2017 the Governor created the Opioid Prevention and Intervention Task Force. And also, in 2017, the General Assembly created the Collaborative Pharmaceutical Task Force to study patient safety in prescribing pharmaceuticals. Where does your task force fit in with those two, which themselves may even be overlapping already?"

- Scherer: "Yes, Representative, I have the Governor's task force report right here. And as you can see, it's a small document compared to the size of this problem. Mine is very narrow in its scope."
- Breen: "Actually, it looks pretty significant as government reports go."
- Scherer: "It's just for prescription drugs only. We're talking about things like Hydrocodone and OxyContin."
- Breen: "To the Bill. Far be it for me to vote against a task force because I don't want to make... send the message or have a hit piece say I'm against, you know, dealing with the issue of opioid abuse. But at some point we may altogether start... want to start a task force to see which task force are doing what and maybe cut them back. We'll have a task force to check on the task forces. Thank you."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Scherer to close."
- Scherer: "This was originally intended to take on the problems that we're facing right now with drug overdose. And I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Scherer moves do pass on House Bill 4707. All in favor... vote 'aye'; opposed 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this measure, there are 103 voting 'yes', 3 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having achieved the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Continuing on the Order of Representative Scherer, we have House Bill 4710. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4710, a Bill for an Act concerning education. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Scherer."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Scherer on Amendment 1."

Scherer: "Thank you, Madam Chairwoman. I would like the adoption of Floor Amendment 1 to House Bill 4710. This requires a task force also dealing with student college credit card debt."

Speaker Currie: "All in favor... Oh, I'm sorry. Representative Ford, do you wish... Representative Wehrli, do you wish to speak on the Amendment? No. All right. 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. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4710, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Currie: "Representative... Representative Scherer."

Scherer: "Thank you, again, Madam Chairwoman. So, this is a task force that includes a matrix of 15 things that we have studied extensively and got these findings from a report. We've changed the deadline to December 14. We've met at least six times on this. And we have come to this compromise trying to

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

find out what kind of debt there is concerning credit cards and colleges. And I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Scherer moves for passage of House Bill 4710. And on that, Representative Breen."

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

Speaker Currie: "She will."

Breen: "And are we on a clock or no? Okay."

Speaker Currie: "Pardon me?"

Breen: "Well, I'll just keep asking. Representative, what's the intent of this Bill?"

Scherer: "The intent of the Bill is to have some hard data on what is creating the problem with student college debt, when they come out of college, in regard specifically to credit cards."

Breen: "And then, I know IDFPR is very concerned about the task force because I believe it impacts them. But they asked the question how are they supposed to get the data from the major credit card issuers and card networks when they don't regulate those particular entities? And so, thus, can't get that data from them?"

Scherer: "There's a Credit Card Act of 2000... I believe it's 2009 from the Federal Government. And we have been studying the research on that. And what we need to do is to take that research and narrow it to the State of Illinois and specifically to college-age students."

Breen: "But how are we, actually, even going to get the data that the task force is supposed to do… the credit card issuer data, et cetera… when IDFPR doesn't regulate the entities, has no ability to get the data from them."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Scherer: "Well, we don't have the data and that is exactly why we want the task force is so that we can get the answers to the data. The 15 matrix I feel very confident that there will be some of these things that could be answered like the percentage of Illinois students who carry balances on their credit cards all or most of the time or the total amount of credit extended to individuals between the age of 18 and 21. You know, there are 15 of them. The total number of credit cards issued to students with add-ons like debt protection. The number of students who pay their monthly bill solely through an online portal."

Breen: "And... are there any credit card companies on the task force?"

Scherer: "No, there are not."

Breen: "And how about..."

Scherer: "There are banks, credit unions."

Breen: "...collections agencies, others?"

Scherer: "Some banks issue credit cards in conjunction with like Visa or MasterCard."

Breen: "I think there's a big concern that we're creating a task force seeking to analyze data that is literally unattainable, including data on such as the number of students who monthly pay their bill online, or the number of student accounts with reward products providing points, the number of online solicitations of preapproved credit card offers. Those are some very ephemeral... they're numbers that are... certainly they may exist, but no one knows how to actually get that data and the entity that you've got, IDFPR, is telling us they can't get the data to even have a task force."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Scherer: "Representative, the report that I referred to a little earlier, from the Federal Government, explicitly said if we don't have the answers to these questions within our state, we need to find these answers. And as... as I said earlier, to some of the matrix, when I met with some of the opposition and asked for answers to some of those, I was given nothing, not that they couldn't or could, I was just given nothing. We probably met, oh, I don't know, eight or nine times and this is a compromise. And it is now an agreed Bill with the exception of IDFPR. And their job really is to collect the data."

Breen: "Well, and, I mean, it's not agreed. We didn't come out of committee unanimously and, right, IDFPR is opposed. Other entities are sitting there going what, you know, it might be a great idea to get the data and look at it or what have you, but you don't actually have the means to do so with this task force. And, you know..."

Scherer: "The community..."

Breen: "To the Bill."

Speaker Currie: "To the Bill."

Breen: "You know, Ladies and Gentlemen, I understand we got to create task forces so that folks can pass Bills and do things and we can, you know, feel like we're doing something effective about the various problems that face our residents and constituents, that the problem is when we create a task force that doesn't have independent authority, you really... you don't need to create a task force to need this. You would have to create an entirely new branch of Illinois government that has the right to go in, take this data from the credit

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

card companies and to actually have enforcement authority and all of that in order to collect the data before you can even start having a task force. The department that would be tasked with supporting the task force is saying we don't have an ability to do any of this. We can't get you any of your data. Your task force would essentially just sit there, continue to meet, and do nothing. And so, for that reason, it's very difficult even being supportive of starting task forces when folks have ideas that, you know, they want to... they want to engage. This task force seems like it is fatally flawed from the outset and it's setting itself up for failure or at the very least, just to be one of these task forces that stops meeting because there's nothing to do. So, for that reason, it's very difficult to support the Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "This Bill is on Standard Debate. I will employ the timer. Representative Wehrli."

Wehrli: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Currie: "She will."

Wehrli: "Representative, the task force is charged with many factors here. Charged being an operative word in this debate. How do they go about collecting the data on the total cost of credit to credit card issuers for students as a percentage of credit card average cycle ending balance? How do they get that data?"

Scherer: "The whole purpose of this is to figure out of these 15 matrix which we can collect the information on and which we cannot collect the information on. So, if this is one that they are not capable of finding the information on, I made it very clear yesterday that... that we understand that could be

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

the case. I would just really like to have a better grip of this, to understand how we can help our college students. Don't you want to know that?"

Wehrli: "So, as a father of a college student, I think it's important that they know how to manage credit, but I don't think running a task force at the statewide level is the way to go about that. My second question. The percentage of Illinois students who pay off their credit card balance in full. How do we collect that data? Isn't that... yeah, are we going to run a credit report on these individuals? Are we going to ask people to voluntarily give us their credit information? Is it going to be an online survey? Are they going to be able to, you know, press one for option one? How do we get this data?"

Scherer: "So, if the credit card companies that are issuing these are responsible business owners, then I would think that they would know this information. If they don't know this, they should start asking it because otherwise they're issuing credit cards to people who have no hope of paying the bill off. And this is exactly the... and I appreciate you asking this because this is exactly why I brought this Bill to the floor is because our students can get so overwhelmed in debt that many of them are coming out of college and they are drowning in debt. And a good example of that would be you come out of college, you have an excellent degree from one of our universities, and you've got... this is true life stories. I've had a constituent... that's how I know this... they go, they get a good job in Chicago at a suburb, in an excellent company. They get the job; they're ready to go to work; they

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

can't take the job because they can't get an apartment. They can't get an apartment because they don't have a good credit score. They don't have a good credit score because of the exact things that I am so interested in finding out. I'm really surprised that you don't want to know and protect your students the same way I do."

"So, usually when a... somebody gets their first credit Wehrli: card, it's has a limited balance, maybe \$500. So, it's common practice for a college student especially, I mean, they may not be the most attentive to detail sector of our population, and they may miss a couple of payments, even if it's \$25. So, you're saying, under this task force, they should have the ability to know the credit card companies, who may or may not be based in the State of Illinois, who could completely look at this task force and blow it off to be quite honest with you because we have no enforcement mechanism whatsoever. They... we're supposed to just kindly ask them to share credit data on... on college students because the State of Illinois politely asked them to. That's... that's comical in my mind. What about balances? So, if you carry a balance for more than a month, you're supposed to give that data up as well? You're asking a task force to do the impossible. So... to the Bill. A previous speaker is absolutely correct. This is about education those students on how to properly manage credit, not embolden a State Government task force to ... to get into the nuances of how credit card companies work. And this... this is, you know... again another task force that serves no purpose. This will be a great mail piece for the Representative, but that's about it."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

- Speaker Currie: "Representative Greg Harris to announce an addition to the excused list."
- Harris, G.: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd like to... the record to reflect that Representative Zalewski is excused for the rest of the day."
- Speaker Currie: "Thank you. Representative Reick, you're up next.

 The five minute timer will be on."
- Reick: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Currie: "He will."
- Reick: "She will. Question for you. The Bankers Association has... has indicated that, you know, why are we involved in this? My question is, what other organizations like retailers, who offer credit cards or payday loans or title loans, are we going to collect data on things like that?"
- Scherer: "My focus right now is on student college credit card debt. I would very much be interested in looking into that next year because I, just like you, I have seen one too many college graduate come out and have their whole life a mess before they even get out of the starting gate because of this issue."
- Reick: "If that's the case, shouldn't there be a broad... shouldn't your task force inquire into other means by which students go into massive amounts of debt that they end up graduating with such as..."
- Scherer: "Absolutely."
- Reick: "...such as student loan programs that suck up existing subsidies and state money that goes to those universities.

 Nothing... nothing justifies or inspires a task... an increase in tuition and fees more than giving a university or college

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

more money because they'll all find a way to spend it and push it on to the... to the person who's going to borrow money to get into college. I'm... I'm very curious as to why it is that your... I understand your need for... the need and the interest, but aren't you also dealing with an invasion of privacy here, if this task force is going to inquire into the... into the types of debt that we're... we're talking about? You're going to have to gain... you're going to have to get individual information here."

Scherer: "That's why I agreed to many of the things that you've said. The banks will keep this as private information. We're not asking people's names or Social Security numbers. We're asking for a collection of statistics and data so that we understand what's causing the problem. I bet there's not a single Representative in this wonderful Assembly that hasn't known someone who has faced a terrible crisis in their life due to credit card debt specifically when they were in college and most vulnerable."

Reick: "Yeah, but what we're..."

Scherer: "In response to your earlier questions, I... I would say that the issue... the reason that I've narrowed it just to credit cards is because the rates that are being charged are so astronomical in some places that they are just... we're preying on our most vulnerable young people who are just fresh out of high school. I know that the Senator is carrying a Bill that follows along the same path, and is much broader in scope, which I imagine you would want to be supportive of that as well."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Reick: "I quess my question is that the ... credit card companies are not in business to offer credit cards to people who will not pay their balances. And the reason we have such a high... high interest rate is because there's such a high default rate. I think that your... your interest and your... your concern is... is well-taken, but I think that the means by which you're doing it is incorrect. As a matter of fact, yesterday we defeated a Bill on this floor that would pretty much give third party information to... or information to third parties which is subject to possible leaking and things like that. And I see the danger of having the same thing happen here where we're giving third... we're giving private... information to third parties who then have a responsibility to keep it ... keep it secret or safe, but we end up having the risk that that is not the case or to be used for additional marketing purposes. How do you respond to that?"

Scherer: "I guess it's a reflection of what I said earlier. We're not asking... it's a slippery slope and we're being very careful. We don't want names. We don't want Social Security numbers, addresses. This is purely a statistical question that we're asking."

Reick: "To the Bill."

Scherer: "I'm just curious. Do you feel there is no problem with college credit card debt?"

Reick: "No, of course not. No, of course not."

Scherer: "Well, then, there's your answer right there that..."

Reick: "To the Bill. I believe that what we're looking for here is we're seeking a small... an answer to a small issue when the larger issue of student debt is much broader than the... what

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

- was being asked for here. I think this task force would be ill-advised and I..."
- Speaker Currie: "Would you... you've used up your time. Would you like to bring your remarks to a close, Representative?

 Representative Reick."
- Reick: "All I would say is that I think that what we're doing here is hiding the larger issue of student debt in its overall sense. And I would urge a 'no' vote on this Bill. Thank you."

 Speaker Currie: "Representative Scherer to close."
- Scherer: "Thank you. In closing, I would like to reiterate, again, that we had opposition. We worked extensively with our opposition. They have all pulled off their opposition, except for IDFPR. And I have reiterated to them that their job is to collect it from the banks, the credit unions, et cetera. I think everyone in this august Assembly will agree with me that someone in their family has had a problem with credit card debt or a relative, a niece, a nephew, a neighbor. And to just turn a blind eye to that is just not the reason that we come here to do the right thing. I would urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Scherer moves do pass on House Bill 4710. 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 Motion, there are 62 voting 'aye', 42 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the appropriate Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Hoffman, we'll go back to you on House Bill 5175. Are you ready for it? All right. Clerk, please read the Bill."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5175, a Bill for an Act concerning education. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Hoffman."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Floor Amendment #1 becomes the Bill. And it would indicate beginning, July 1, 2019, school boards should... shall pay teachers, on a full-time basis, 40... no less than \$40 thousand a year. I ask that we adopt this Amendment and move it to Third Reading for debate."

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 have been approved for consideration. No Motions are filed."

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

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5175, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Currently, we're facing an historic crisis of a shortage of teachers. Currently, close to 2 thousand full-time teaching positions remain unfilled. Also, a recent study indicates that in 2016 19 to 30 percent of early career teachers, 1 to 5 years of service, leave their profession within 5 years. Additionally, the U.S. Department of Education has reported that there was a 31 percent decrease... a 31 percent decrease in the number of students that have enrolled in teacher preparatory programs. We're facing a

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

crisis of unprecedented proportion when it comes to making sure that the best and the brightest students, men and women, go into the teaching profession in Illinois. There is no greater profession, no more honorable profession than passing on knowledge to people and the students here in the State of Illinois. That is why I think it's time. It's time to... for the first time since 1980... for the first time since 1980, when a starting teacher's salary with a bachelor's degree was at \$9 thousand minimum. That's still in state statute, passed in 1980. We've not adjusted that since then. This would simply say that we're going to honor our teachers. We're going to recruit teachers. We're going to make sure that we retain teachers for the good or our education system here in Illinois. And we're going to make the starting salaries \$40 thousand. I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Hoffman moves do pass on House Bill 5175. And on that, Representative Breen."

Breen: "Yes. And Madam Speaker, inquiry of the... of the Clerk. Did we adopt Amendment 2?"

Speaker Currie: "Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #2 remains in the Rules Committee."
Breen: "So, we're... Okay. Well, all right. Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Currie: "The Sponsor will yield."

Breen: "So, Representative, I mean, I know you were supposed to hold the Bill on Second Reading with the Amendment filed to remove the opposition. And I know there was a negotiated Amendment 2, which changed the mandate of the \$40 thousand to a goal of \$40 thousand. And that was going to make everyone

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

- neutral and we were not going to have to have an extended floor debate on it. What happened?"
- Hoffman: "I never... I never committed to holding it. I did file the Amendment, but I've decided that a mandate is... a mandate of \$40 thousand was needed in order to recruit and retain teachers."
- Breen: "Fair enough. Okay. And so, Representative, where did you get your \$40 thousand number?"
- Hoffman: "If you look at the... the average throughout the State of Illinois, it's 39 thousand, I believe, \$300 is the average."
- Breen: "So, you decided that no matter where you live in Illinois, no matter high or low... how... no matter how high or low the cost of living that we're going to pay \$40 thousand as a minimum... that... that's your to... to recent college graduates who begin in the teaching field?"
- Hoffman: "Yes. Now, I will say this, Representative, is I'm not wedded to... to just one \$40 thousand across the state amount. I would be... I would be willing to take a look at what the... what the people who are interested in... in this Bill to look at possible regions, if that makes more sense. But I'd like to move this Bill over to the Senate. Let's... let's set a mark that we in this General Assembly are going to try and address the shortage of teachers in Illinois and we're going to pay them a decent wage when they come out of school."
- Breen: "To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a catastrophic mandate from this State Government on to the local school districts that are unable, for whatever reason, to pay their starting teachers at a lower level. As well, if you start looking at the average college graduate salary in the State

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

of Illinois it's not \$40 thousand for many, many professions. And in fact, you know, for teachers even up in the northern part of the state at times it's just a touch over \$40 thousand with a much higher cost of living than in certain other parts of the state. Whatever the merit or demerit of setting a \$40 thousand start in your particular school district, it's not our business here in the General Assembly to set that number for your local district no matter where you are in the state. doesn't make any sense. The Representative essentially acknowledged he pulled the number out of the air. I'm assuming he's doing it for some reason of his own, you know, I don't know why. As I think someone earlier talked about, yeah, that's a great Bill for your reelection mailer. I'm assuming this is the same thing. Please let's disregard this. If he wants to adopt Floor Amendment 2, which sets a goal. The goal may not even be valid, but at least it doesn't do harm to our schools, our school districts, and our property taxpayers. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Currie: "This Bill is on Short Debate. So, that I will...
although there are now five or six people who want to speak
and I will let them do so. I will limit them to two minutes
apiece. Representative Mayfield."

Mayfield: "Thank you so much. This Bill came out of my committee.

And I just want to state that there was no mention by anyone there. This is an initiative of IEA, not the Sponsor, but IEA is the initiator of this Bill. At no time did School Management Alliance or any other entity offer a dollar amount other than the 40 thousand. I want to put that out there. I want to state that a student that graduates with a bachelor's

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

degree under current law only makes \$10 thousand. If you have a master's degree, it is \$11 thousand. We pay janitors more than we are paying our teachers. We have a severe shortage of teachers across the state. There is no incentive for a student, who has tons of student loans, to take a position that at the most will pay them \$11 thousand. That is totally unacceptable. We need to stop disrespecting our teachers. We need to pay them what they're worth. This is s job that is critical for our future and for our children. I am asking everyone in here to support this Bill, vote 'yes'. This is not a political Bill. This is about, you know, addressing our teacher shortage across the state. Thank you so much."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Keith Wheeler."

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

Speaker Currie: "She will."

Wheeler, K.: "I think it's Jay Hoffman. I..."

Hoffman: "Gender off."

Speaker Currie: "Sorry. I was so used to seeing Scherer."

Hoffman: "Gender change."

Speaker Currie: "Yes. Representative Hoffman will respond to your questions."

Wheeler, K.: "Very good. Well, thank you."

Hoffman: "It's... it's Hoffperson... Hoffperson."

Wheeler, K.: "Oh, well played. Representative, tell me what other fields that we mandate in State Law to have minimum salaries?"

Hoffman: "I don't... I'm not aware of any. There may be some, but I don't know that we do."

Wheeler, K.: "And in... I guess..."

Hoffman: "Let me just say this."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Wheeler, K.: "Sure. Now, it's right."

Hoffman: "Let me just say this."

Wheeler, K.: "I'm short on time, so go fast."

Hoffman: "This is not a new... no, you can go. I'm not trying to...

I just want to make one point. This is not a new concept. In

1980, we mandated a minimum..."

Wheeler, K.: "I agree. I'm just trying..."

Hoffman: "...salary."

Wheeler, K.: "Yeah. I do understand where you're going with that. I guess my point, Jay, is that ... that most school districts that I'm aware of are collectively bargained units that have negotiated a salary that starts and ... and scales up and has steps and lanes and all kinds of things involved in it. And now we are just going to come in here as a State General Assembly, and we're going to, you know, reset the floor, if you will, and bring things up based on an arbitrary time line that we set based on a arbitrary number that... that I guess you set. And it to me doesn't make sense. So, let me just go to the Bill 'cause we're out of time. I appreciate where we're going to go with this. Ladies and Gentlemen, to the Bill. These school districts already have budgets planned. They already have preparations. They have hire... made hiring decisions, classroom staffing decisions. And here we come with, as soon as it takes place, on June 30, 2019, we're going to change a lot of that. We need more time to think this through. This does not deserve a 'yes' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Brief discussion Representative Katie Stuart, the timer is on."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Stuart: "Thank you. I rise in support of this Bill. We did... I want to thank Chairwoman Rita Mayfield for having all of our subject matter hearings and discussions of the teacher shortage crisis that we're facing here in the State of Illinois. And this is how we fix that crisis. We actually respect our teachers and we actually respect the professionalism and the training that goes into becoming a teacher. We've had a lot of other things thrown at us, a lot of different changes. But actually, respecting the hard work that teachers do in their classroom every day and backing that up by paying them a salary that lets them actually move out of their parents' house by the time they maybe turn 30 and pay off their student loans they've had to incur. Let them pay for their master's degree that they want in order to... enhance their teaching. That's the way that we get teachers and we retain teachers. We... we need to vote in favor of this Bill."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Wehrli, the timer's on."

Wehrli: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will Representative Hoffperson yield?"

Speaker Currie: "Representative Hoffperson is happy to yield."

Wehrli: "Thank you. Representative, have you done any fiscal impact of this piece of legislation?"

Hoffman: "Here's what I do know, that 39... the... the starting salary average statewide is \$39,100. So, I guess you could take... that's the starting salary."

Wehrli: "So, you don't know what cost per district this may have?

Would this apply to counties... to school districts under PTELL?

Is it possible that a school district under PTELL could have

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

- such a massive need for a tax increase that they can't possibly meet the goals of your Bill because of tax limitation law? Is that possible?"
- Hoffman: "I guess anything is possible, but the..."
- Wehrli: "Okay. So, what do we do there? Would it... is there PTELL relief in this piece of legislation?"
- Hoffman: "It would apply to all teachers throughout the... throughout the State of Illinois."
- Wehrli: "So, it applies to all teachers, but we're not providing the local unit of government... or the local school district the ability to actually meet this piece of legislation."
- Hoffman: "Well, I..."
- Wehrli: "So, we have no fiscal impact. We don't know what the relief would be, if needed. And we put our school districts in a bind. Is that correct?"
- Hoffman: "I would just say this. Our... what we've done... here's what we've done to teachers. We have reduced the pension so that in 2023 over half of the teachers will be under Tier II. Now, you can debate that, but everyone knows Tier II is a failing system."
- Wehrli: "Okay. I have limited time. So, can we move this for regular debate, please, unlimited debate?"
- Speaker Currie: "Well, I... Is there a showing of hands among you?

 All right. We will move this to Standard Debate."
- Wehrli: "And should this Bill receive the prerequisite number of votes, I request a verification."
- Speaker Currie: "Your... your request will be noted. Representative Barbara Wheeler."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Wheeler, B.: "Thank you, Ms... Madam Speaker. To... may I ask a question of the Sponsor?"

Speaker Currie: "The Sponsor will yield."

Wheeler, B.: "Thank you. Jay, do you not pay enough in property taxes?"

Hoffman: "Excuse me. I'm sorry. I didn't hear you."

Wheeler, B.: "I said, do you not pay enough in property taxes?"

Hoffman: "Look, I voted probably 19 times for a property tax cap."

Wheeler, B.: "Okay. So, I come from one of the highest property tax counties, not just in the state, but in the country. And I also am a former teacher and I... in my first year out of college, I made \$13 thousand. So, I appreciate what you're trying to do and how you're respecting teachers. I really do. And when I worked for the public school, they were kind enough to pay for my master's degree, which I very much appreciated. And I got extra dollars for coaching volleyball, which was very appreciative... appreciate it. But Jay, when you do this, my District 155, the average teacher makes \$90 thousand. It's a great school district; I'm very happy with it. And I'm not complaining, but I also, let me repeat, live in one of the highest taxing counties in the country. So, when you're asking for there to be the beginning level of \$40 thousand for teachers, that is going to affect... the average starting for teachers now I think is about that. But that's not... the cost of living down in southern Illinois and central Illinois is nothing what it is up in northern Illinois and around the collar counties. Please do not do that across the board to the state. I'm not proud of the fact that McHenry and Lake County are the ... some of the highest property taxing counties

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

in the state. But it is because of the high cost of our teachers. So, please vote 'no'."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Hays, the timer will be on."

Hays: "Thank you, Madam Chair. And I would like to start by saying, you know, in light of a recent sexual harassment training, which I took very, very seriously, if the Chair chooses to refer to Representative Hoffman as she, who am I to judge? Are you willing to... we're setting a floor here for salaries of teachers. Are you then willing, over in the Senate, to work with them to set a ceiling?"

Hoffman: "I would... no, I'm not."

Hays: "I think that says it all."

Hoffman: "Well, I would just say this, this isn't a new concept.

In 1990... 1980, we set a floor of \$9 thousand. We're... we're looking at over the time where it should be now it should be...

I believe at \$40 thousand."

Speaker Currie: "Are you finished, Representative? Representative Flowers, the timer will be on. Do you wish to speak, Representative? Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Madam Chairman. I just want to rise in support of the Gentleman's Bill. This is a fantastic piece of legislation. Our teachers are overworked, underpaid. And I would really encourage everyone to vote 'yes' on this legislation."

Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Representative Carroll."

Carroll: "Thank you. I stand in support of this Bill. As a former special education teacher, I understand the value of feeling appreciated by the school district that I work for. Let me tell you something. The other side of the aisle likes to talk

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

about how we're losing people in the state, losing valuable people in the state. Well, let's make this the state where people want to come to teach and make sure that our children are taught the best in this country. So, Representative Hoffperson, or Hoffman, or whatever we're saying, thank you so much for putting this forward. Thank you so much for trying to show that our most important profession of educating our children will be appreciated. And this will allow us to attract the best talent in the State of Illinois to come teach our children. So, thank you."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Scherer."

Scherer: "Thank you, Madam Chairwoman. I just have one comment to make and that is that I have spent five years now on this floor listening to people say that our children are our most important asset for our future, that education is the driver of our economic... economic situation. They are required to have a college education. Then they're encouraged to get a master's degree, and like several of us on this floor, working towards their doctorate degree. And yet, we pay for it out of our own pocket, in many cases. And yet, we're going to sit here and say that there are a million college jobs out there that pay better than a teacher and that you just can't figure out a way to pay them, but oh, we love you, and you mean everything to us, and let's pay you peanuts. Well, the old saying of you get what you pay for. I imagine if we compared this to a professional athlete and we started paying them \$35 thousand a year, I imagine that they would go find a different career. So, I strongly urge an 'aye' vote. And you now have the opportunity to put your money where your mouth is."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Speaker Currie: "Representative Batinick, the timer will be on."
Batinick: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Currie: "He will."

Batinick: "I believe you said earlier that we did this in 1980.

Is that correct?"

Hoffman: "Yeah. The statute was passed in 19... or began in 1980." Batinick: "And what was the... what was the minimum price start

Hoffman: "Nine... 9 thousand."

Batinick: "Okay. Have you looked at an inflation calculator since 1980?"

Hoffman: "I have not."

then?"

Batinick: "Well, I mean, to put it in perspective. You all can get your computers. You can look at this. A dollar in 1980 is 2.97 dollars now, which would put that floor at \$26,730 for perspective. So, this is a... this is a 50 percent jump versus what we did in 1980. Is that correct?"

Hoffman: "It's your numbers. I don't... I don't have them."

Batinick: "Okay. All right. It's a 50 percent jump from what we did in 1980. So, we'll start there. The second part is school districts have budgets they're already set. When this Bill starts moving through the process, the school district is not going to know whether this Bill is going to become law or not. My concern... any my wife is a teacher... when you're looking at budgets, if they think they're going to have to raise a bunch of salaries are they going to have to RIF and put layoff notices right about now to teachers not knowing if this is going to become law for the next school year? Where are they going to find... find the money for that. I'm not... I'm trying

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

to figure out what a school board is going to do. Teachers may be laid off because of this Bill."

Hoffman: "The effective date is July 1, 2019."

Batinick: "So, they may have to be laid off next year?"

Hoffman: "They won't be laid off."

Batinick: "Okay. No more questions. Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Reick, the timer's on."

"Thank you, Madam Speaker. To the Bill. The previous speaker raised an issue that I wanted to raise dealing with that this is RIF season. We are in RIF season now. There's a Bill pending in committee that I'm trying to get through to allow school boards to determine their staffing needs, not 45 days before the end of the school term, but someday when... a short period after this Body passes a budget. A budget, May 30, 19... 2018, a budget. It gives school boards the flexibility of... or the... the assurance of knowing when and how much money they're going to get. This Bill... and that Bill, by the way, has been basically shot down by the unions which do not want to have any kind of ... don't want to do anything in the way of accommodating school boards and giving them the opportunity to plan. They want to ... they're content to allow reductions in force notices to go out willy-nilly. This is only going to do this more. We're going to have greater uncertainty in teaching. So, you know, if we're going to have a \$40 thousand minimum first-year salary, the least that can be done is to offer school districts the opportunity to know how much money they have to spend to know what they're going to increase the number of teachers or they're going to have to RIF them. In addition, we have ... we don't have a statewide school board. We

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

have 800 and some-odd school boards that are scattered across the state, each one having to make its own decisions as to what and how to spend the money that it gets. We've been remiss completely in our responsibility to do our part toward funding of education, and we're trying to move in the right direction here, and this is not the day for that conversation. But I believe that it is incumbent upon those who would impose greater costs upon those 850-some school boards to give them the opportunity to plan their budgets in a way that provides security for the school district, as well as for the teachers that are constantly subject to the uncertainty of reductions in force. This is going to do nothing but increase that. And I strongly urge this Body to vote 'no' on this Bill. Thank you very much."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Butler."

Butler: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. To the Bill. And I would like to add on to what Representative Batinick said. So, my first job, when I got out of school, paid me \$18 thousand a year, \$18 thousand. In today's dollars, that's \$33,164. \$18 thousand in 1991 is \$33 thousand a year this year. I've been in communication with some of my superintendents as we've been sitting here during debate. One of my superintendents from Menard County, just next door here from Sangamon County, this legislation could have detrimental effects on the new formula. My district alone would affect one-third of my staff would get automatic raises, \$96 thousand in new salary from this Bill. So, it's very easy for the folks who represent the prosperous parts of northern Illinois to think this is a great idea, but for those of us who represent small and rural

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

districts, this is the… we talk a lot about mandates around here. Every day we talk about mandates on our school. This is the mandate of all mandates on our schools. And if we are truly for local control, this is certainly not a good Bill. I urge a 'no' vote. This will have a detrimental effect on the schools in my district most certainly."

Speaker Currie: "Representative David Harris."

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. And to the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, the Gentlelady from the 96th District said it. She said this is a chance to put your money where your mouth is. Folks, it's not our money. It's the school district's money that we are spending here. And you know, the Lady from Lake County made a reference to her school district about the average salary in her district was like 90-plus thousand dollars. My high school district has that beat by probably 10 or 15 percent, a six-figure on average salary. So, this is not going to impact my school districts. My school districts, I guarantee you, pay at least this much. But for those school districts that don't pay this much, you're asking me to vote for a tax increase on those districts, because they're going to have to levy those property tax levies on... to get those dollars to pay this increased salary. You're asking me... doesn't impact my district... but you're asking me to put a burden on your districts... on your districts that I think is unfair. Do we really want to do that? All of us recognize the importance of education, all of us recognize our teachers are devoted individuals who do the very best they possibly can for... for our students and our children. We want to pay them as much as we possibly can, but we are forcing a burden... a

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

financial burden on school districts that cannot afford this.

And I just think that's unfair. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Bristow."

Bristow: "Thank you, Madam Chair. Representative Hoffman, can you tell me what the starting salary is for the State of Missouri or the Metro East in... on the Missouri border?"

Hoffman: "Yeah. The starting... the starting salary over in St. Louis school district is above the \$40 thousand range."

Bristow: "So, this would keep us competitive with our neighboring state?"

Hoffman: "Right. And as you know, we're losing some of the best and brightest to Missouri, and to the St. Louis area, and the St. Louis County, and St Louis city school districts because a couple things. First of all, the starting salary, but secondly, their pension in Missouri is not near as... as lax as our Tier II pension, which actually you lose money on if you're a beginning teacher."

Bristow: "Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Willis, our last speaker."

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

Speaker Currie: "He will."

Willis: "Mr. Hoffman, you were on the floor less than two hours ago. How many Bills did we pass because we have recognized that there's a teacher shortage in the state?"

Hoffman: "I... I apologize. I was in Bill review so."

Willis: "Okay."

Hoffman: "You could probably answer that."

Willis: "I think there were two at least that I'm aware of, if not more because we have seen... to the Bill. We have seen that

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

there is a teacher shortage in the state, so we're looking at other ways that we can go about to make sure that we pay our teachers adequately, that we can make sure that all of our schools have the teachers there where we need them. We've had numerous, numerous speakers before me state that nobody denies that education is important and our children are important throughout the state. But in order to do that, in order to educate our children, we have to have good qualified teachers to do that. If we don't pay them adequately, they're not going to teach in the State of Illinois. We just heard from my colleague right across... right across the river in St. Louis, they're paying more than this. We need to keep our teachers here. St. Louis, that's right in this area. It's a shame that we're not paying teachers in this area that amount of money. This is not a get rich amount. Forty thousand dollars, yes, it's a workable wage. It is something that we can go and afford to keep our houses, we can live on our own, not have to live with our parents. I have a daughter that's a teacher. She lived with me for an extra five years 'til she was able to get out on her own. This is what we need to have in today's budget. Will it cost? I actually say it's not going to cost because we won't have as much teacher turnover. The teacher training will go down. We'll have teachers that are stabilized in there, we won't have to do as much recruiting because we'll have teachers that are there, happy and willing to teach our students. And they'll have some sense of stability in our school districts. This is what we need to see. This is what we need to do. I don't think it's an overreach by any means. And I would certainly urge everyone

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

to support this Bill. Is it going to be a burden on some school districts? Maybe initially, but in the end it's going to do what we want. It's going to make sure we have teachers where we need them, that they do what they need to do, that we put stability in our system, and that we educate our students so that we have a new generation that can do the best for the State of Illinois, want to be part of our state, stay here in-state, and therefore, help our economy as we continue to go. Thank you so much for bringing forth this Bill, Mr... or should I say Hoffperson or should we just go with Jay? I guess Jay is much better, it's gender neutral. So, Jay, thank you so much for this Bill. And let's continue to work for it. Let's support our teachers wholeheartedly with an 'aye' vote. I urge the rest of this Body to continue and do that with me. Thank you so much."

Speaker Currie: "Jay to close."

Hoffman: "Well thank you, Madam Chairman. I just... I appreciate the debate and I appreciate the comments from the opponents. I just totally disagree. I read some statistics previously. Two thousand full-time teaching positions are unfilled. Nineteen to thirty percent, to the previous speaker's point, of early career teachers are leaving within the first five years. It'll be cheaper to keep people if you pay them. It'll be easier to recruit people, the best and the brightest to teach our children, if we pay them a decent wage. You shouldn't have to live in your parent's house for five more years so you can fulfill your passion of teaching young people. Let me give you three more statistics. If you have a degree in math or science, the average starting salary is 53

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

thousand if you're in the noneducation field. Social sciences, 47 thousand if you're in the non education field. If you... if cross the United States of America, if you are a beginning teacher, you average \$50,556. If you're in Illinois, you average only \$39 thousand. This says let's pay teachers who make this their profession and want to help our young people, let's give them what they deserve. I think a \$40 thousand salary is something that is reasonable. We just passed evidence-based funding, 350 million new dollars into our school districts. It was needed. And a good portion of that should go to recruiting and making sure we have the finest teachers in the United States of America. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Hoffman moves do pass on House Bill 5175. All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'no'. Voting is open and Representative Wehrli has requested a verification. Vote your own switch. 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 62 voting 'aye', 38 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And Representative Wehrli, do you persist in your request for a verification? He does. Clerk, please read the votes in the affirmative."

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

Representative Ammons; Representative Andrade;

Representative Arroyo; Representative Brady; Representative

Bristow; Representative Burke, D.; Representative Burke, K.;

Representative Carroll; Representative Cassidy;

Representative Connor; Representative Conroy; Representative

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Conyears-Ervin; Representative Crespo; Representative Representative D'Amico; Representative Representative DeLuca; Representative Drury; Representative Representative Feigenholtz; Representative Fine; Representative Flowers; Representative Ford; Representative Gordon-Booth; Representative Greenwood; Representative Representative Halpin; Representative Guzzardi; Harris, G.; Representative Representative Hoffman; Representative Hurley; Representative Jones; Representative Representative Lang; Representative Representative Mah; Representative Manley; Representative Martwick; Representative Mayfield; Representative Mitchell, B.; Representative Mitchell, C.; Representative Moeller; Representative Movlan; Representative Representative Riley; Representative Rita; Representative Scherer; Representative Slaughter; Representative Smith; Representative Stratton; Representative Stuart; Representative Tabares; Representative Representative Wallace; Representative Walsh; Representative Welch; Representative Williams; Representative Willis; Representative Yingling, and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Currie: "Questions of the affirmative?"

Wehrli: "Yes. Representative Dan Burke."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Burke, Representative Dan Burke.

Representative Dan Burke does not seem to be in the chamber."

Wehrli: "Okay."

Speaker Currie: "Clerk, removes... remove his name."

Wehrli: "Representative Bristow."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Speaker Currie: "She... Bristow. Representative Bristow. She waved her hand when... when you were reading the... the roll. Representative Bristow. Representative Bristow. You want to wait for her to come out? We can do that."

Wehrli: "So, we'll move on from there. Representative Guzzardi."

Speaker Currie: "There's Representative Bristow."

Wehrli: "Okay. All right. Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Guzzardi's in his spot."

Wehrli: "Representative Will Davis."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Will Davis. Representative Davis. Representative Davis. Further questions?"

Wehrli: "Ann Williams, Representative Ann Williams."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Williams."

Wehrli: "Oh, thank you. Withdraw."

Speaker Currie: "Well actually, you lost. So, on this measure, there are 61 voting 'aye', 38 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this measure, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Hoffman, you're on a roll. Do you want to do House Bill 5175? Oh, excuse me, just a minute. We need some information... pearls of wisdom from the Clerk, Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Introduction of Resolution. House Resolution 1025, offered by Speaker Madigan, is referred to the Rules Committee."

Speaker Currie: "And Representative Demmer, for what reason do you rise?"

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

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Speaker Currie: "The record will so reflect. All right,
Representative Hoffman, are you ready on House Bill 5197?
Clerk, please read the… read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5197, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Hoffman."

"Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 517 (sic-5197) would require that the City of Chicago, just like the entire rest of the state, provide for a foreign fire insurance board. The foreign fire insurance board is made up of the chief, as well as six members who are elected. There is a fund that is automatically put into the ... foreign fire insurance fund that is administered for the foreign fire insurance board... by the foreign fire insurance board. Every... once again, every... every fire district in the state has this. It is money that is being... that is put into these funds in order to get safety gear and other equipment for firefighters and the funding comes from the... an insurance company who is domiciled out of state that pay... that sells insurance within the state and within that jurisdiction. I think this is a matter of fundamental fairness. And I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Hoffman has moved for passage of House Bill 5197. This Bill is on Short Debate. Representative Breen."

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

Speaker Currie: "He will."

Breen: "And Representative, where does the Chicago two percent tax on insurance go today?"

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Hoffman: "It actually goes into, I believe, it is utilized by the fire department, but the determination as to what is it... it is utilized for is made by, I believe, the City Council."

Breen: "Right. So, it's just done through the normal process today. And the idea is that we... in other fire districts, the union gets control and the..."

Hoffman: "Well, it's not necessarily union. The..."

Breen: "Normally... well the..."

Hoffman: "Well, down by me, we have a lot of volunteer fire departments and they would... they would control it."

Breen: "They would control it. Okay."

Hoffman: "And they're not union, no."

Breen: "Right. To the Bill. This is something where, hey, the City of Chicago is already hurting for money to take another \$4 million out, that currently could be dealt with through the collective bargaining process, and instead force it to be spent at the behest of the union doesn't seem to make sense. There was a reason we did this in the first place and Chicago is certainly is hurting for money all the way around. So, removing this flexibility from them, doesn't seem to make any sense. So, I can't really support the Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Martwick."

Martwick: "Thank you. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, the Foreign Fire Insurance Fund was designed... it is a tax on insurance policies, it is collected, but it's to be used for the improvement of fire protection districts. The City of Chicago is taking that and they're just basically offsetting the cost. They are not doing anything to actually improve the fire departments with this money. This is the same thing that

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

you have in all of your communities. The City of Chicago has the right to have a board that can make decisions to help firefighters have... have good equipment, the right stuff so that they are safe amongst their... when they're performing their duties as firefighters. It's an important Bill. I strongly urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Representative Willis."

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

Speaker Currie: "The Sponsor will yield."

Willis: "So, the... could you please explain one more time for the Body the purpose of the Foreign Fire Insurance Fund?"

Hoffman: "So, the fund is... is actually a... a payment that is made by foreign insurance companies. An insurance company, not from another country, but one that is domiciled in another state other than Illinois. And when they sell fire insurance, they have to pay a premium into this Foreign Fire Insurance Fund. And the fund is set aside to be utilized for things like equipment, whether it's safety equipment, turnout gear, things of that nature."

Willis: "So, it is clearly marked how the funds can be spent.

They are to be spent for enhancements of equipment, whether it is personal gear or fire trucks or any other things that may come along with that. It is not to be spent for personnel, correct?"

Hoffman: "That's correct."

Willis: "Okay. To the Bill. What we're seeing right now is we want to see equity. We're hearing oftentimes that the City of Chicago gives carveouts. They have this that they do differently than everybody else. What we're saying now is

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

they should not do it... be differently. They should do it the same way every other department. My home department of Addison Protection Fire District they have a foreign fire fund. They have a board that makes up that board... they decide what equipment is best to be put into that department. How to spend the money that they may get. We're saying that the City of Chicago should be doing the same. It is not a union run board. Am I correct with that, Representative?"

Hoffman: "The way... the way it works is that on each board there are seven members. One is the chief and six are elected by the district."

Willis: "Okay. And are... those are members of the department and they could be at any rank..."

Speaker Currie: "Bring your remarks to a close. Your time is up." Willis: "Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Willis."

Willis: "I would just very... very much say that this is something that we want to see happen. It is much more important that we put this money where it is meant to be totally statewide to go and make sure we have the best equipment possible for our men and women in the fire departments, specifically the City of Chicago. I urge an 'aye'."

Speaker Currie: "Representative... Representative Hoffman to close."

Hoffman: "Thank you. Real briefly. What we're talking about here is just making the City of Chicago have the same setup, the same board, and the same ability to fund equipment for the safety of the men and women who serve and fight every day to keep us safe. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

- Speaker Currie: "Representative Hoffman moves passage of House Bill 5197. And on that, 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 Motion, there are 98 voting 'yes', 7 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having achieved the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Fine, are we... are you ready for us to go back to House Bill 4146? Rules Report from the Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Committee Reports. Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on April 26, 2018: recommends be adopted, and referred to the floor is Floor Amendment #4 for House Bill 4790, Floor Amendment #1 for House Bill 4883, Floor Amendment #3 for House Bill 5104, and Floor Amendment #2 for House Bill 5508."
- Speaker Currie: "Thank you. Would you please read House Bill 4146 on Second Reading?"
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4146, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments have been approved for consideration. No Motions are filed. But a state mandates note has been requested and has not been filed."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Fine."
- Fine: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This Bill is a consumer friendly piece of legislation that will help patients afford their medication."
- Speaker Currie: "We have to leave this Bill on Second Reading unless you're able to waive..."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Fine: "Oh."

Speaker Currie: "...to decide that the... the mandate note request is inapplicable."

Fine: "Thank you. I'd like to find the mandate note inapplicable."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Fine moves that the mandate note act... note is inapplicable. All in favor of her... No, no, no.

I'm sorry. Representative Breen on the Motion. No, he doesn't want to speak on the..."

Breen: "Yes, I'd... I'd like to speak. Madam Speaker, we object to the waiving of the mandate note and would request a Roll Call vote there upon."

Speaker Currie: "All in favor of finding the note inapplicable vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Clerk, take the record. On this measure, there are 61 voting 'aye', 44 voting 'no'. And the mandates act... note is inapplicable. Then, Mr. Clerk, Third Reading. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "No further note requests are pending."

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

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4146, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Fine."

Fine: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This Bill is a consumer friendly piece of legislation that will help patients afford their medications. When someone signs up for their yearly insurance contract, sometimes they pick that policy because their medication is covered under that policy. However, during that contract year, although the insurance company can change the…

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

the policy, the person who's on that plan cannot change. So, what this legislation says is if you are stable on your medication, you can stay on your medication at the original contracted price."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Fine has moved passage of House Bill 4146. And on that Motion, Representative Batinick."

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

Speaker Currie: "She indicates she will."

Batinick: "My understanding was we were going to hold this on... on Second."

Fine: "No. When I originally called the Bill, I said I would bring it back but we pulled the transcript to ensure the fact that I said I'd try to bring back an Amendment, but I would not hold the Bill. And the goal is to continue working on it in the Senate."

Batinick: "Can we have Standard Debate on this, Madam Chair?"

Speaker Currie: "If you have enough people asking for it, we can.

All right. This will move to Standard Debate."

Batinick: "Okay. So, you're admitting that you need to... I think you just said on the record here you need to... you're going to continue working on it?"

Fine: "Yes."

Batinick: "So, this isn't the full version of the Bill. I really want to talk about what the… the Representative talked about...

I'm going to go to the Bill. The Representative talked about what this Bill does. The Representative not... did not talk about what this Bill doesn't do. In insurance, when we're making changes to insurance policy, we are not affecting what's called ERISA plans. That's the big corporations. They

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

follow federal quidelines. This Bill also does not affect Medicaid and state employees. So, we're affecting the small portion of the Bills that are small businesses and individual people on Obamacare. What's the issue with that? Those are the small businesses in the state... and I'm sure you guys have some of them and I have some... that are paying extremely high premiums with extremely high deductibles. This Bill will cost approximately 161 million on the backs of those people. That has to be tossed out. That has ... somebody has to pay for that. And we keep passing Bills in insurance saying that we're protecting we're protecting Illinoisans from this, Illinoisans from that. We're not. We're protecting a small subset of Illinoisans from that and those are the ones that are paying for this Bill. I don't believe this Bill is ready. It was my understanding that we were holding this Bill on Second. I strongly urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Breen, five minutes."

Breen: "To the Bill. As the previous speaker said, we've got numerous Amendments here. Amendment 2 was shot down in committee. Amendment 1, I guess, is what we're proceeding on. You know, things do change with the way pharmaceuticals are priced. They can come on and off of the generic list. And so, we have to at some point trust the insurance package that you sign up for, or that your employer provides for you, to be able to determine, with you, what medication you need and don't need. I've got no problem putting mandates on insurance companies when they're not covering things appropriately. But the problem with this is it seems that they are covering it appropriately. We're just throwing another mandate on there

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

that, without any ability of them to pay and without really thinking hard about how our mandate will impact their ability to operate in the state. When you see a list of opponents like the Chamber of Commerce, the Department of Insurance, United Health Group, Humana, Cigna, the Life Insurance Council, the National Federation of Independent Business, which is ... Representative Batinick noted is the group that's actually buying this insurance because all the other... the bigger insurance company plans are regulated through the Federal Government not by us. You look at the ... the Illinois Insurance Association, BlueCross BlueShield, AHIP, PCMA, the Academy of Managed Care Pharmacy. Even CVS is opposed to this Bill because it's just a bad idea. It's not the way that we... we just should not be intervening in the private insurance market in this way. And again, if it's going to make our... our insurance packages being offered here in Illinois less competitive. It's going to raise the costs on our small businesses, which are the chief generator of job growth in the State of Illinois. And it continues to play into this... the way that people think about Illinois is we will crush any business we see thriving we're going to crush it. Anything we can regulate, we're going to regulate it. This is not the way through our problems here in this state. And it may be one little Bill, one little insurance issue at least for some. But again, it's endemic of the way that this General Assembly treats business, the way that we treat everything. If it moves, we regulate it. And so, please, vote 'no' on this. There's time to do something on this that's agreed with the

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

opponents and the proponents down the road, but this is nowhere near what we need to be doing."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Wehrli, five minutes."

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

Speaker Currie: "Yes."

Wehrli: "Have you worked closely with the opponents of this Bill?"

Fine: "Yes. We've met a number of times and we're going to continue to meet."

Wehrli: "So, they've offered... they've offered language to amend the Bill to remove them from the Bill. What was wrong with their language?"

Fine: "Well... what was wrong with the Amendment that died in committee? Is that..."

Wehrli: "What was wrong with it... so, our analysis says that the opponents to your legislation have offered several suggestions that would remove their opposition. What was wrong with their opposition... or what was wrong with their... their suggestions?"

Fine: "I... what we want to ensure with the Amendment on this legislation that it is impacting the stable patient and that stable patient should be determined by the doctor. If the doctor feels that it's okay for the patient to switch their formulary and we want to make sure... we're not saying that they can't switch their formulary. They can change the formulary throughout the contract year. But for that patient who's stable on their medication... and we've all heard from friends and family members who have been stable on medication who go to pick up their... their medicine at the pharmacy and it went from \$90 to 900 and now, they can no longer afford

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

it. And if they need that medication... and let me tell you a little bit about the people who are in favor of this legislation. We're talking about the AIDS Foundation, Alliance for Patient Access, America Autoimmune, American Cancer Society, American Diabetes, American Liver, Arthritis Foundation. These are organizations that are looking out for the best interest of their patients. What happens when their medication is switched or when they don't get the medication they can need because they can no longer afford it, they end up in the hospital, they end up missing work. And the cost of that is far more expensive than allowing them to stay on their stable medication."

Wehrli: "Who's the... do you have a Senate Sponsor already? Of this..."

Fine: "Yes."

Wehrli: "Who is that?"

Fine: "Heather Steans."

Wehrli: "Okay. And you're giving us our... the commitment that you're going to continue to work on this Bill once it gets to the upper chamber..."

Fine: "Yes."

Wehrli: "...and hopefully remove some of this opposition?"

Fine: "Absolutely."

Wehrli: "Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Willis."

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

Speaker Currie: "She will."

Willis: "Representative, I actually happened to be subbing in committee when this was up for discussion. And I was very

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

happy to be able to support the Bill. What you're stating... and let me ask you on this. You're saying that we want to protect people when they cannot change their insurance carrier throughout the year. That could change the way their regular medication would cost. Is that correct?"

Fine: "Right. We're trying to prevent the bait and switch. So, for example, when you rent your apartment for the year, you sign a contract and you have one contract price for every month throughout that year. Your landlord cannot come back to you and say, oh, you know it's July. I need more money. I'm going to raise it. They have to commit to that contract for the year. And that's exactly what we're saying in this legislation."

Willis: "So, we're basically saying that that contract for insurance that gives you what your monthly rate would be also should be applying to what the rate for that... that medication is, especially since we're dealing with patients that have chronic illnesses, most of them are where we're looking at. For example, my daughter who happens to be a Type I diabetic, you're saying what we pay for insulin this month should be the same cost that we pay through the entire year of that insurance policy?"

Fine: "Right. And also, in addition to that, we're not saying that you can't switch to a generic or you cannot switch to your other medication, if there's a cheaper medication on the market. But what we're saying is, let's let the doctor be the judge of what is best for their patient."

Willis: "Right. So, it should be totally by the doctor not by the pharmacy, not by the insurance company, so that they can go.

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

To the Bill. This is a Bill that is long overdue. We have had the pharmaceutical companies and insurance companies pulling the string and making our health care decisions for us. That is not the way we should be in this. We need to make sure that the health care decisions are being made by our physicians and ourselves through education on that. I had a terrible problem with this that my own daughter who, like I said earlier, is a Type I diabetic, insulin costs continue to rise, rise, rise on it. But she cannot change her insurance carrier to a better... a better coverage during the year. She only has a very small window of time when she can do that. Why can't we make sure that this, again, happens with the prescription medications the same way? At that renewal time, they have a right to go and bring it up to the higher prices that is so that they can... your insurer or insure, I quess, it is... is the person that makes the decision not the insurance company. I urge everybody to take an 'aye' vote on this. I think the few things that need to be worked out on it can be worked out in the Senate. And this is a.m. definitely a good Bill. Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Currie: "Are we... this is on Standard Debate, so the timer is on at five minutes, but also the Rules call for three to speak in favor, three to speak against. Representative David Harris, you're up next. I believe we've had three opponents. Are you going to speak for the Bill?"

Harris, D.: "I am."

Speaker Currie: "Please proceed."

Harris, D.: "Thank you. A question of the Sponsor, if I may?"

Speaker Currie: "You may."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Harris, D.: "Representative, when... when a formulary is prepared,
 how long does that normally last for?"

Fine: "That's really a good question."

Harris, D.: "Well, thank you, that's why I asked."

Fine: "That's not something the consumers doesn't know 'cause most of these contracts are done without the consumer having any knowledge. So, when you sign up for your contract year, you don't know that three months down the line that formulary might change."

Harris, D.: "Well, but most formularies... when you enter a plan,
 most formularies are negotiated on a yearly basis, are they
 not?"

Fine: "I believe some are yearly and some are even longer than that."

Harris, D.: "Well, my point about... about a formulary changing after perhaps a year is that once you're locked into that formulary, if there were a change... when the formulary changes presumably in six months, if it's only a year plan, there really is a... and not a heavy burden because that... that company on the new formulary can put a new drug at a higher price..."

Fine: "Correct."

Harris, D.: "...into the formulary, right? So, and it's just briefly to the Bill, Ladies and Gentlemen, and I recognize what some on my side of the aisle have said about it only... it doesn't impact ERISA plans and it impacts a smaller number of plans, but I'm not trying to crush businesses here in Illinois. I just don't think that this is an undue burden. It does protect consumers from a change in a formulary for a plan which they agreed to and... and for the business, that formulary is going

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

to be recalculated at the next negotiation period and they're going to be able to change the drug or change the price at that point. So, I think a 'yes' vote is warranted on this Bill and hopefully, you will support it. Thank you."

- Speaker Currie: "We've had three proponents, three opponents. So, now it's time for Representative Fine to close."
- Fine: "Thank you, again, Madam Speaker. I would urge an 'aye' vote on this legislation. Again, I want to read some of the organizations that are working with me on this Bill. The National Psoriasis Foundation, Multiple Sclerosis, Mental Health America, the Illinois State Med Society, the Illinois Psychiatric Society. They understand the importance of somebody being able to stay on their medication at an affordable price. Like I said, this is for the stable patient. And I ask for your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Fine moves do pass on House Bill 4146. 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 71 voting 'yes', 27 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having achieved the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Clerk, Committee Reports."
- Clerk Hollman: "Committee Report. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee... committee action taken on April 26, 2018: recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 4495."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Olsen, are you ready on House Bill 54... no... 4191? Clerk, read the Bill."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4191, a Bill for an Act concerning animals. This Bill was read a second time a previous day.

Amendment 2 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Olsen, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Olsen."

Olsen: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Amendment 3 adds to the Bill. It's an Amendment of the… recommendation of the City of Chicago. It adds the Animal Control to a list of law enforcement and emergency responders that can respond and take possession of the animal after this occurred. I ask for its adoption."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Olsen has moved do pass on House Bill 4191. And on that Motion, Representative Mylan... Moylan."

Moylan: "Mr. Representative..."

Speaker Currie: "I'm sorry. That was... do you want to speak on the Amendment, Mr. Moylan?"

Moylan: "No."

Speaker Currie: "No. And Mr. Davidsmeyer, do you want to wait and discuss the Bill on Third? All right. Representative Olsen moves do pass on Amendment 3 to House Bill 4191. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

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

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

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill... House Bill 4191, a Bill for an Act concerning animals. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Olsen."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Olsen: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I appreciate the... then appreciate moving it to Third. This Bill is a Good Samaritan Act for individuals in the rare circumstance when you come across a dog or cat in a locked car. On a very hot day, the dog is in imminent distress and you have to take action in order to save that animal. This Bill requires that the person contact law enforcement and using the reasonable person standard, have a good faith... make a good effort to take other steps. But if they believe, using that reasonable person standard, that the animal is in imminent danger, they can take action to rescue that animal. This Bill is an initiative of DuPage and Will County. It is also supported by the Humane Society of the United States and a number of other groups. I believe this Bill provides some limited liability relief for individuals who'd have to take action in circumstances to be a Good Samaritan to animals. I ask for your support."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Olsen moves do pass on House Bill 4191. This measure is on Short Debate. And under our Rules, that calls for one person... the proponent to make his opening, one person to stand in opposition for two minutes, and then the Sponsor to close. There are a lot of people seeking recognition. Is there an opponent among you? If there's not an opponent among you, then do you all feel a need to speak? Representative... oh, wait. Representative Davidsmeyer, were you an opponent? Representative Davidsmeyer, speak."

Davidsmeyer: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I also sit; I roll over.

So, I will speak at this point. A question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Currie: "He will answer your question."

124th Legislative Day

- Davidsmeyer: "I'd prefer not to speak against your Bill. I didn't have a chance to realize this was coming up until just today. I would have liked to have speak a little bit with you a little bit further behind the scenes. But so, is this taking away liability from someone who breaks a window to get an animal out of the car?"
- Olsen: "That's correct. It's a liability shield given if they've met the circumstances described in the Bill."
- Davidsmeyer: "Okay. And are those circumstances ensuring that the animal is in distress?"
- Olsen: "I believe they are. It requires using a reasonable person standard, the person to have a good faith belief that the animal is in imminent danger of suffering harm, if not immediately removed from the vehicle."
- Davidsmeyer: "And... and how do you prove that after the fact?"
- Olsen: "I believe that's an issue that would... would have to be resolved based on the facts of the case, but it does use, as stated, the reasonable person standard."
- Davidsmeyer: "Does it allow you to use the animal as a witness because the animal would have to attest to the distress because there's nobody else there, correct?"
- Olsen: "Well, I don't believe the animal would be able to be used as a witness, per say, under rules of evidence."
- Davidsmeyer: "Can you... can you currently do this if a child is locked in a car?"
- Olsen: "Court precedence allows this if a child's in the car. It is not codified in law."
- Davidsmeyer: "So, I understand that... that this happens. My concern is if... if you leave a dog in the car with the window down and

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

you run into the gas station to grab a candy bar and run out, what justification... I mean, how do you know that the animal is in distress? How does law enforcement... how does the state's attorney... how does anybody know that the animal was in distress?"

Olsen: "So..."

Davidsmeyer: "How do you prove that?"

Olsen: "...I think the, you know, here in this Bill you're required to first make a good faith effort to reach out to law enforcement and emergency responders. And the Bill requires the person to have a good faith belief that the animal is in imminent danger of suffering harm."

Davidsmeyer: "What is the definition of 'imminent danger'?"

Olsen: "So, the Bill defines 'harm' means injury or death. And the Bill states that it's in imminent danger. So, you believe, based on the circumstances known to the person at the time, that belief is reasonable."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. And then, if the animal is, you know, they say a cornered animal often will react offensively, so on offense. So, if you break the window and you reach in to try to save the animal and get bit, who... who then is in charge of... of that action?"

Olsen: "The Bill does not directly speak to that, but the intent of the Bill is that the person rescuing the animal would be liable in that case."

Davidsmeyer: "The intent of the Bill... but I believe the law would say that the individual who owns the animal would be charged.

So, the animal could be euthanized if it attacked somebody?"

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

- Olsen: "So given... I understand that concern and I know the Senate Sponsor, Senator Connelly, has agreed to be the Senate Sponsor and has filed for this Bill. I know he's amenable to work... continuing work on the Bill if there's further suggestions to make... clarify the Bill."
- Davidsmeyer: "I'm going to leave it at that. I think that this oversteps some bounds. I understand what you're trying to do and I appreciate your efforts to try to protect animals. I... I think this goes a little bit too far. And I will be a 'no' vote."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Moylan, I'm breaking the rules for you because you chose not to speak on the Amendment."

Moylan: "Thank you very much. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Currie: "Sponsor will yield."

- Moylan: "Representative, I see that your proposed Bill covers dogs and cats. Would you consider an Amendment that would cover elephants or rhinoceros?"
- Olsen: "Representative, this Bill is intended only to cover dogs and cats. If you... if you'd like to consider other animals, I'd be open to working with you on further legislation."

Moylan: "Yes. I think this Bill needs some work. Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "We've actually used up our numbers of proponents and opponents, but both Representative Lang and Feigenholtz had their lights on. Do you wish to speak? Representative Lang."

Lang: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Currie: "He will."

124th Legislative Day

- Lang: "I appreciate you indulging me, Madam Chairman. Where's Mr. Olsen? There's Mr. Olsen. So, I... why do you just limit this to dogs and cats?"
- Olsen: "We believe that those are the most likely animals to be located in cars, but if you'd like to explore further legislation for other animals, I would be open to that."
- Lang: "Do you have any research showing these are the most likely animals? What if... this came out of DuPage. What if someone was parked in the Oak Brook Mall parking lot and they went in to get a latte. And their pet snake was in distress in their car. What about that?"
- Olsen: "This Bill would not cover that circumstance."
- Lang: "Don't you think you ought to take it out of the record and fix that?"
- Olsen: "And Representative, I think that we could work on further legislation, if you so desire, but I'd like to proceed with this Bill, as dogs and cats are the most likely animals that individuals own and there is data to back that up."
- Lang: "All right. You've said that twice now. Is that part of the script you're reading from, Representative?
- Olsen: "Representative, I do not have a script."
- Lang: "So… so, let me ask you this. And it was asked by a prior Legislator… and it was a good question, but I really didn't get the answer. How do you know that the dog or cat is in distress? Do they hold up a sign?"
- Olsen: "Well..."
- Lang: "Do they wave? Do they paw at the window? How do you know they're in distress?"

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Olsen: "So, Representative, the Bill requires that the individual has a..."

Lang: "So, you are reading from a script. I see you doing that."

Olsen: "Representative, I'm looking at the language of the Bill, directly."

Lang: "Okay."

Olsen: "And it requires that the individual have a good faith belief that the dog or cat is in danger of suffering harm, imminent danger of suffering harm."

Lang: "And if they're wrong?"

Olsen: "And I think that's critical, imminent danger."

Lang: "What if they break open the window, the dog jumps out, bites the person and runs away?"

Olsen: "So, Representative, if they're... if they are wrong, if there is not a reason for them to have a good faith belief, then they would not be immune from civil liability. And I'd also note that we've added a Section... Committee Amendment 2 added a Section that stated that a person is not immune if the person's actions constitute recklessness or willful and wanton misconduct with regard to the entry of the vehicle."

Lang: "So, let's assume I'm in your district in Downers Grove at Gatto's, a wonderful restaurant and I..."

Olsen: "It is a good restaurant."

Lang: "It's not as good as others, but it's okay. And... and let's assume I've parked my car and my... my poodle's in the car."

Olsen: "Okay."

Lang: "And I go in to have a piece of pizza at Gatto's and somebody walks by... let's say Mr. Harris, who I know is interested in this Bill, walks by... I used his name in debate in case he

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

wants to speak... walks by and thinks your dog is in distress, breaks the window, the dog runs away. And you're... and I'm distressed. I've lost my poodle. I have no recourse against Mr. Harris because he thinks my dog's in distress?"

Olsen: "You would have recourse because Mr. Harris has not followed the provisions of the Bill, which require that the person, and in this case Mr. Harris, remains with the dog or cat in a safe location until law enforcement, emergency responders or animal control arrive. So, Mr. Harris would not be immune from liability in that case."

Lang: "So, Mr. Harris..."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Lang, you have used up more than the two minutes."

Lang: "Just... just one more second."

Speaker Currie: "So, if you could bring your remarks to a..."

Lang: "Well said, Madam Speaker. I'll get you back for that. So… so, he's supposed to wrestle the poodle to the ground and make sure he keeps it?"

Olsen: "Representative Lang, yes. He would have to stay with the dog. If the dog was offering resistant, he would have to restrain the dog in a safe manner."

Lang: "Last question. What if Mr. Harris is in distress? All right. Thank... you know what, you've done such a great job, I'll vote for your Bill."

Olsen: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Currie: "Okay. The Chair will now break the rules one more time and we'll hear very briefly from Representative Feigenholtz."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, for your gracious gift allowing me not to torture Representative Olsen like the two previous speakers and just say what a great job you have done on this Bill. This is a real problem and Legislators around the state, especially in the city, have gotten calls from people. I know I have. A former staffer, who will remain nameless, called me and said, didn't you just pass a Bill that allows me to... I'm in the Willis Tower parking lot. There's a dog in a car, it's clearly in distress. Am I allowed to break the window? They called law enforcement. Nobody knew what people were allowed to do. This Bill will clarify that. He... the Sponsor has taken Amendments from interested parties. Everybody's in support of this except for some philosophical disagreements. So, I really encourage an 'aye' vote. Thank you, Representative Olsen."

Olsen: "Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Olsen to close."

Olsen: "Thank you very much. I appreciate the spirited debate.

And I would appreciate your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Olsen has moved do pass on House Bill 4191. 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 78 voting 'aye', 27 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Parkhurst, are you ready on House Bill 4193? Clerk, please read the Bill."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4193, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Parkhurst."

Parkhurst: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This Bill amends the special education hearing officers time for reporting. There's a shortage of special education hearing officers. They have 10 days to..."

Speaker Currie: "Have you finished?"

Parkhurst: "No."

Speaker Currie: "Oh, sorry, sorry. Please carry on."

Parkhurst: "Okay. This Bill simply changes the... the calendar 10 calendar days to not include a Saturday, Sunday, or a holiday. So, it gives them a little extra... a couple extra days to be able to finish their report. There's no opposition. And there's no fiscal impact. I encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Parkhurst has moved do pass on House Bill 40... 4193. And on that Motion, there is no discussion. All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this Motion, there are 109 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. We're going to go back and pick up some Bills that we earlier missed. Representative Dan Burke, are you ready on House Bill 1469? On House Bill 4701? Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4701, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Burke."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Burke, D.: "If my... as we have indicated to Leadership, with respect to our priorities, I would prefer to call House Bill 4643. Is that an opportunity?"

Speaker Currie: "We will get to that, but we haven't got to it yet. It is..."

Burke, D.: "I..."

Speaker Currie: "...it is not on the current list, so if you'd like to call the... 4701, this would be a good time to do it."

Burke, D.: "That would be..."

Speaker Currie: "Would you like to?"

Burke, D.: "That'll be fine."

Speaker Currie: "Okay."

Burke, D.: "Thank you, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Currie: "I think the Clerk already read the Bill on Third Reading, so it's up to you."

Burke, D.: "I actually thought that there was an Amendment to this."

Speaker Currie: "Clerk, is there an Amendment filed?"

Clerk Hollman: "There are no Amendments filed for 4701... House Bill 4701."

Burke, D.: "Okay. Thank you, Madam Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, this matter would amend the Downstate Police Article of the Illinois Pension Code and provide that a police officer who previously participated in the Illinois Municipal Retirement Fund for service as a member of the police department of a municipality and it was transferred to that municipality's police pension... basically, it gives them a Tier status that would otherwise not occur. It's a very minor population that would be affected. And I'd be happy to answer any questions."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Speaker Currie: "This Bill is on Short Debate. Representative Breen for two minutes."

Breen: "Move for Standard Debate, please."

Speaker Currie: "Standard Debate it is."

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

Speaker Currie: "Sponsor will."

Breen: "And Representative, I just want to make clear what... what is occurring here. The individuals were in IMRF Tier 1. They've now moved to Downstate Tier 2. And you want to move them to Downstate Tier 1... Downstate Police Tier 1?"

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

Breen: "Okay. The problem, at least as I understand it, is that Downstate Police Tier 1 is much more generous than IMRF Tier 1. And so, it is a benefit increase that was never expected and is undeserved."

Burke, D.: "I would not say undeserved. They certainly had put their time in. And as we presented this Bill in committee, Representative, we had a officer from the town of Eureka, I believe it is, where they have six officers, three of whom are affected directly by this inhibitor. And they may lose three of their six officers as a result of the inconsistency. We're not talking about giving anything away here, Representative. We're talking about individuals that are unfortunately affected by the Tier system. And this would afford equality."

Breen: "And then I see that the... the Illinois Municipal League is opposed, which I understand. I also see the DuPage Mayors and Managers and the Northwest Municipal Conference, specifically, are opposed. Are there some police departments

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

in those towns that... or in those counties or areas that are... would also specifically be affected by this?"

Burke, D.: "Well, Representative, you might want to inquire of the Northwest Municipal Conference 'cause they certainly didn't present themselves in committee."

Breen: "And then the DuPage Mayors and Managers I see as well, which just... it was interesting..."

Burke, D.: "They did slip."

Breen: "...to see them on the list. They did not slip."

Burke, D.: "They did not offer testimony in the matter."

Breen: "Okay. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, we created Tier 2 because we have a pension crisis in this state. gentleman in question who... the folks that are impacted here were in IMRF. They were Tier 1 in IMRF, which is certainly better than Tier 2 in IMRF. But moving them to Tier 1 in the Downstate Police Fund is much, much better than they would have come in and expected. I know there was some talk, well, the officers may move to a different department where they can maybe get some different benefits. At that point, I'm assuming they would then be replaced by younger officers who would be Tier 2 in the Downstate Police Pension system. So, as to at least allow us some savings to that... that pension system. There is going to be a significant impact on property taxpayers who are going to have to pay for all of these pensions. It will be on the local communities involved and impacted by this Bill. There's been no fiscal impact estimated for all of those various benefits, which of course will span for decades to come based on the actions taken by the General Assembly here today. So, while I respect what we're trying to

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

do in terms of providing equivalent benefits, the problem is you can't when you move from IMRF Tier 1 to Downstate Police. The Downstate Police program is entirely different. And so at that point, I do respectfully urge a 'no' vote to protect the property taxpayers and... and those... and the citizens who are going to have to cover all of these pension promises that this General Assembly continues to make and has made irresponsibly for the last few decades."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Wehrli."

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

Speaker Currie: "He will."

Wehrli: "Representative, are the... are the employees that are moving from one pension system to the other, are they required to make any additional contributions? Are they required to pay any unaccrued interest, things along those lines? Are they required to square up when they move pension systems?"

Burke, D.: "As far as I'm aware, they would not be required to pay any additional... I'm talking about individuals that have certainly served their time and protected their communities in those little tiny communities across our state want to preserve their relationship with these individuals. And if they have to move to another town just to be certain that they're paid equitably for their service, I think that's inappropriate."

Wehrli: "It's... it's inappropriate for them to be treated equitably to where..."

Burke, D.: "I'm asking for equitable."

Wehrli: "...they're going to move to... if they're going to move to a pension system that offers a richer benefit that they not

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

have some additional skin in the game that would require them to pay the increased pension benefits at least accrued up to the point to where they move?"

Burke, D.: "It's not like we're finding these people on the corner and sticking them in... in a more..."

Wehrli: "I... I think... I think my question is pretty simple."

Burke, D.: "I'm getting your question. I understand what you're saying. We are not talking about finding individuals that didn't serve a period of time that deserve this."

Wehrli: "Well, it's to..."

Burke, D.: "It's just because..."

Wehrli: "To the Bill... to the Bill. Here we have an example of yet again more fiscal impact to the ... to municipalities, to these pension funds that are already stressed throughout our state. We've had the City of Harvey Pension Fund. We've had North Chicago Pension Fund. We have these pension funds that are literally on the verge of collapse. And while I understand the good intentions of the Representative's Bill, it has no fiscal implications other than to provide additional benefits that perhaps these municipalities cannot afford. At the very least, one would expect that the person moving from one pension system to the other would at least square up the pension system at that point in time that they have the... that they're transferring those years over. I strongly urge a 'no' vote on this piece of legislation. It needs to be rethought, reworked and come up with a financial solution. If we continue to do this as a state, people are going to continue to flee. Our financial situation is going to get worse and worse. We need solutions to these problems not additional problems

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

piled on... piled on top of problems. So, I urge a 'no' vote.

And I give the balance of my time to Representative Batinick."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Batinick has plenty of time on his own. Representative Batinick."

Batinick: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm going to go directly to ... direct... directly to the Bill. This is ... this is something that's for three people? But instead of writing legislation to fix the issue with those three people, the admitted issue, we're changing our entire pension system. This is ... this is using a sledgehammer to kill a fly. Here's the issue. We have a few members of the Eureka Police Department that were IMRF Tier 1. When Eureka became big enough to go into Downstate Police and Fire, they slid into... into Tier 2. There's two simple options. We either let those three officers stay in IMRF or we let the municipality put them into IMRF, as opposed to, affecting something that we don't know how much this is going to cost municipalities and the pension systems for everybody. I believe that the officers started in Tier 1 IMRF they should have the option to keep that. Why we're moving them into a separate pension system that has a higher cost... and we're not even only doing it for those three, we're doing it for anybody that falls into this circumstances. This is part of the reason why we're having this problem. There is a way to fix this. I know there's bipartisan people and a bipartisan way talked about fixing this issue. I strongly urge an 'aye' vote. Does anybody on my side need... I strongly urge a 'no' vote. Does anybody on my side need any... no, we're good. I strongly... this is ... this is a... this is way over correction, way over cost. Representative, I'd really

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

appreciate it if we could just fix the Bill for these three officers and that's it. Thank you. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Burke to close."

- Burke, D.: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would encourage the Body to be considerate of this... the little tiny community not too far from Springfield and the few others in our state that would be affected. This is not a giveaway. This is not a gift. We are talking about supporting individuals that serve on police departments across the state that every day put themselves in the line of fire, jeopardize their life and safety on our behalf. It's not a gift. I would ask you to be fair. Please vote 'aye'."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Burke moves passage of House Bill 4701. All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The vote... the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? On this Motion... Clerk... Clerk, please take the record. On this Motion, 65 voting 'yes', 39 voting 'no'. 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 just want the record to reflect that on House Bill 4146, of which I was a cosponsor, I should be recorded as voting 'yes'."
- Speaker Currie: "The record will so reflect. Representative Long."
- Long: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Please let the record reflect that I intended on voting 'no' on 4191."
- Speaker Currie: "The record will so reflect. Representative Keith Wheeler."

124th Legislative Day

- Wheeler, K.: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Please let the record reflect that Representative Bourne is excused for the rest of today."
- Speaker Currie: "The record will so reflect. Representative Phillips, are you ready on House Bill 5466? Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5466, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Phillips, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Phillips on Amendment 1."
- Phillips: "Yes. Thank you, Madam Speaker. What Amendment 1 does is define the definition for what we're trying to do here. Defines 'utility terrain vehicle', which would separate the language from including all-terrain vehicles, golf carts, off-highway motorcycles. So, it specifically targets just our vehicle. Second thing that it does, it provides that counties may, at their discretion, license and register such vehicles. Thank you."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Phillips moves... moves do pass on Amendment 1 to House Bill 5466. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Hollman: "No... no further Amendments. No Motions are filed."

 Speaker Currie: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5466, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

124th Legislative Day

- Speaker Currie: "We're taking the Bill out of the record. It was not... we were not expecting to call it at this time. Representative Spain, how about House Bill 5351? Yeah. Clerk, please read the Bill. And then, we'll recognize Representative Bellock."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5351, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Bellock."
- Bellock: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. And I have House Bill 5351. And what this is, is a Telehealth Bill. If an individual or group policy of accident or health insurance provides coverage for telehealth service it must provide coverage for licensed dieticians, nutritionists, and certified diabetes."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Bellock moves passage of House Bill 5351. Seeing no one requesting recognition, all in favor vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? On this measure, there are 105 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having... received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Sente on House Bill 4790. Clerk, please read the Bill. Your Amendment was just adopted in the Rules Committee, so we... we can't hear the Bill yet. Representative Slaughter, 51... House Bill 5136. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5136, a Bill for an Act concerning education. This Bill was read a second time a previous day.

 No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by

124th Legislative Day

- Representative Slaughter, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Slaughter on the Amendment."
- Slaughter: "Floor Amendment... thank you. I'd like to adopt Floor Amendment #1."
- Speaker Currie: "You want to adopt Amendment #1?"
- Slaughter: "Can we... I've got some other Bills first can we... can we get to those first? Can we get to these other Bills first?"
- Speaker Currie: "All right. You want to take this out of the record?"
- Slaughter: "Yes."
- Speaker Currie: "All right, Representative. At the request of the Sponsor, Representative Slaughter, House Bill 5136 is out of the record. How about House Bill 4741, Representative? Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4741, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. This Bill was read a second time a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Slaughter, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Slaughter moves for adoption of Amendment #2 to House Bill 4741. Do you want to explain the Amendment?"
- Slaughter: "Sure. Thank you, Madam Speaker. House Floor Amendment #2 makes a few changes to... to the Bill. On line 16, it replaces the number 30 with 7. On line 17, replaces the number 50 with 30. And then, on line 19, inserts the date of August 1, 2019."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

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

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

Speaker Currie: "Third Reading. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4741, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Slaughter."

Slaughter: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. HB4741 increases the number of visits our inmates get in the Illinois Department of Corrections from five visits per month to seven visits per month. This Bill is also requiring that the department keep and maintain the inmate's visitors list electronically. We worked with the department on this. With the Amendment, the department is supportive and is a proponent. These visits are important to both the inmates and the families. When we look at the best practices regarding prerelease programs, we see that these visits are instrumental to the rehabilitation of our offenders. And they often can enhance the effectiveness of these programs. I urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Slaughter moves do pass on House Bill 4741. Seeing no one seeking recognition, 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 106 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having achieved the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed.

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Representative Slaughter, are you interested in House Bill 5303? Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5303, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. This Bill was read a second time a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Slaughter, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Slaughter on Amendment 1."

Slaughter: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move for House Floor Amendment #1. This Amendment is a gut and replace Amendment that becomes the Bill. The Amendment puts forth several changes in regards to how the Cook County Sheriff's Merit Board will operate and function."

Speaker Currie: "The Gentleman moves adoption of Amendment 1. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

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

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

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5303, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Slaughter."

Slaughter: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Members of the House.

HB5303 is a Bill that will help address the Cook County
Sheriff's Board... Board's massive backlog of cases. Currently,
in regards to disciplinary matters, this board oversees the
motions, suspensions, and terminations. What this Bill is
doing is requiring that the board just be able to take up
terminations and will shift the motions and suspensions over
to the grievance process. There are also provisions in the

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Bill that allow the board to designate and utilize hearing officers to hear some of these cases. And it also puts forth a 90-day time period for the board to render its decision on these matters. There are no opponents. The Cook County Sheriff's Office as well as the Cook County Sheriff's Merit Board is in support. They support the framework of the Bill. I am hearing that there may be possible minor changes, if and when this Bill gets to the Senate. I urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Slaughter moves for passage of House Bill 5303. And on that question, Representative Breen."

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

Speaker Currie: "He will."

Breen: "Okay. And Representative, I just want to make sure that we're clear. The main thrust of your Bill is that we've got so many of these cases backed up we need to give explicit authority for hearing officers to hear the cases instead of having the entire board hear every single case. And so, that's really the main thrust of your measure, right?"

Slaughter: "Yes, it is. That's accurate, yes."

Breen: "Okay. And that's certainly... that comports with certainly the needs of the situation. Looks like... and you've got a good bipartisan group of cosponsors. So, thank you for doing that."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Slaughter moves do pass on House Bill 5303. 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 the Motion, 106 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having achieved the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

declared passed. Representative Smith, are you ready on House Bill 5856? Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5856, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. This Bill was read a second time a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Currie: "Third Reading. Read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5856, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Smith."

Smith: "Yes. House Bill 5856 amends the Toll Highway Act by exempting vehicles owned and operated by a Mass Transit District from paying tolls on the toll highway system. Under current law, the Suburban Bus Division, PACE of the RTA is allowed to ride the toll roads for free. In order to fulfill its services to its constituency, this Bill simply expands this program to all Mass Transit Districts."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Smith moves do pass on House Bill 5856. And on that question... the Bill is on Short Debate. Representative Breen for two minutes."

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

Speaker Currie: "Sponsor will yield."

Breen: "Yes. And Representative, I see the Toll Highway is opposed and that they would prefer to use agreements for local Mass Transit Districts. Is that in accord with the... the allowances given to the other Mass Transit Districts under current law or... or how does that work?"

Smith: "Actually, I have... we have an agreement with the tollway system, if and when this Bill makes it to the Senate. There

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

will be an Amendment filed making some changes to this legislation."

Breen: "So and... and is that clarification the one that the tolling exemptions will only apply to Mass Transit vehicles that are in service and not special event service vehicles or transit employee vehicles?"

Smith: "That is correct."

Breen: "Is this your first Bill?"

Smith: "That is correct."

Breen: "We... it's hard to make jokes about the tollway. Sorry.

Will you be taking everyone on a tour of a Mass Transit

vehicle on the tollway should we pass this measure?"

Smith: "When the appropriate fare is paid."

Breen: "Well, will the vehicle be allowed to go 70 miles an hour?"

Smith: "My vehicle doesn't go over the speed limit."

Breen: "Thank you, Representative. I really don't have anything else to ask you about and we need to go home. So, thank you."

Smith: "Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "The Bill is on Short Debate, so we really are limited for the number of speakers. Representative Gordon-Booth."

Gordon-Booth: "Does the Sponsor yield?"

Smith: "Yes."

Speaker Currie: "Yes."

Gordon-Booth: "Representative, can you tell me where this Bill came from? What is the impetus of this legislation?"

Smith: "The River Valley Mass Transit Authority in Kankakee County. That's where this Bill originated."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Gordon-Booth: "So, do you represent the... do you represent Kankakee County?"

Smith: "Portions of it, I do."

Gordon-Booth: "Wow. So, how... how long is your district?"

Smith: "How long? How much time do we have? My district extends from the south side of Chicago into portions of Kankakee County."

Gordon-Booth: "That's incredibly significant. You must be a mighty fine Legislator to be able represent the interest of not only the City of Chicago but also Kankakee County. Can you tell us how important this legislation is to that particular community that you represent?"

Smith: "That community... that will allow constituents of this community to have access to Midway Airport..."

Gordon-Booth: "Nice."

Smith: "...which is vital to their survival and vacation time."

Gordon-Booth: "To survival, vacation, as well as economic development. So, is this your first Bill?"

Smith: "Yes, it is."

Gordon-Booth: "Welcome to the General Assembly. I ask that everyone vote 'aye'."

Smith: "Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "This Bill is on Short Debate. If there's anybody standing in opposition, among the many who wish to speak, let me know and we'll hear from you, otherwise we'll ask Representative Smith to close. Anybody in opposition? Representative Martwick."

Martwick: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Currie: "He will."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Martwick: "So, Representative Smith, this would allow Mass Transit to avoid having to pay tolls? Is that what that... did I understand that right?"

Smith: "Only busses carrying passengers."

Martwick: "Okay. So, is there a minimum number of passengers required?"

Smith: "No, there is not."

Martwick: "So, if I'm driving down to Springfield and I've got Guzzardi and Andrade in the car, does that qualify me then to skip paying tolls?"

Smith: "If you are driving a Mass Transit Authority bus, it does."

Martwick: "Would... would it help if I had a stressed poodle and an elephant in the car?"

Smith: "As long as you have all of your windows intact."

Martwick: "Nothing further."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Smith to close."

Smith: "Yes. Again, House Bill 5856 is intended for Mass Transit Authority vehicles to ride the tolls for free, as RTA PACE busses already do. I would encourage an 'aye' vote on this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Smith moves do pass on House Bill 5856. And on that, all who are in favor vote 'yes'; 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, 103 voting 'yes', 4 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having achieved the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Clerk, please read House Bill 4790, Representative Sente."

124th Legislative Day

- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4790, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. This Bill was read a second time a previous day. Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendments 3 and 4 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #3 is offered by Representative Sente."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Sente."
- Sente: "I'd like to adopt House Floor Amendment 4 to House Bill 4790. House Amendment 4 is a gut and replace Amendment that encourages the use of compost-amended soil. And it removes IDOT's opposition."
- Speaker Currie: "I think you want to withdraw 3 and then we will propose 4?"
- Sente: "I'm sorry. I couldn't hear back here what you read. Yes,
 I would like remove House Amendment 3."
- Speaker Currie: "She withdraws Amendment 3. Clerk, next Amendment."
- Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Sente, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Sente."
- Sente: "I'd like to adopt House Floor Amendment 4 to House 4790."
- Speaker Currie: "Want to explain the Amendment or just adopt it and describe the Bill on Third Reading?"
- Sente: "I would like to just describe the Bill on Third Reading, please."
- Speaker Currie: "All right. All in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Currie: "Third Reading. Clerk, read the Bill."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4790, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Sente."

Sente: "Thank you. House Floor Amendment, as I mentioned, is a gut and replace Amendment. It does two things. It creates two pilot projects for IDOT where they're using compost-amended soil versus regular soil. After they go through those projects, they're to give us a report back to the General Assembly. And also ask all state agencies, except universities, to consider compost-amended soil when they have a landscape project. I'm happy to take any questions."

Speaker Currie: "This Bill is on Short Debate. Representative Breen for two minutes."

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

Breen: "All right. Representative, this is a pilot project that IDOT had already, to some extent been... been looking at. And so, we're really codifying a project that was already in the works, but that's just been apparently a little slow to get started. Am I right about that?"

Sente: "They did ask me last year to not move a similar Bill forward and they would do it on their own. And... and then, when it didn't happen, I refiled the Bill this year. I am aware that they have two projects in mine, and District 1, that will be moving forward."

Breen: "Fair enough. Okay. And considering we've had a full day of compost-amended soil type Bills, I'm glad to support yours."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Speaker Currie: "Is there opponents to this Bill who would like to speak? We have room for one opponent, otherwise Representative Sente to close. Representative Sente."

Sente: "'Aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Sente moves do pass on House Bill 4790. 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... Clerk, please take the record. On this measure, there are 107 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Katie Stuart, are you ready on House Bill 4129? Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4129, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Stuart."

Stuart: "Thank you. This is simply a TIF extension for the Village of Caseyville that's in my district. All letters of support have been submitted. And there's no opposition."

Speaker Currie: "I don't see anyone seeking recognition. So, those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; those 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 97 voting 'yes', 6 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4495, Representative Thapedi. Out of the record. Representative Wallace, are you ready on House Bill 4964? Representative Wallace. House Bill 4964. Clerk, read the Bill."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4964, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Wallace."

Wallace: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This is a Bill that will create remedies for foster children or actually, youth in care, who are hospitalized beyond medical necessity. I encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Wallace moves do pass on House Bill 4964. And on that question, Representative Breen."

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

Speaker Currie: "She will."

Breen: "And Representative, I just... I'm trying to see... so, just as a matter of any youth in care who is in a psychiatric facility for more than 14 days will be paid \$600 per day for every day that they remain, which it's I guess determine... determined later beyond necessity or when they could have been released. That's... that's your Bill. It's just to hand them 600 bucks a day."

Wallace: "No, that is not the Bill. The Bill is it creates the opportunity for private action should they be in the hospital beyond medical necessity. We're actually saying that you can keep that child for... which I'm not very comfortable with this either... but 14 days beyond their medical need to be there. But on the 15th day, the state needs to figure out what is going on and it creates a private action."

Breen: "So, they have to hire... they would... they would hire an attorney and sue the state. Is that... is that what they would do?"

Wallace: "That is what they could do."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Breen: "But, I mean, you said you're creating a private right of action. Is that done through a legal process or are they just..."

Wallace: "Yes."

Breen: "...do they make a claim and we hand them a check or what's... what's the issue? How do we do it?"

Wallace: "Yes, the... the former."

Breen: "Okay. 'Cause I don't see any sort of lawsuit details in your Bill. And where does it say that? There's just a mention of damages, but what's the cause of action?"

Wallace: "I'm sorry? Was that a question?"

Breen: "So, how do you... how do you sue over this? How do you get your money?"

Wallace: "They could retain an attorney. They could retain some other advocate. For historical context, in 2015, the State of Illinois created a... foster children's Bill of Rights. In 2017, I expanded upon that creation that I did in 2015 that says that individuals have the right to be in the least restrictive, most home-like setting. And we are talking about children who are there beyond..."

Breen: "Right."

Wallace: "...medical necessity."

Breen: "But..."

Wallace: "They are just simply..."

Breen: "But..."

Wallace: "...sitting in the hospital."

Breen: "Okay. But you said they have a right to damages, I'm reading it in the Bill. How do they get the money? I mean, even..."

124th Legislative Day

- Wallace: "They have a right to a private action."
- Breen: "...even apart from whether we should be paying them. 'Cause there's no... there's no cause of action in here. I mean, is it the Court of Claims? What do they do? How do they get their money? If, I mean, again..."
- Wallace: "But it's a... the typical process of suing the State of Illinois is how they would get their money."
- Breen: "Okay. So, they'd go got the Court of Claims. They would have to hire an attorney. Do they get attorney's fees if they win? 'Cause I don't see that in the Bill."
- Wallace: "The Bill doesn't allow for that. It didn't state that."
- Breen: "Okay. And... and at least in my analysis, it looks like there's a cost of at least \$5 million a year or 7, I guess, was one of the DCFS's most recent liability. Is that... does that comport with your understanding of the cost?"
- Wallace: "That is the cost if no one places the children outside of the hospital once they should be medically be released from the hospital. So, that is not an automatic cost. That is the cost only if you continue to retain children. And that cost estimate is based upon the fact that, I believe, today there are 36 children who are in a psychiatric hospital and do not have the need to be there."
- Breen: "All right. And then, I just... just so I've got my opponents correct. It looks like... it's the rare case where AFSCME and the Governor's Office agree in opposing your Bill. Is that correct? I mean, does that... your analysis show the same thing that both AFSCME and the Governor have come together to oppose your Bill?"

124th Legislative Day

- Wallace: "AFSCME's opposition is that they believe that this is an issue that creates some tension for their workers. I believe that this is a particular issue that will push DCFS and DJJ to do better by providing their workers with the resources necessary to recruit adequate foster homes for children so that they may be discharged from the hospital."
- Breen: "And... and again, just... I think I heard you. The AFSCME folks are worried because this might cause a premature release of someone and they don't have an adequate place to send them."
- Wallace: "No. This is not premature release. This Bill does not even become an issue until 15 days, 2 weeks and 1 day, after they were supposed to be discharged from the hospital in the first place."
- Breen: "It's just that we don't have a place to send them. Is that... that's the... that's the issue?"
- Wallace: "It is the issue. Unfortunately, there are discussions and meetings that are actually held that are in reference to 'stuck children'... or, no. They're not even referred to as children. Those children are referred to as stuck kids, as if they are some burden on us because these children are youth in care and we have not done our job to find adequate placement for them."
- Breen: "Ah. Okay. And so... but the money they get paid even... even if you get them out of the hospital, but you send them to residential instead of to a different placement than they would otherwise be entitled to. We just don't have available to us. That... so, it's not just keep them in the hospital.

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

It's even if you put them into residential that they... they would get the money anyway."

Wallace: "This Bill addresses the fact that children should be in the most appropriate setting and right now, that is not the case where we have over 30 children, right now, today, sitting in hospitals where they should not be. And when that happens, there are children who need psychiatric placement who can't be placed for the treatment that they need because we have children who are there beyond medical necessity."

Breen: "To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, let's take the \$7 million we're talking about here and actually just provide appropriate... appropriate placement for these kids, which I'm sure that we can find with that kind of money available instead of doing a punitive thing that... where the AFSCME folks are uncomfortable with it, the administration is uncomfortable with it. Let's just properly fund our program and get these kids the homes they need. But allowing people to start suing the state, which is a very tedious and difficult process that requires expert legal counsel and such that we don't know if the kids are even going to get their money after all the legal fees. So, again, let's take the money. Let's use it to actually fix the problem and not create another cause of action against the state. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Wheeler to add someone to the excused list."

Wheeler, K.: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Please excuse Representative Phillips for the rest of today."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Speaker Currie: "Thank you, That's what the record will show.

Representative Bellock, the Bill is on Short Debate. And

Representative Turner in the Chair."

"Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. To the Bill. I Bellock: appreciate what Representative Wallace is trying to do and her intentions are extremely good. This is a huge problem. And I have concerns over this Bill because of the \$600 a day and possibly a \$7 million liability. But she is right in addressing this issue. And this issue we have pulled from all the discussion we've had and it is in the Medicaid Working Group to try to come up with a... because the kids are in the beds, some of them are staying 135 days just like what you're saying. And... and then, at the same time, the MCOs who need kids to go into those beds have no place to go. So, the issue is huge. I just don't think, at this time, that we should address it in this Bill with the \$600 a day and the liability. But I just wanted to point out that her intentions are good; this is a huge problem. And we're going to address this with DCFS starting right today and HFS as to how we can take better care of those kids, get them out of those psychiatric hospitals after their time is up, and allow other kids who have those needs to go into them. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Wallace to close."

Wallace: "Thank you. This Bill is about caring for the children that we say we could be better parents to than their own biological parents. This is about making sure that they have the most home-like setting and sitting as some eight-year-old child did this holiday season in a hospital, when there was no medical need for them to be there, is not the State of

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Illinois being the best parents that we can be to the youth in care. I encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 4964 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 54 voting 'yes', 50 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having failed to reach the Constitutional Majority... Representative Wallace is recognized."

Wallace: "Yes. I would like to Postponed Consideration. And I would like to invite every Member in this chamber to find the nearest child and adolescent psychiatric facility to them, find the nearest juvenile detention center to them and go and visit and talk to a child who had to spend a holiday or any other time in a facility they did not need to be in. And then, come back..."

Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk..."

Wallace: "...and I will call this Bill again."

Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, please move this Bill to the Order of Postponed Consideration. Mr. Clerk, House Bill 4595, Representative Fine. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4595, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. This Bill was read a second time a previous day.

No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read the ball...
Bill again."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4595, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Fine."

Fine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is identical to the Bill that we passed last Session that was vetoed by the Governor. And what it does is create a not-for-profit state worker's comp fund. Similar companies in other countries, including our neighbors in Missouri and Kentucky, have successfully implemented these companies and our legislation is modeled after these states. In all 27 states have state worker's comp funds or state charters worker's comp insurance companies created through a public-private partnership. This is an idea for another solution to the argument that our state companies are paying too much in worker's comp insurance. And I ask for your support."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Breen."

Breen: "Mr. Speaker, I move to Standard Debate."

Speaker Turner: "This Bill will be moved to the Order of Standard Debate."

Breen: "And I'll yield my time to Representative Wheeler."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Wheeler for five minutes."

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

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

Wheeler, K.: "Thank you. Representative, we discussed this in committee, I guess, a number of times now."

Fine: "Yep."

Wheeler, K.: "In the last committee session we had, I don't have my figures in front of me, but you had mentioned a figure based on the \$10 million investment the state would make that

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

we would be able... how much insurance do we sell based on that downstroke?"

Fine: "Right. It would be a loan. It would not be an investment.

It would be a \$10 million loan. And the figure is \$3 of insurance for every dollar of investment."

Wheeler, K.: "So, is it \$3 of insurance or \$3 of premium?"

Fine: "Three dollars of premium for every dollar of investment."

Wheeler, K.: "Okay. And what's the average profit margin of a... of a work comp insurance company?"

Fine: "Right now, that has gone up. It says... according to the Department of Insurance, insurance company profits are up about 30 percent since 2011. And this is since we passed the worker's comp insurance changes that are already in law in Illinois."

Wheeler, K.: "I'm afraid that didn't answer the question because back in 2011 worker's comp insurance companies were not making a profit, they were losing money. So, I guess the question then becomes if this is a competitive marketplace, which of course you're asking for this to be, then that \$30 million amount of premium you're going to write won't generate enough profit to be able to pay back the state within the time period allowed. That's pretty much simple math. So, this Bill can't work."

Fine: "I believe it can. The National Council on Compensation Insurance has recommended that since its recommendation last year insurance rates for our employers should go down another 10.9 percent in premiums for 2018. And since the 2011 benefit cuts, they've recommended a total decrease of 36.5 percent.

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

And if you ask the employers in your district, I can guarantee you they've not seen that decrease."

Wheeler, K.: "So, just to reiterate, with what your Bill does, if there's \$30 million in premium you could write..."

Fine: "I'm sorry. Repeat yourself, please."

Wheeler, K.: "If there's \$30 million in premium that you could write, based on the \$10 million... assuming no overhead..."

Fine: "Right."

Wheeler, K.: "...and..."

Fine: "The first year out."

Wheeler, K.: "Right."

Fine: "In just the beginning."

Wheeler, K.: "Well, this is assuming all these things are... which are all magical, by the way... the idea that we could make that \$2 million a year in 5 years to pay the \$10 million back isn't going to happen. So, this really..."

Fine: "They... we've seen it be successful in other states and that's what we're modeling."

Wheeler, K.: "Okay. I'm also trying to illustrate for the effect that if you have a \$30 million stroke... revenue potential and your... and you can make 5 percent... let's be generous about this... with, again, no overhead... that's 1.5 million a year. In 5 years, you've only given back \$7.5 million because you can't compound... you can't invest the money 'cause you have to give it back to the state. So, it's one of two things here. Either you're going to be a not-for-profit company, okay, that has no profit and can never pay the state back. Or we're going to be a for-profit company who still can't make enough money in

124th Legislative Day

- that period of time to pay the state back. And again, these are numbers that are prove… assume zero overhead. So…"
- Fine: "But do you have an issue with the payback time? We can amend the Bill to increase the payback time for 10 years versus 5."
- Wheeler, K.: "I'm just going back through. This is like the sixth time we've debated this. The numbers never really fleshed out until today on the floor, that part won't work. The fact that you're almost assuming that the 330 companies who already provide worker's compensation insurance in the State of Illinois which some would have to be colluding, which is the buzz word of the year, to be able to not lower their prices to be more competitive with each other and get more business. That's an assumption that's being made. And that's not going to be solved by a company that can only write \$30 million of insurance a year anyway. So..."
- Fine: "Well, the reasoning behind this Bill would be a not-for-profit. They... they wouldn't worry about making any money over what the... the employers are actually needing to make to..."
- Wheeler, K.: "Yeah. But... but a not-for-profit still has marketing overhead. They still have administrative overhead. They still have to pay the light bill, the rent. All those things are still part of a not-for-profit. It's not free. So, realistically..."
- Fine: "Absolutely. But there's no profit margin over that. And all the other companies had those expenses plus the profit margin. And when you look at the premiums collected by insurance companies that actually is used to pay out benefits, in 2016 it was calculated at 54 percent was used to pay

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

benefits and there was 46 percent, obviously, when you do the math that was not used."

Wheeler, K.: "I understand there's other reasons for that by the way. It's not just like it's a one for one option they have to keep in with the reserves. I have to go to the Bill. Thank you for answering the question, Representative. Ladies and Gentlemen, we are back at this again. Somehow going to prove to the state that our State of Illinois can design and run a worker's compensation insurance company better than that 330 companies already doing it in our state. Yes, we have higher worker's compensation costs and it's certainly not because we don't have enough competition. It's because the regulations that we, in this Body, place on those companies that make things too expensive. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Ives for five minutes."

Ives: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. So, this is easily probably the fifth or sixth time that I've seen this Bill. It's gone through Labor Committee. It's gone on the House Floor. It came back for a Veto override that didn't happen. So, we've seen this Bill endlessly. And I'll be honest with you, as long as this Bill's been floating around there has not been one single business group that has come to me and said, you know what would solve our problems, you know what just make life really peachy here, would make it easy for me to expand my business here? You know what we really need? We need an Illinois state-run worker's compensation insurance company. Not a single business has asked me for that, not a single one. And in fact, when you look at the number of people

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

that are opposed to this, you see that they are largely the business groups. And I just... you know, I just wonder what we're doing here. If you think we get out of \$250 billion in debt, minimum as a state, if you think that we can pay down nearly \$9 billion in back bills, without expanding our business activity in this state, you're wrong. So, why would anybody in this chamber continue to vote against business, why? IRMA, NFIB, small business representatives, Illinois Chamber of Commerce, in addition to the insurance companies... in addition to them. Everybody who represents business is opposed to this Bill. Do you represent business? That's my question to this Body. Do you represent business? Because I'll tell you what, like I've said before, you can't love jobs and hate job creators. You can't ask people to invest in the State of Illinois when you do Bills like this. In fact, I'll tell you what, I have a heart for Representative Wallace's Bill that she ... she pass ... she just tried to pass last... yesterday. I mean, I'm sorry... right before this Bill. I have a heart for that plight. And I'd rather spend \$10 million fixing that problem than \$10 million on a state-run worker's comp insurance company. But you see what we never do that in this state. We never sit out and look at our budget, and prioritize what we're going to spend money on, and decide what we really need to do. Well, what we don't need to do is chase business away. And this will chase business away. You know, after last year of Session IMA got in, got up, and they did a press conference and say, you know what, business got nothing. Business got nothing. And here we are, one year later, and business is still getting nothing... nothing out of

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

this chamber to help make it easier for them to grow their businesses to stay in the State of Illinois. Worker's comp is near and dear to my heart. I'll tell you why because, you know, when Office Depot and Office Max were trying to merge, it was a \$2 million difference between them staying in Illinois or going to Florida, just on that one line item, just on worker's comp. Well, guess where they ended up? Of course, they ended up in Florida. And this does not solve the problem. The State of Illinois, obviously... and let's go back to the previous Bill... we're not even managing some of our large systems really well. We can't even handle some of the agencies that we currently have under our control let alone taking on the additional requirement of a state-run worker's comp insurance company. This is ridiculous. Over insurance companies operate in the State of Illinois, licensed to sell this type of insurance. We have a competitive market. It's simply that the rules that are written by this Legislature are not competitive across the board. Literally, businesses are leaving the State of Illinois over this one line item alone. So, you're either going to decide that you're going to vote with business and oppose this Bill or you're going to vote against business. That's your choice. It's that simple. Do you want businesses here or do you not want businesses here? Mr. Speaker, if this should receive the requisite number of votes to pass, I request a verification." "A verification has been requested by Speaker Turner: Representative Ives. Representative Willis, do you rise in

Willis: "Support."

support or opposition of this measure?"

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed."

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

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

Willis: "Representative, is it true that the State of Illinois did a very extensive rewrite of the Workman's Compensation laws just within the last few years or last decade?"

Fine: "Yes. In 2011, the benefit cuts including cutting medical fee payments by 30 percent, expanding the use of the American Medical Association guidelines for accessing permanent partial disability benefits, restricting personal... partial disability benefits wage differentials from the age of 67 or five years after an injury, and allowing employers to limit injured workers choice of medical providers. All this put in place was supposed to lower these costs."

Willis: "Correct. It was supposed to lower the costs. Have the costs been lowered..."

Fine: "Well..."

Willis: "...by private insurance companies?"

Fine: "Actually, no. Employers are paying about 14.5 percent more in insurance premiums than they were in 2011."

Willis: "But on the other side of that, we're also seeing that the claims have gone down throughout the state. So, the number of workman's comp claims have been reduced, but the private insurance companies continue to raise their rates. Is that correct?"

Fine: "That's correct. Actually, the average worker comp cost for medical treatment in Illinois are actually 23 percent lower than Indiana, 17.6 percent lower than Wisconsin, and 9.6 percent lower than Iowa."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Willis: "Do we have insurance companies... workman's comp insurance companies in the State of Illinois going out of business?"

Fine: "None that I know of."

Willis: "No. They actually have a very high profit margin. Do we have CEOs of these companies getting bonuses and making a very wealthy paycheck at... yearly or quarterly, however you want to look at it?"

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

Willis: "I said, do we have the CEOs of this workman's comp private insurance companies making a very wealthy paycheck?"

Fine: "I'm sure they do."

Willis: "Right. This is why we need to have this. To the Bill. This is something that really needs to come in. We have gone and put in what we figured were best practices. We worked with the industry a number of years ago to come up with stronger parameters 'cause they were crying foul that they were losing money. We did that. They increased their profit margins. They continue to increase their profit margins, but they continue also to reduce the benefits that they're giving to our workers. We are not doing a service to them. This is a... this is what is, in my opinion, probably the best way to do it. Let's put a non-profit company in there where they will be good. We'll make sure that we can save our money, but we can still do the service to our workers throughout the state. I commend you again, Representative, for another good Bill. And I urge this Body to vote 'aye'. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Wehrli, do you rise in opposition to this? You're the third and final speaker on that... on opposition."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield. Five minutes."

Wehrli: "Déjà vu all over again. This Bill's identical to the one you ran previously, correct?"

Fine: "Yep."

Wehrli: "How'd that... how'd that work out for you?"

Fine: "Well, I thought it was a great idea otherwise I wouldn't be running it again."

Wehrli: "But it got vetoed. Did it not?"

Fine: "Unfortunately, it did."

Wehrli: "Were you able to override the Veto?"

Fine: "It got vetoed and we haven't seen anything to relieve worker's comp burden for our employers."

Wehrli: "But we haven't done anything to address any of the concerns of the Veto, have we? We haven't done anything... we haven't changed a thing. We're just going to try it again in hopes that somehow somebody over here flips."

Fine: "What would you like to see changed?"

Wehrli: "Well, honestly, I think this is a terrible idea. So, if this is such a great idea and all these proponents love this, why don't we ask them to each contribute a million dollars to this fund and let them set it up on their own?"

Fine: "Well, I..."

Wehrli: "Why does the state need to do this?"

Fine: "After the fund is paid back, it's no longer the state.

It's now..."

Wehrli: "That's not what I asked. I asked how come the people...
the proponents to this, how come they're not willing to put
their money where their mouth is and instead we're relying on

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

the taxpayers of the State of Illinois to come up with \$10 million? So, the Department of Insurance is..."

Fine: "Well, actually, it's not the taxpayers..."

Wehrli: "...the Department of Insurance is going to have to fund the money for this. Is that correct?"

Fine: "No. Every year all insurance companies pay into a particular fund and it's part of that fund that we're borrowing from."

Wehrli: "Okay. So..."

Fine: "The fund had \$28 million in it last year. This is a \$10 million loan that would be repaid with interest."

Wehrli: "A \$10 million loan from whom?"

Fine: "Ten million loan from the Worker's Compensation Commission Operations Fund."

Wehrli: "Okay. And is that run by the State of Illinois?"

Fine: "It's all insurance companies in the State of Illinois pay into it."

Wehrli: "So, they're subsidizing what we're trying to do here.

Can you give me an example of another place where the State

of Illinois has successfully managed a business better than
the private sector, just one?"

Fine: "Well, there's a difference between public and private. And I think, you know, if you look at universities as a business, I think you could look at that as quite a successful business because our universities were strangled for almost two years without getting any funding from the state and they have survived. I don't think most private businesses could go for two years without any funding and still survive."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Wehrli: "So, to the Bill. Here we are the Illinois General Assembly that is well known for our fiscal management. We have a bond rating a couple notches away from junk. We had a bond issuance this week that we paid 270 basis points additional money because we can't manage. We haven't had a balanced budget some would argue in decades. We've racked up over \$130 billion in pension obligations. So, when other states look at us, we are the last when it comes to fiscal sanity. And here we are thinking that we as a state can do things better than the private sector. Those that have years of experience doing this, those that have the education requirements in order to run businesses like this. The... the actuarial expertise to understand how these systems work, but yet we think we can do better. This is a terrible Bill. It was a terrible Bill then; it's a terrible Bill now. I strongly urge a 'no' vote. And I would like to yield the balance of my time to Representative Reick."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reick is recognized."

Reick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Or no, question for the Sponsor, please?"

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

Reick: "Representative, this Bill... I've been in this chamber for one term and I've already voted on this Bill four times, twice in committee and I will vote on it for a second time on the floor today. This Bill is like Marley's ghost, it just keeps coming back. And I will ask you the same question I asked you before. Do you have a business plan that indicates exactly how you're going to gain revenue and pay back the money that you are intending to borrow from the companies who are... and

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

we find out today that the money you're borrowing is money that's put into the fund by the companies that this company is going to compete against. Do you have a business plan that indicates how this is going to be done, dollars and cents, over the next five years?"

Fine: "The business plan would be created by the seven-member board of directors. And this board would be experts, who are in the field made up of insurance experts and actuarial experts, and based on what we've seen in other states."

Reick: "Excuse me. My time is limited and I would like to ask another question. It seems that, if you're asking for \$10 million, the normal thing that people do when they're asked to borrow... to loan money to an entity is they are given projections before the entity is formed so that they can make a determination as to whether or not that money is going to be paid back. I would ask you, where is the business plan for this enterprise before you establish it? It should be done before not after. To the Bill. This Bill, again, I say is like Marley's ghost. It keeps coming back; it keeps coming back; it keeps coming down, put a stake through its heart and kill it. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Fine to close."

Fine: "Thank you. I disagree with those who are opposed to the Bill. I think this is a business friendly Bill. We all hear from our employers in our districts who are looking for a way to get relief from the growing amounts of money that they have to pay for worker's comp insurance. This is an opportunity. We've seen it work successfully in 27 other states and they're not states that are a liberal bastion. We

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

have many republic states... Republican states that have put this into action. This is something that we should attempt to do here in Illinois. We would put a board together who would organize it. And we would be doing something to help relief for the financial bottom line of many of our employers. And I ask for your 'aye' vote."

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

Representative Ives. Please be at your seat to vote your switch. The question is, 'Shall House Bill 4595 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 62 voting 'yes', 43 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'... Representative Ives, would you like to persist with your verification? Mr. Clerk, please read the affirmative votes." "A poll of those voting in the affirmative. Clerk Hollman: Representative Ammons; Representative Andrade; Representative Arroyo; Representative Bristow; Representative Burke, D.; Representative Burke, K.; Representative Carroll; Representative Cassidy; Representative Chapa LaVia; Representative Representative Conroy; Representative Conyears-Ervin; Representative Costello; Representative Crespo; Representative Currie; Representative D'Amico; Representative Davis; Representative Drury; Representative Evans; Representative Feigenholtz; Representative Fine; Representative Finnie; Representative Flowers; Representative Ford; Representative Gordon-Booth;

Representative

Representative Greenwood;

Guzzardi;

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Representative Halpin; Representative Harper; Representative Harris, G.; Representative Hoffman; Representative Hurley; Representative Jones; Representative Kifowit; Representative Representative Representative Lilly; Representative Representative Manley; Martwick; Representative Mayfield; Representative Mitchell, Moeller; Representative Representative Representative Mussman; Representative Riley; Representative Representative Scherer; Representative Representative Slaughter; Representative Smith; Representative Stratton; Representative Katie Stuart; Representative Tabares; Representative Thapedi; Representative Turner; Representative Wallace; Representative Walsh; Representative Welch; Representative Williams; Representative Willis; Representative Yingling; and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Ives."

Ives: "Representative Andrade."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Andrade's down front."

Ives: "Representative Costello."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Costello's in the back."

Ives: "Okay. Thank you. We're done."

Speaker Turner: "The Lady would like to withdraw her Motion. And a count of 62 voting 'yes', 43 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 4595, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4572, Representative Guzzardi. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4572, a Bill for an Act concerning human rights. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Guzzardi."

"Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Members. I rise to present House Bill 4572. This addresses a sort of surprising oversight in Illinois's Human Rights Act. At the moment, as we sit here, it is currently legal in most parts of the state to discriminate in small businesses and businesses with 15 or fewer employers. You can be fired, you can be demoted, you can be punished simply for being a woman, or a Muslim, or a Christian, or a veteran. And we seek to redress that... that flaw in our law. We want to expand the right and good protections of the Illinois Human Rights Act to cover businesses of all sizes. The City of Chicago, the county of Cook, and a number of other local communities around the State of Illinois already have human rights ordinances, local ordinances that cover businesses of all sizes. And we've seen in many of those communities thriving and flourishing small business environments. So, I don't think it would be fair to suggest that this is any sort of impediment to the growth of small business. We've also seen a number of other states including many of our neighbors that are here in the Midwest: Wisconsin, Michigan, Minnesota, as well as states like from... excuse me... from Maine to Alaska, from North Dakota to Oklahoma. States across this union that provide the same kind of protection to all employees despite no matter the size of their employer. We believe this is an important stand for us to take as a Legislature that discrimination should be illegal no matter how many people work in your workplace, I ask for

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

your 'aye' vote. And let's take a stand as a General Assembly against discrimination. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Breen."

Breen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think I'll just go to the Bill. This particular measure is one that is... it sounds great until you actually start digging down into what it will do and what it can do to our small businesses. The idea that no one should discriminate is an obvious idea particularly in 2018 in the State of Illinois. The problem is that a lot of these complaints are not necessarily brought against individuals who have discriminated. They are often brought in connection with a termination of employment that may have been justified and the difficulty is for anyone who's got business, especially one of 15 employees or more, and who's had to hire or fire, you've run into a situation where you might have gotten a complaint filed against you that was absolutely meritless. But the problem is under the law, the way it is today, it's cheaper to payoff the complainant than it is to go through the legal process, defend yourself at a full hearing and a full trial. And the thing is those folks who have left employ, whether being fired or quitting, know that. And so the idea that somehow entities under 15 employees are just discriminating rampantly across Illinois is ... it's silly, it's frivolous. Now, I want to thank the Sponsor for excluding places of worship. Problem is, is for many folks, it's not just a place of worship that has a religious component, but religious nonprofits are also very small. They've got all sorts of employees there. And Mr. Speaker, is this on Short Debate or Standard Debate?"

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Speaker Turner: "This in on Short Debate."

Breen: "I'd move it to Standard Debate, please."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing the requisite amount of hands this will

be moved to Standard Debate."

"And so, again, this is not... this is the sort of thing, Breen: you know... folks who don't understand will just say, oh yeah, yeah we need to move it down to 1 employee, but at the federal level it's 15. At the state level, we adopted the federal standard of 15. And even then, with the 15, we have certain exemptions already written into the law. And so, this is something that when you look at where we are today, it's not a license to discriminate. It is a license to harass a very small business and that is the issue. And Ladies and Gentlemen, the age of social media, if your business is discriminating, you get outed pretty quickly. You can see just when some... when a business can be attacked in that way, you know, sometimes justified, sometimes not. That's a much more effective deterrent than any of these official legal processes. When, again, what... what happens is ... the reason you've got all of your major business groups in the state that have a variety of leaders of all types coming together and saying, hey, we ... we don't need this number lowered in order to maintain a friendly welcoming business environment in our state. They're not doing it 'cause they want to discriminate. They're doing it because they want to do business. They want to serve everybody in Illinois in that way. And so, respectfully, understanding what the Sponsor's trying to do, but believing it to be severely misguided, I

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

would again respectfully urge a 'no' vote on this particular measure."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Ives, do you rise in opposition to this measure? You're recognized for five minutes."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, here you go again. You can Ives: either decide to vote with business or against business. All of the major business associations' stand opposed to this Bill. So I'm going to... I mean, I've been keeping a tally list. I'm going to add to my tally list and I'm going to make a decision here. And as are other businesses looking at the State of Illinois, are you with business or are you against business? There's... this... there's no need for this Bill. The Sponsor has not given us multiple examples of where this Bill is needed. He just simply is running this Bill. We already have this Bill in place. We already have protections in place. If you're... actually, even if you're... you have... you're an employer with less than 15, you can still sue for any of the same reasons that this Bill covers. But the problem here is, is that you're simply attacking businesses with this Bill. That's all you're doing. That's all you're doing. And so, are you going to stand with business or are you going to vote against them? It's that clear. And I also stand firmly opposed to the concept that this chamber has that the real mentality, and the philosophical leaning of this chamber, is simply that business is bad and business owners are bad actors. And that's the message you're sending when you... when you actually vote for a Bill like this. You're saying that you don't trust business. Is that the message that you want to send in 2018 when we lead the nation in outmigration? Is that the message

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

you want to send when we're looking at trying to attract Amazon to come here? Do you want to send the message that we don't... that we philosophically think that business owners are bad actors? 'Cause that's what the message you're going to send if you vote for this Bill. And this is number two in a row on one single day in the State Legislature. So, are you going to vote against business again? I'll be watching."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Flowers, do you rise in opposition?"

Flowers: "Watch this."

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Leader."

Flowers: "Representative Guzzardi, what is the purpose of this legislation?"

Guzzardi: "The purpose of this legislation is to protect everyone in the State of Illinois from discrimination at the workplace."

Flowers: "Did you say everyone in the State of Illinois?"

Guzzardi: "I said everyone, Representative."

Flowers: "Everyone in the State of Illinois needs to be protected. Well, I agree with you, Representative. And if one person... just one person in this state is discriminated against and that's one too doggone many. And if that... if this is what it takes... it this is what it takes so be it. And let me put business on notice. Don't come to the State of Illinois if you think you going to disrespect any of us. You may as well stay out because there will be a price to be paid. Look at the women, women that who are guilty of wanting to go to work every day just to take care of their families. They are being sexually harassed by people at Ford Motor Company. They are

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

being abused, misused, but yet it is our tax dollars that's keeping that business in business. Not on my watch. And if there's anything that I can do about it, I will change that. So, I stand in support of your legislation, Sir. And I would urge everyone, who respects people, all people, to please join with me and send businesses a message that if you come here there's a protocol that you will respect my mother, my sister, my brother, my dog, and my cat, and any other thing that I may have. Thank you very much. And I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Wheeler, do you rise in opposition or support of this measure?"

Wheeler, K.: "Opposition, Sir."

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Representative. You will be the final speaker in opposition."

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

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

Wheeler, K.: "Will, I always look forward to our discussions on the floor."

Guzzardi: "As do I."

Wheeler, K.: "So, Will, is the Human Rights Act the only mechanism that protects workers in the State of Illinois?"

Guzzardi: "Protects workers in what sense, Representative? I wonder what you're... what you're driving at."

Wheeler, K.: "From discrimination."

Guzzardi: "Well, there's also the federal EEOC, which is sort of layered on top of the Illinois Human Rights Act. But again, bear in mind that the federal employment law also excludes businesses with fewer than 15, in most instances."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Wheeler, K.: "Do you suppose there's a reason why they do that?" Guzzardi: "Well, I suppose that there's a reason that 36 other states around the country have instituted further protections beyond the Federal Law because I think they've seen that discrimination should be illegal regardless of the size of your business. While you're waiting, Representative, I just want to briefly say we've... there's been some discussion about business owners and small businesses not liking this. We had conversation in the Labor Committee. I presented a letter from 50 different small business owners in the City of Chicago who already comply with this statute because the City of Chicago has a local ordinance that covers them. And they said that... a report from them, they said that nondiscriminatory and inclusive business practices are good for our neighbors, good for our communities, and good for our businesses. We don't find it burdensome to comply with this law, in fact, it's easy. We just don't discriminate. This is business owners saying this not me, Representative."

Wheeler, K.: "Thank you. You know, and I appreciate that. And I applaud all those business owners."

Guzzardi: "They do."

Wheeler, K.: "But I also don't... I don't know any business owners personally and I was once very involved in one. It has 11 thousand members in the state who've say wow we improved our profits, we extend our market share by discriminating. It's just... it's just unconscionable."

Guzzardi: "I agree."

Wheeler, K.: "The question that comes from this legislation..."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

- Guzzardi: "It should have been... also be illegal. I believe the answer is absolutely it should be."
- Wheeler, K.: "...is are there protections in place for the smallest companies who don't have deep pockets to withstand a frivolous abuse in this? Unfortunately, a part of our real world, sometimes people take advantage of good intentions and they have to defend themselves. And that could be very expensive."
- Guzzardi: "I'm... I'm thrilled that you asked that question, Representative. I think it's a piece of one of the most important parts of this process, which is that the Department of Human Rights... when someone files a complaint against a business owner, the Department of Human Rights has a year to investigate that complaint. They perform an independent investigation. The business can choose to retain counsel or not during that investigation, but at the end of that investigation, the department issues a report to the Human Rights Commission saying whether the complaint had merit or not. So, the business owners are in fact shielded from frivolous complaints by the process itself. And... and to the point that the previous speaker from Wheaton said that these folks can already sue these employers, they... it's just unfortunately completely factually inaccurate, as I believe you know, Representative."
- Wheeler, K.: "Well, my point is that most business owners if you've got 5 or 10 employees, and you've spent your entire career trying to build something, and you're trying to protect that and there's a complaint..."

Guzzardi: "Most business owners aren't discriminating."

Wheeler, K.: "I agree. And so..."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Guzzardi: "I agree totally and they will not be affected by this law in the slightest."

Wheeler, K.: "So let's just put it on the record we're all for human rights. We're all for human rights."

Guzzardi: "I think they're..."

Wheeler, K.: "Understand then..."

Guzzardi: "...we're about to put it on the record, Representative.

We're going to have a vote on the board as to how we're for human rights or not. Folks who press that red button are going to demonstrate how they feel..."

Wheeler, K.: "That's not fair..."

Guzzardi: "...about human rights, Representative."

Wheeler, K.: "...because there's some intended consequences and that's what I'm trying to put on the record with you is the fact that because as soon as a complaint occurs a smart business who's trying to protect their assets, to protect the resources behind that company and those jobs is going to retain counsel. There's automatically a cost built into it. That is an unfortunate reality of these kinds of situations. I don't know any way around that yet. I'd like to work with you to find that way around that. I understand this is a process we can choose or not choose to retain counsel, but this is such a complicated prospect for most people. Most small businesses don't have an HR director. They don't have a department of people that they can turn to in-house that's already built into cost structure and say, hey, this is how you should proceed. This was a mistake; this was not a mistake; defend this. This..."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Guzzardi: "That's... that's right, they don't. And that's why when we created the Human Rights Act, we created this process, an extensive independent investigation that does not require the retention of outside counsel, at the end of which investigation..."

Wheeler, K.: "Will..."

Guzzardi: "...there's a report issued as to whether or not the claim had merit."

Wheeler, K.: "I... I heard the process. I'm going to tell you..."

Guzzardi: "So, I could imagine myself in the position of the small business owner saying I won't retain counsel until the report has been made."

Wheeler, K.: "Wait, hold on."

Guzzardi: "And if then there's a finding that my..."

Wheeler, K.: "No, I'm running out of time here, so I apologize."

Guzzardi: "Of course, please, Representative."

Wheeler, K.: "My point is this. Worker's comp was designed the same way. We wouldn't have to necessarily have an attorney involved. This has evolved into that kind of a situation. I don't want to see that happen here in the same respect. Ladies and Gentlemen, to the Bill. I do applaud the Sponsor's intentions. I know he's a... he works hard and he's got a great idea in mind here. And he's right in the fact that most businesses don't discriminate. We're... this is an open door to problems we don't need. And unfortunately, I wish I could support the Bill. This time I can't."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sente, do you rise in support of this measure?"

Sente: "Yes."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed."

Sente: "I would like to encourage someone to think of maybe this Bill in a different way. It ... it disappoints me often when we think of the Democrats are not for business and business being probusiness is only maybe something that is partisan or something on the other side. Interestingly, I spent the last 29 years in a business that had 15 people, 15 to 20 people, and I thought about this piece of legislation a lot. We also talk about business owners as, you know, they're always bad and the employees are good and we kind of take the opposite side. But we know that there is ... that's too simplistic. So, I would argue that small business owners, as... as the Bill's Sponsor said, want to do the right thing. Whether it's law or not, I do not consider this as a small business owner, which I still am today, as overly burdensome. I consider this something that I would do on my own and so, whether it's in law or not does not matter to me. I think... I actually did have a HR finance director, but as a small business owner if I didn't have the opportunity to have someone on staff, I would actually get that advice from someone that I would hire and consult, like I would hire my CPA, et cetera. So, I... I did give this careful thought. I commend you for bringing it forward. And I will be supporting the Bill and encourage others to."

Speaker Turner: "We've heard from three Members of the opposition and three Members in support. Representative Will Guzzardi to close."

Guzzardi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you for the robust debate. I think that this Bill is very simple, Ladies and

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Gentlemen. Should it be legal to discriminate against women, against Christians, against Muslims, against seniors, against veterans? Should discrimination in this state be legal? Today, as we sit in this chamber, in many businesses across this state it is. That is a wrong that we should correct. No sort of boogeyman arguments about the potential impact on small business should deter us from correcting that wrong. The City of Chicago, the county of Cook already have this in statute and it's not driving small businesses out of those ... those areas. Our neighboring states: Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, states all across this country already have this on the books. Blue states, red states and purple states. It is the right thing to do. It is a simple matter of basic human decency for people who, at this moment, have no legal protection. I believe this should be a bipartisan vote. I urge my friends and colleagues on both sides of the aisle to stand in support of this legislation. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 4572 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 64 voting 'yes', 37 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 4572, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, House Bill 4643, Representative Burke. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4643, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. This Bill was read a second time a previous day.

No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by

124th Legislative Day

- Representative Daniel Burke, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Burke."
- Burke, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe that House Floor

 Amendment #1 would replace the original language of the Bill.

 And I ask for the Body's favorable consideration."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 4643. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments have been approved for consideration. And no Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read House Bill 4643."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4643, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Leader Burke."
- Burke, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. On behalf of over 13 thousand physical therapists in our state, who each and every day work with our constituents... I would be shocked if I didn't believe that every one of you in this chamber doesn't have a physical therapist as a constituent... this Bill will offer this profession the opportunity of equal playing field with 44 other states in this country. Physical therapists will be considered first visits. They will be able to attend to their patients without doctor referral. It's fair. It's equitable. It's the right thing to do. And I would be happy to answer any questions."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Speaker Turner: "Representative Breen, this Bill is on the Order of Short Debate. You are recognized."

Breen: "Mr. Speaker, I move to... for Standard Debate."

Speaker Turner: "This Bill will be moved to the Order of Standard Debate. Representative Breen for five minutes."

Breen: "Thank you. And Representative... Representative, I'm... I'm confused. I see a Floor Amendment 2 and a Floor Amendment 3 that were supposed to take care of some opposition. Floor Amendment 2 taking care of the opposition of the dentists. Floor Amendment 3 taking care of the opposition of the chiropractors. And that then clearing away the opposition so that you could move your Bill and we could all be very much supportive of it."

Burke, D.: "Mr. Breen, this initiative has been worked on for several months, as you might imagine. I am in perfect agreement with those two Amendments that would relieve the concerns of both the Dental Association in our state and the chiropractic profession in our state. When we presented this Bill yesterday, and it was my understanding that those two matters would be brought to this floor's consideration, that has not occurred. That will not deter me from insisting that this matter be properly... properly considered at the Senate level. You have my word, and certainly the word of over 13 thousand physical therapists, that this... this matter is an agreed Bill."

Breen: "All right. And then so just..."

Burke, D.: "This is not in dispute... there is no dispute here."

Breen: "And then just... just to be clear though and so in the Senate, you will add Floor Amendments 2 and 3 in the Senate?"

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Burke, D.: "Absolutely."

Breen: "Okay. That's good. So, and... and Representative... and Representative, I just want to make sure that... well, and... I except that... so, I'm being reminded that we are passing Bills on Second Reading that some of our Members thought would be held and things like that. However, that was not you doing that, Representative. I know you better. So, at least that's not an issue for me. I don't know if will be a Member issue for some of my caucus Members who may want to see those Amendments on the Bill before moving it. But again, the issue you're trying to address is the issue that in many other states physical therapists don't need a specific referral from a physician prior to doing their... their work. And so, we're trying to just bring Illinois into line with those other states that allow physical therapists to practice within the realm of their licensure and their expertise."

Burke, D.: "Exactly."

Breen: "At this point, I will yield my time to Representative... well actually I'm in favor of this. So, is anyone else in favor? I'll yield to you. Okay. We have a... Okay. Well, Representative Wheeler will speak after I am. I have no problem with your Bill with the Amendments added. I understand we're going to have a little more... have a little more debate. Thanks."

Burke, D.: "Bring it on."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Wheeler... Barbara Wheeler, are you rising in support or opposition of this measure?"

Wheeler, B.: "I would have loved to have rise in support, but unfortunately, I rise in opposition because this is not what

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

we were promised yesterday during committee. We all came to committee including the representatives for the chiropractors and the representative of the dentist. We had an agreement, Leader. I'm so disappointed. Rules met four times today. We still have tomorrow. I... I would love to be voting for this. I would encourage everyone on our side to be voting for this if you had done what you told us you were going to do. You promised us in good faith that yesterday in committee that these two Amendments were going to be on the floor, which they are not, and I... I'm... I will not believe you, once again, that we can't get this done by tomorrow. I don't want to see this in the Senate. I think we gave you in good faith the chance to pass Floor Amendment... or to get Floor Amendment here was 2 and 3, one for the chiropractors and one for the dentists. I promised them... I gave them my word that we would hold this until today when those Floor Amendments should have been passed. And I know... It's my understanding that Rules met four times today. We had plenty of time to get this prepared and done right. Will you please take this from the record and do this right and not expect the Senate to do this right. That was your promise to us yesterday. That's what I expect today."

Burke, D.: "Mr. Speaker, are there Floor Amendments that are still in the Rules Committee?"

Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendments 2 and 3 have been referred to

the Rules Committee."

Speaker Turner: "Yes, Sir."

124th Legislative Day

- Burke, D.: "Representative Wheeler, you heard from representatives of both the chiropractic profession and the Dental Association. They have no concern. They trust me. I had said to this Body you have my word that these matters they're more technical than anything else."
- Wheeler, B.: "You gave me my... you gave me your word yesterday..."
- Burke, D.: "Absolutely... you..."
- Wheeler, B.: "...that it would be passed today on the floor and it will not..."
- Burke, D.: "I have no control over this process. I am just 1 of 118. I can't control this. I want to take care of over 13 thousand practitioners in this state..."
- Wheeler, B.: "I'm going to say..."
- Burke, D.: "...that have been denied the same opportunities that 44 other states have had for 20..."
- Wheeler, B.: "I don't ... Why are you getting mad at me?"
- Burke, D.: "Because you are talking about my word."
- Wheeler, B.: "Leader... and I'm going to say Leader one more time..."
- Burke, D.: "You are challenging my integrity."
- Wheeler, B.: "I am. You told me yesterday..."
- Burke, D.: "How dare you?"
- Wheeler, B.: "...you told me yesterday this would be taken care of..."
- Burke, D.: "I thought it was going to be a very simple..."
- Wheeler, B.: "...and you are a Leader in the Democratic Party... in the Majority Party. So, Leader, I have a hard time believing that today, after Rules met four times, that you couldn't get your agreed Amendments out."

124th Legislative Day

- Burke, D.: "All right. Let's... let's call a halt to this. You know me better than what you've just said."
- Wheeler, B.: "That's why I..."
- Burke, D.: "I will take this matter out of the record."
- Wheeler, B.: Thank you."
- Burke, D.: "And I would depend on this Democratic Majority to take care of the 13 thousand decent hardworking physical therapists in our state to give them the same opportunities that 44 other states have."
- Wheeler, B.: "I look forward to supporting that."
- Burke, D.: "Mr. Speaker, take this matter out of the record."
- Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, please take this Bill from the record.

 Mr. Clerk, House Bill 3479, Representative Feigenholtz.

 Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3479, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. A fiscal note and state mandates note have been requested but not filed at this time."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Feigenholtz."
- Feigenholtz: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to rule the note inapplicable."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative... Representative Feigenholtz moves to deem the fiscal note inapplicable. Representative Breen on that... on that Motion."
- Breen: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And if the Sponsor would yield."
- Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

124th Legislative Day

- Breen: "And Representative, this... this appears to have a significant fiscal impact on the State of Illinois. So, why is it that the fiscal note would be inapplicable on this particular one?"
- Feigenholtz: "Mr. Breen, I don't know if you heard about what happened in committee yesterday. And I feel that this issue should be moved to the Senate. There were many, many people who came to committee. Many southern Illinois and rural pharmacists who shared some pretty alarming legislation... information with us about what's going on with small business in this state when it comes to the main street pharmacist and independent pharmacists. So, I'd like to rule this inapplicable and..."
- Breen: "But, I mean, what's the cost here? You're saying that there's not... there's money not going out to them or and how much money is not going out and what's the... what's going to be the additional costs that we're going to have to deal with from a budget standpoint?"
- Feigenholtz: "It is my hope that this is not a expenditure to the taxpayers of the state as it currently is after what we heard in committee. It's... you could talk to some Members of your caucus. Many of them are cosponsors of this Bill because of the grave concern and the closing of doors because of what's been going on in rural parts of the state. Some people don't have access to pharmacists for 50 miles because of this legislation... I mean, because of the circumstances we're living under. So, I'd like to rule this inapplicable."
- Breen: "Well, Mr. Speaker, we object to the ruling of the note inapplicable. There's clearly a cost to the Representative's

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

- Bill to start changing the reimbursement rates of pharmaceutical services and the related items. And it's a... it's something that's going to... that could have a very significant fiscal impact on the state. And we should know about that beforehand. We request a Roll Call vote."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Feigenholtz moves to deem the fiscal note inapplicable. All voting... all in support 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 59 voting 'yes', 40 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', this measure, having received more 'yeas' than 'nays', the fiscal note is deemed inapplicable. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "A state mandates note has been requested but not filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Feigenholtz."
- Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also would like for this note to be ruled inapplicable."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Feigenholtz moves that the state mandates note be deemed inapplicable. And on that Motion, Representative Breen is recognized."
- Breen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We object and request a Roll Call vote."
- Speaker Turner: "The Lady moves that the state mandates note be deemed inapplicable. All those 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 58 voting 'yes', 35... 39 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', this Motion, having

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

received move 'yeas' than 'nays', carries. And the state mandates note is deemed inapplicable. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "There is no further note requests."

Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read House Bill 3479."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3479, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, again, rise on House Bill 3479 that amends the Illinois Public Aid Code. And the Bill actually, as drafted, talks... I mean, in Illinois we expanded Medicaid. And we, those of us who realized that we would have to go move people into managed care, never really contemplated that this... what is occurring with independent pharmacies across Illinois would come to fruition, which is independent pharmacies around this state are closing their doors. Yesterday, we had a gentleman, Owen Sullivan, who has been in business as an independent pharmacist, who shared information illuminating the disparities in the reimbursement rates. This is an issue of fairness. It's an issue of access. It was demonstrated to us that the system is rigged. And when we contemplated managed care, we did not intend to close and put independent pharmacists out of business. So, I'm prepared to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "This Bill is on the Order of Short Debate. Rep...

Representative Breen is recognized."

Breen: "Mr. Speaker, I move for Standard Debate."

Speaker Turner: "This... this Bill will be moved to Standard Debate."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Breen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Five minutes."

Breen: "And the Sponsor yield?"

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

Breen: "And Representative, I'm trying to figure out your Bill applies to a managed care community network that contracts to the Illinois department. Which Medicaid community networks would your Bills... would your Bill apply to?"

Feigenholtz: "Mr. Breen, the intent of this Bill is for all managed care and anyone who we entrust with the lives of Medicaid recipients in Illinois."

Breen: "Are you... we're having a question over on our side whether the managed care organizations are actually covered by your Bill or if it's just the managed care community network of which there may only be one?"

Feigenholtz: "We might need to do some clarification on that when this Bill moves over to the Senate."

Breen: "It might have been a good idea to wait for the fiscal note and actually get that clarified prior to running the Bill."

Feigenholtz: "Thanks for the..."

Breen: "Sure."

Feigenholtz: "...recommendation, Representative."

Breen: "Well, I mean, running... running poorly drafted Bills doesn't help anyone. And I'm also informed of the progress of the Medicaid Working Group. Is this an issue that's in front of the Medicaid Working Group?"

Feigenholtz: "It is."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Breen: "And so, you're going to run the Bill instead of waiting for the working group to make a recommendation?"

Feigenholtz: "You know, I would ask the Body, especially those Members of this Body who signed on to this Bill, who have heard from the pharmacists who are getting gouged, and who are getting letters from pharmacy benefit managers who are encouraging them to be bought out and literally, paying them less than acquisition costs. The dispensing fees are so significantly diminished I'm not even sure how some of these pharmacists are still keeping their doors open. Many testified yesterday that they are not that we move this Bill to the Senate for further consideration. And I would ask the Members on the other side of the aisle to join me, those especially who signed on as cosponsors, to help move this along so that we have a vehicle."

Breen: "All right. And Representative, it's been, at least, confirmed to me on our side the only entity that your Bill applies to is CountyCare in Cook County. But it doesn't actually apply to anywhere else in the rest of the state, as best we can tell. Based on the reading and the particular part of the statute that, you have decided to amend."

Feigenholtz: "So for... for purposes of legislative intent, I'm going to say that, as you said earlier when you were telling me about drafting Bills and how I should do that, that the intent is that it be managed... all managed care organizations."

Breen: "And Representative, you tell me what to do all the time, too, so touché. Again... to the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a..."

Feigenholtz: "I'll let that slide because your wife's a Cubs fan."

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Breen: "...Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a Bill that is clearly not ready to run yet. It ... it's impacting a single entity in Cook County. It's not taking care of this broader issue that we've got with trying to deal with some of our pharmaceutical issues, reimbursement rates and how we work with our independent pharmacies, especially downstate. This doesn't fix that issue. Instead, we've got the wrath of opponents. And we've got a Medicaid Working Group that is actually dealing with this issue and hopefully will draft a piece of legislation that will properly address the various issues that we're finding with this issue. But right now, this is not really not soup yet. It's just kind of we're throwing it up against the wall and saying that the legislative intent we're going to impact a lot of other entities that aren't actually in this part of the statute, which obviously you can't do. So, again, this is not ready to go. And again, it just impacts one entity in Cook County. So, it's hard to support a Bill like that that leaves the rest of the counties out in the cold but takes care of a very small population in Cook, who may not even have this issue. We just don't know."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Scherer."

Scherer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today I stand in strong support of our small local businesses. This particular one being our pharmacists. I will take our Leader's word that this will come back for all of Illinois. And with that being said, I'm referring to the Lady from Wheaton who talked about Democrats are never probusiness. And yet, this is not my first Bill this season that has been blocked by Republicans and indeed, the Bill is a pro small business. So, perhaps, the issue isn't

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

who's for the people, who's for the working people, the middle class, the poor? It's more, who's for corporate and who's for the people. That's the true question that was left out earlier. In my very own district, which we're standing and sitting in right now, three of my local pharmacists... let me give you an example. One went from being a business of a payroll of \$450 thousand to now being a pharmacist that's on unemployment. And we are paying his unemployment, I might add. Another one had to go out of business and sell out to Walgreen's because they came in and bought him at fire price and wanted all of his customers. Another one is hanging by a very thin thread. That's why time is of the essence, Representative. I am pro small business, as are many people on this side of the aisle. And it's time that we quit saying things that are simply not true. Low reimbursement rates are running small locally owned pharmacists out of business. It hurts the low-income families that now have to travel great distances for their medication. How are they supposed to get there? The state is overpaying the PBMs because there's no oversight. And you know it and you will still stand there and vote against it. And it's time that for once we do the right thing because it's the right thing to do not because it's the easy thing. People are watching your vote on this Bill. And I urge you to vote with your constituents not the big corporations that are taking our country over. Thank you. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Demmer's recognized."

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

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

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

- Demmer: "Representative Feigenholtz, I have a few questions about not just where this Bill stands today, but sort of this conversation that's ongoing. You and I have had a couple conversations on it. We've had some suggestions that the Medicaid Working Group, which is dealing with many complex issues such as this, that maybe that'd be an appropriate place for some of these discussions to happen. But as this Bill stands today, as the Bill that we're voting on right now, to... to which managed care providers would this Bill provide... would this Bill apply?"
- Feigenholtz: "I believe you're asking the same question as the previous Leader. And the answer is, is that we intend to fix this technical error so that it includes all managed care organizations and pharmacy benefit managers."
- Demmer: "So, today, it applies... as we pass it today, it applies to one of the seven. Your intent is to apply this to all seven. So, in fact, the... the question that was raised previously about whether or not a fiscal note would be inapplicable on this Bill is magnified, not from one provider to seven providers. This Bill provides that the reimbursement to a pharmacy shall not be less than the fee-for-service reimbursement and not less than the actual acquisition cost to the pharmacy provider. Is that correct?"

Feigenholtz: "That's what the current language says."

Demmer: "So, not less than the fee-for-service reimbursement.

That's something that we probably could... could understand.

When can look at what fee-for-service reimbursement was, we could apply that across, to what you're saying, would be all seven managed care providers across the state. But on the

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

acquisition cost, how do we know what the acquisition cost is for these managed care providers?"

Feigenholtz: "The conversation, Representative Demmer, will likely include shifting the burden not to Medicaid and their providers, but perhaps to the current profit makers who are debilitating independent pharmacists and then sending out letters encouraging them to be bought out."

Demmer: "So, again, to the question though."

Feigenholtz: "So..."

Demmer: "How do we know what the acquisition cost is for any provider? They simply send in an invoice that has a dollar amount on it and we pay it?"

Feigenholtz: "I'm not sure what you're asking?"

Demmer: "Your Bill says that the reimbursement shall not be less than the acquisition cost for the pharmacy provider. My question is, how do we know what the acquisition cost is for a pharmacy provider? Do they simply tell us it's a hundred dollars. And we say, okay, it's a hundred dollars."

Feigenholtz: "The Bill also says that this is to establish, maintain, and provide a fair and reasonable reimbursement rate to pharmacy providers for services, which is not what's happening now."

Demmer: "Okay. So, the Bill says we shall provide a fair and reasonable reimbursement rate. It also says we shall not pay less than the actual acquisition cost to the pharmacy providers. What is fair and reasonable? What is the acquisition cost?"

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

- Feigenholtz: "The pe... currently, the pharmacies know what the acquisition costs are, but there's no opportunity to negotiate. And I think that is where the problem is."
- Demmer: "I'm asking, how does the state know what the acquisition cost is? Do we simply take any price the pharmacy provides to us?"
- Feigenholtz: "The... we have research charts and costs reports with all of that data that I'm happy to share with you."
- Demmer: "I... I don't believe that information exists. We do not know for any individual pharmacy what their acquisition costs are other than that number which they simply report to us. They could simply tell us our acquisition cost is anything and we'd have no way of knowing whether that was the actual acquisition cost or not."
- Feigenholtz: "Well, actually, as this Bill moves forward and as the work group works on this, Representative Demmer, that is... you make a good point and it's something we should be addressing."
- Demmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I think we've pointed out the fact, today, that this Bill is simply is not ready. This Bill, today, applies to only one of seven managed care providers. This Bill provides that we shall not reimburse at less than acquisition cost. We have no way of knowing what acquisition cost is. This fiscal impact could be in the hundreds of millions of dollars to the State of Illinois. The Bill is not ready. If we need to have more discussions on it, let's have those discussions. Let's take a Senate Bill and put an Amendment on that. This is not the last day of Session.

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

This is a deadline we've imposed on ourselves. The Bill's not ready. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Halbrook, do you rise in opposition or support to this measure?"

Halbrook: "Opposition."

Speaker Turner: "You'll be the final opposing speaker."

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

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

Halbrook: "Yeah, Representative, this morning, at the urging of my pharmacist, I signed on as a cosponsor to your Bill. And they indicated to me that it did cover their MCOs. And in this debate, it's been discovered that it does not cover all the MCOs. Is that correct?"

Feigenholtz: "Yes, as previous speakers have asked, I believe two of them, as this Bill moves forward, it is our intention to amend it in the Senate and fix some of the technical aspects of it."

Halbrook: "Well and..."

Feigenholtz: "That would be just a technical change. It should be all seven."

Halbrook: "Well, I agree with my previous speakers on many accounts. I'm just not sure I want to vote for something that we're going to send out and hope to fix it in the Senate. I think we've got time to fix it before it leaves here. Again, we've got hard costs. I had three pharmacists in just two days ago in this office and they showed me their numbers. They're losing money even before the costs of their overhead's factored in. And so, I agree that need... something needs to be

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

- done here, but I'd like it to be done before we send it on out."
- Feigenholtz: "Well, it is certainly... for legislative intent purposes because, Representative Halbrook, I'm sure that you want to vote with your small pharmacists that's why you co... you are a cosponsor of the Bill. You have my word that this is intended for every MCO. That is just a technical error. But I'm certain you don't want to put your businesses... your pharmacies out of business. Would that be correct?"
- Halbrook: "Well, again, and I... it's final and after urging as a cosponsor because they... they fully understood that it did include them. So, that's my concern is if it is not fixed that's not going to look very good."
- Feigenholtz: "You can decide what you want to do and what kind of message you want to send to your pharmacists, Sir."
- Halbrook: "Well, I want to vote with my pharmacists, my small town independent pharmacists. We need them. They're miles and miles between, so it's important to keep them in business and keep them viable. I'm going to vote with this Bill. I signed on with this issue. I just believe it's not soup yet. And I would urge you to pull this and let's fix this in the House before we send it on. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Davidsmeyer, do you rise in opposition or support to this measure?"
- Davidsmeyer: "Support."
- Speaker Turner: "Please proceed. You'll be the final speaker in support."
- Davidsmeyer: "Thank you, Leader Feigenholtz. I... I appreciate you bringing this forward. This is an issue that we had a chance

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

to discuss a couple weeks ago and I appreciate you going after this. I also understand that it's not quite there yet. I do rise in support and I will support it here on the floor. I'm hoping that we can fix it in the Senate and get to see it before May 30, so we can have a positive effect on... on my small rural pharmacies that CVS and the big guys are never going to come in and... and service. You know, these are people that can't afford to drive 30 miles to... to the nearest pharmacy to see... and I appreciate you doing this. You know, I've seen things where, you know, the reimbursement rate should have been \$121 and someone's getting \$7.60. And it's just... it's time to get that out of the system. You know, we need to save money in our health care system, but nobody should be taken for a ride. So, I appreciate what you're doing. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Feigenholtz to close."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you for the robust debate on this very, very important piece of legislation. I respect the technical aspects that were... that were brought up just from some of the speakers. We are going to move this Bill forward because it has such a enormous effect on pharmacists around the state. And I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3479 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 87 voting 'yes', 16 voting 'no' and 1 voting 'present', House Bill 3479, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Members,

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

on page 37 of the Calendar, we have Motions in Writing. And Leader Currie moves Motions to Table House Bill 1471, House Bill 3522, House Bill 4791. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Motion... the Motion carries. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."

- Clerk Hollman: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 1016, offered by Representative Sosnowski. House Resolution 1017, offered by Representative Keith Wheeler. (sic-House Resolution 1018, offered by Representative Keith Wheeler.) House Resolution 1019, offered by Representative Keith Wheeler. House Resolution 1020, offered by Representative Hoffman. And House Resolution 1021, offered by Representative Crespo."
- Speaker Turner: "Leader Currie moves that the House adopt the Agreed Resolutions. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolutions are adopted. Mr. Clerk, Adjournment Resolution."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Joint Resolution #68, offered by Representative Currie.
 - RESOLVED, BY THE SENATE OF THE ONE HUNDREDTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CONCURRING HEREIN, that when the Senate adjourns on Thursday, April 26, 2018, the Senate stands adjourned until Tuesday, May 01, 2018, and when it adjourns on that day, it stands adjourned until Wednesday, May 02, 2018, and when it adjourns on that day, it stands adjourned until Thursday, May 03, 2018, and when it adjourns on that day, it stands adjourned until

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Tuesday, May 08, 2018, or until the call of the President, and when the House of Representatives adjourns on Friday, April 27, 2018, it stands adjourned until Tuesday, May 08, 2018 at 12:00 o'clock noon, or until the call of the Speaker."

- Speaker Turner: "Leader Currie moves that we adopt the Adjournment Resolution. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. Mr. Clerk, committee announcements."
- Clerk Hollman: "The following committees will be meeting immediately upon adjournment: Judiciary-Criminal is meeting in Room 114. Personnel & Pensions is meeting in Room 122. State Government Administration is meeting in Room 118. Elementary & Secondary Education: Licensing, Administration & Oversight is meeting in Room 115."
- Speaker Turner: "And now, allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, Leader Currie moves that the House adjourn until Friday, April 27, 2018 at 9:00 a.m., Friday, April 27, 2018 at 9:00 a.m. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the House is adjourned."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Committee Reports. Representative Turner, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary Criminal reports the following committee action taken on April 25, 2018: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment 1 to House Bill 1472, Floor Amendment 1 to House Bill 2063, Floor Amendment 1 to House Bill 4077, Floor Amendment 1 to House Bill 4581, Floor Amendment 2 to House Bill 4741, Floor Amendment 1 to House Bill 4932, Floor Amendment 2 to House Bill 5203, Floor Amendment 2 to House Bill 5203, Floor Amendment 2 to House Bill 5231, Floor Amendment 1 to House

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Bill 5303. Floor Amendment 3 to House Bill 5341. Representative Mussman, Chairperson from the Committee on Special Needs Services reports the following committee action taken on April 25, 2018: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment 2 to House Bill 4836. Representative Rita, Chairperson from the Committee on Business & Occupational Licenses reports the following committee action taken on April 25, 2018: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 4953. Representative Hoffman, Chairperson from the Committee on Labor & Commerce reports the following committee action taken on April 25, 2018: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment 1 to House Bill 1595, Floor Amendment 6 to House Bill 2376, Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 4324, Floor Amendment 1 to House Bill 5147, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 5689. Representative Soto, Chairperson from the Committee on Health Care Licenses reports the following committee action taken on April 25, 2018: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment 1... Floor Amendment 2 to House Bill 4100, Floor Amendment 1 to House Bill 4515, Floor Amendment 1 to House Bill Representative Mayfield, Chairperson from the Committee on Elementary & Secondary Education: Licensing, Administration & Oversight reports the following committee action taken on April 25, 2018: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment 1 to House Bill 5572. Representative Greg Harris, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-Human Services reports the following committee action taken on April 26, 2018: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment 1 to House Bill 4096, Floor Amendment 1 to House Bill 4736. Introduction of

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Resolutions. House Resolution 1017, offered by Representative Welch, is referred to the Rules Committee. Introduction and First Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 34, offered by Representative Hernandez, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Senate Bill 65, offered by Representative Rita, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 211, offered by Representative Moylan, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. Senate Bill 274, offered by Representative Ammons, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 424, offered by Representative Bourne, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 457, offered by Representative Guzzardi, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Senate Bill 544, offered by Representative Andersson, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. Senate Bill 563, offered by Representative Burke, Kelly, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 1246, offered by Representative Burke, Kelly, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Senate Bill 1628, offered by Representative Moeller, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 2017, offered by Representative Manley, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 2210, offered by Representative Gordon-Booth, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Senate Bill 2225, offered by Representative Long, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Senate Bill 2232, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 2252, offered by Representative Halpin, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 2267, offered by Representative Butler, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Senate Bill 2328, offered by Representative

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

McDermed, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 2332, offered by Representative Lilly, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 2343, offered by Representative Moylan, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 2344, offered by Representative Martwick, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 2362, offered by Representative Turner, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Senate Bill 2424, offered by Representative Gabel, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 2444, offered by Representative DeLuca, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 2560, offered Representative Wallace, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Senate Bill 2569, offered by Representative Scherer, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 2585, offered by Representative Breen, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Senate Bill 2599, offered by Representative Slaughter, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 2617, offered by Representative Zalewski, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 2619, offered by Representative Willis, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 2628, offered by Representative Currie, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 2654, offered by Representative Hammond, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 2661, offered by Representative Martwick, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 2662, offered by Representative Drury, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 2667, offered by Representative Turner, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

2677, offered by Representative Costello, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 2693, offered by Representative Pritchard, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 2765, offered by Representative Jesiel, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Senate Bill 2772, offered by Representative Cassidy, a Bill for an Act health. Senate Bill 2817, offered concerning Representative DeLuca, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 2822, offered by Representative Sauer, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 2830, offered by Representative Kifowit, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 2836, offered by Representative Jesiel, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 2838, offered by Representative Mayfield, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 2846, offered by Representative Welch, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 2857, offered by Representative Evans, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 2858, offered by Representative Harris, Greg, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 2866, offered by Representative Gabel, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Senate Bill 2868, offered by... offered by Representative Hernandez, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 2879, offered Representative Olsen, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 29... correction... 2889, offered by Representative Breen, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Senate Bill 2896, offered by Representative Butler, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 2900,

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

offered by Representative Reick, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 2904, offered by Representative Feigenholtz, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 2905, offered by Representative Harris, Greq, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 2923, offered by Representative DeLuca, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 2925, offered by Representative Mitchell, Christian, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 2939, offered by Representative Chapa LaVia, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 2951, offered by Representative Feigenholtz, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Senate Bill 2999, offered by Representative Conyears-Ervin, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Senate Bill 3003, offered by Representative Evans, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Senate Bill 3015, offered by Representative Welch, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 3017, offered Representative Fortner, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Senate Bill 3019, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. Senate Bill 3022, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. Senate Bill 3023, offered by Representative Evans, a Bill for an Act concerning substance use disorder treatment. Senate Bill 3045, offered by... offered by Representative Reis, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Senate Bill 3048, offered by Representative Cassidy, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Senate Bill 3052, offered by Representative Turner, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Senate Bill 3062, offered by Representative Drury, a Bill for

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

an Act concerning health. Senate Bill 3086, offered by Representative Halpin, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Senate Bill 3093, offered by Representative McCombie, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 3096, offered by Representative Stewart, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Senate Bill 3101, offered Representative Moeller, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Senate Bill 3102, offered by Representative Mah, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Senate Bill 3104, offered by Representative Rita, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 3105, offered by Representative Stewart, a Bill for an Act concerning children. Senate Bill 3106, offered by Representative Davis, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 3109, offered by Representative Guzzardi, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 3115, offered by Representative Flowers, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Senate Bill 3116, offered by Representative Feigenholtz, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 3117, offered by Representative Andersson, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 3119, offered by Representative Zalewski, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Senate Bill 3138, offered by Representative Welch, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 3148, offered Representative Davis, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Senate Bill 3151, offered by Representative Zalewski, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Senate Bill 3152, offered by Representative Zalewski, a Bill for an Act Bill 3166, offered by concerning revenue. Senate

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

Representative Feigenholtz, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. Senate Bill 3174, offered by Representative Costello, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 3179, offered by Representative Drury, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Senate Bill 3195, offered by Representative Unes, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Senate Bill 3197, offered by Representative Martwick, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 3205, offered by Representative Connor, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Senate Bill 3214, offered by Representative Bennett, a Bill for an Act concerning solar sites. Senate Bill 3215, offered by Representative Bennett, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 3234, offered by Representative Currie, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Senate Bill 3237, offered by Representative Guzzardi, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 3261, offered by Representative Smith, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 3276, offered by... offered by Representative Cassidy, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 3285, offered by Representative Bristow, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 3288, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Senate Bill 3290, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Senate Bill 3291, offered by Representative Evans, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Senate Bill 3302, offered by Representative Spain, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 3387, offered by Representative Rita, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. Senate Bill 3398, offered by Representative Demmer,

124th Legislative Day

4/26/2018

a Bill for an Act concerning business. Senate Bill 3404, offered by Representative Mitchell, Christian, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 3452, offered by Representative Hays, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. Senate Bill 3466, offered by Representative Davis, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 3489, offered by Representative Guzzardi, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 3500, offered by Representative Stratton, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 3507, offered by Representative Drury, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 3509, offered Representative Hurley, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 3527, offered by Representative Gordon-Booth, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 3528, offered by Representative Wallace, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 3547, offered by Representative Chapa LaVia, a Bill for an Act concerning service members. Senate Bill 3548, offered by Representative Turner, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 3549, offered by Representative Turner, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. First Reading of these Senate Bills. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."