140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

Speaker Turner: "Members are asked to be at their seats. We shall be led in prayer today by Representative Natalie Phelps Finnie. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off all cell phones, and rise for the invocation and Pledge of Allegiance."

Phelps Finnie: "Let us pray. Lord, I just come to You with a humble heart and I praise You for who You are. I praise You for all the blessings you've given to my family. So many people, Lord, You've touched, Lord, and we just praise You and we thank You. And Lord, I repent any wrongdoing, Lord, and I ask that You, like King David prayed, that You would create in me a pure heart, oh God. Lord, I ask for wisdom as I have many times, like King Solomon, Lord, and I pray for wisdom for this Body that only You can give, Your perfect will and Your perfect wisdom. And dear Lord, I ask for love and compassion to be in my heart and the heart of my colleagues here, Lord, we would have mercy and we would have forgiveness to forgive even our enemies, Lord. Give us that kind of heart. Give us a servant's heart, Lord. That is what true leadership is, Lord, when you're willing to put yourself below others. So, please, give us that heart, dear Lord. There's no room for ego or pride, Lord, when we're serving. Help us to put those things away, to empty ourselves of all ... any ugliness or wrongdoing, Lord, and fill us only with Your goodness. Lord, I thank you. I thank you for all of the things you've done, Lord, for me and my family, for the people in southern Illinois, for the people in this great state, and for the United States of America, Lord. We are so thankful.

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

Give us thankful hearts that we would never take for granted anything. I praise You in the name of Jesus, Amen."

Speaker Turner: "Shall be led in the Pledge of Allegiance today by Representative Unes."

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

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

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. Please let the record show that not a single House Democrat is excused today."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Demmer."

Demmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please let the record reflect that all House Republicans are ready to do the work of the people. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "With 118 Members present, a quorum is established. Representative Butler, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Butler: "A point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Sir."

Butler: "Over here in the corner, on the Abraham Lincoln side of the gallery, I've got a very good friend of mine and his family, the Mulvaney family. Stand up there. Gigi and Julia are here with their dad, Bill. Bill is a longtime friend of mine, a fellow graduate of Eastern Illinois University, a fellow Sigma Pi fraternity member, a fellow tug champ in Greek Week. He's the superintendent of Armstrong Township High School in Representative Hays's district. I got that

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

straight. So, please welcome the Mulvaney family to the State Capitol here today."

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

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

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

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Sir."

Sauer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like the Assembly to look up and recognize two very special people here from my district. Susan and Kristin are with an organization called Let It Be Us. We had an event in the rotunda today to talk about foster care and awareness and adoption. I'd like everybody to welcome them. They're changing lives. They're helping families adopt from foster care. Welcome, Susan and Kristin to the Capitol."

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

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

Willis: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed."

Willis: "I'd ask for a moment of silence from the Body. Yesterday, the Chicago Fire Department lost one of its very own, 46-year-old Juan Bucio. He was a 15-year member of the department. He was a member of their dive team since 2007. He actually lived in the Speaker's district. He was a father of two, a nine-year-old boy and a seven-year-old boy. He was one of nine siblings. His sister also was a Chicago Police Officer and has a brother who was also a Chicago Fire Department. The department always knows that when they go out for calls they

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

never know what's going to happen. Unfortunately, yesterday, Mr. Bucio went into the waters to try to save someone. What we're hearing now is that his equipment malfunctioned and it resulted in his death. I would ask for a moment of silence for Mr. Bucio and his family, and keep them in your thoughts and prayers for the rest of the day. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Body will take a moment of silence. Thank you. Mr. Clerk, House Resolution 77... 779, offered by Representative Reick."

Clerk Bolin: "House Resolution 779. Be it

RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ONE HUNDREDTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that we mourn the passing of Harlow "Bud" Swartout Jr., and extend our sincere condolences to his family, friends, and all who knew and loved him."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reick is recognized."

Reick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Bud Swartout, better known as Bio Bud to his students, friends, and colleagues in Woodstock, died on November 20, 2017 at age 90. He was born in Galesburg and graduated from Galesburg High School where he played football, wrestled, competed in track and field, went on to Drake University with a football scholarship until he was drafted into the Army during World War II. Upon being discharged from the Army, he earned a bachelors and master's degree at Illinois State University. Bud married JoAnn Sterling in 1951, and they were parents to children Jerry and Nancy, and grandparents to seven grandchildren and two greatgrandchildren. Bud began teaching science and coaching football in Woodstock in 1954 and became known as Bio Bud for

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

instilling a love and respect for biology and science in the students he taught. Parenthetically, my daughter was in his class and that is a true statement. After his retirement, he continued to volunteer and coach. He volunteered for over 50 years as a scorekeeper for countless wrestling matches at the high school, lined the football field, taped ankles, did everything that was necessary to make sure that Woodstock had fielded competitive teams. He also found time to volunteer in the activities department at Valley Hi Nursing Home in McHenry County two mornings each week for 20 years. He adapted activities so the Valley Hi residents, including those in wheelchairs, could participate in a variety of activities. Shortly after his retirement, the coach's scholarship bearing Bud's name was created in his honor to honor senior student athletes who participated in three sports during each of their four years of high school, and continues to be awarded annually to the student athlete most exemplifying the pillars of character taught by Bud in the classroom and on the playing field. He was elected to the Illinois High School Football Coaches Association Hall of Fame in 1995 and the Woodstock School Activities Hall of Fame in 1996. The press box at Woodstock High School football field is named in his honor. In 2011, the District 200 Education Foundation presented its first ever Award of Excellence to Bud Swartout for exemplary service to the students of Woodstock School District 200. We're joined today by Bud's daughter, Nancy... Nancy Lawson, her husband Bernie, daughter Sarah, and son Ethan. And I would ask you to join in congratulating them upon... and help celebrate a life well-lived. Thank you."

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

- Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative Reick. The Gentleman moves for the adoption of House Resolution 779. 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, Rules Report."
- Clerk Hollman: "Committee Report. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 29, 2018: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4949."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Harris, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege, please."
- Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Sir."
- Harris, D.: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd just like to put into the record, today, that Illinois is not yet quite the wasteland that all of you... or not all of you, that we may have heard about said from folks indicating that everybody is leaving this state. As a matter of fact, in March of this year, Site Selection Magazine named Illinois as a destination... as a destination for businesses looking to relocate. The Governor's Cup ranking lists the state as one of the top three... as one of the top ones for new and expanding businesses. This is the second consecutive year that Illinois has received the honor and the recognition is awarded to states with the most qualifying new and expanding facilities per capita. So, perhaps we may very well be on the right track

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

in attracting the type of businesses that we want. Thank you very much."

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

Batinick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege." Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Sir."

Batinick: "I wanted to thank... I think, some of you guys are opening up the envelope right now from Representative Martwick. I wanted to thank him for the calculator that he gave us for our help on the budget. I did want to point out a couple of things. The addition button seems to be twice as large as the other buttons on the calculator. But just to point out, right above it is a subtraction budget... button, if you're all interested. Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "Thanks you, Representative. Representative Bourne, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Bourne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege." Speaker Turner: "Please proceed."

Bourne: "Thank you. Today, I would like to introduce the Body to my Page, Clayton Coleman. He's a ten-year-old from Pana and he attends Sacred Heart School. When he grows up, he wants to work with his dad at their family business. And this is his first time at the Capitol. So, welcome him to the Capitol and give him some work today."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you, and welcome to your Capitol. Leader Bellock, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

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

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Representative."

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

- Bellock: "I have two young men here today that are going to Page.

 I have Alex, who goes to Hawthorne School in Elmhurst. He's in fourth grade. And his dad is up in the balcony. And I have Christian here, who is from Our Lady of Peace School in Downers Grove, in 6th grade. And his grandmother and grandfather are here. So, I'd ask everybody to give them a warm welcome. Thank you very much."
- Speaker Turner: "Thank you and welcome to your Capitol.

 Representative Ammons, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Ammons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege, please."
- Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Representative."
- Ammons: "I'm going to introduce and ask my son, Amir, to stand to be introduced to the General Assembly. We haven't seen Amir in a little bit because he's been a star athlete in baseball, an academic successful student this year, is going on to the 11th grade at Urbana High School. He plays drums, the trumpet, and he dances. So, we have to welcome him today to the General Assembly. This is his first visit in almost a year. So, welcome back to the General Assembly for Amir, my 16-, going to be 17-year-old son."
- Speaker Turner: "Thank you, and welcome back. Representative Breen, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Breen: "A point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Sir."
- Breen: "Ladies and Gentlemen, this week the General Assembly is wrapping up the budget process for the year. Tough decisions are being made about which programs will be funded and at

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

what levels. There are items being traded back and forth to satisfy this constituency or that one, but there are also certain items that are not negotiable between the parties. Certain items that either the Democrats or the Republicans say that item is not on the table at all. Last year, by bare partisan Majority, the General Assembly enacted House Bill which both eliminated our state's long-standing prohibition against tax dollars being used to pay for elective abortions and created a program to begin providing those abortions. Not one Republican in either chamber of this General Assembly supported House Bill 40, and many vocally opposed that Bill whether on this House Floor or in the public, and that's because every innocent human life is a treasure of immeasurable worth. But predictably, in the current budget process, this General Assembly is now faced with the question of whether to fund that Democrat program of elective abortions. This is the first year when that question will be answered. But when last year's Appropriations Bills were passed, there was no concept by anyone that the Department of Healthcare and Family Services would later use those moneys to pay for elective abortions. It is estimated that if the Democrat abortion program is funded, the state would pay for between 30 thousand abortions on the high-end and 20 thousand abortions on the low-end each and every year. The abortion clinic lobby has been salivating at the prospect of all this new money coming to them from the Democrat Legislators they control. In the wake of House Bill 40, the largest abortion provider in Illinois publicly posted its plans to open four new clinics in this state. But for any

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

Legislator, for any Illinoisan who holds to the truth that a baby is a baby, whether born or unborn, this item is nonnegotiable. Babies are not bargaining chips. There is no price that can be put on a single innocent human life, much less 30 thousand innocent human lives. We all know that people are opposed to taxpayer funded abortion. The latest survey shows percent of Republicans are opposed, 56 percent Independents are opposed, even 43 percent of Democrats are opposed to taxpayer funded abortion. Our Congressmen and women in Washington, for all their dysfunction, still understand and respect this deeply held belief. Despite their stances as either pro-choice or pro-life, they recognize that while abortion may be legal, if you want an abortion, you pay for it yourself. Each year in the federal appropriations package, the Congress makes clear that tax dollars may not be used for elective abortions. The man who originally offered that language, Henry Hyde, began his political career in this very House chamber on this very House Floor where he served as Majority Leader of this House, and now the task falls to us, the 100th General Assembly of this State of Illinois. If there is a majority of Members who wish to fund these abortions, then go ahead and take a vote on it. We, who are pro-life, are not going to be complicit in your plans to terminate 30 thousand innocent little lives next year. You go to the people of the state, you explain how you raise taxes to make sure there is money to pay for your 30 thousand elective abortions every single year. But if there is no such majority here for taxpayer funded abortion, then let's get the abortion funding off the table and out of the budget right

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

now. Add the Federal Hyde Amendment language to the Budget Implementation Bill, prohibit those dollars from being used for elective abortions. Let's set aside a line item for the abortions and zero that line item out. There's nothing stopping us from doing either of these. There's no federal constitutional requirement, no legal requirement to fund these abortions. The funding's banned at the federal level. There's no state constitutional limit on this General Assembly's power to decide how we will fund or not fund a particular program. Whether it's raises for AFSCME members that were never appropriated or broadband internet Southern Illinois, both of which we just approved last week, there is no room in the Illinois budget for taxpayer funded abortion. If we stop this barbaric program, the people of this state will thank us, especially those tiniest Illinoisans who are now in their mother's wombs, whose very survival hinges on the decisions of this General Assembly over these final three days of our Legislative Session. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Parkhurst." Parkhurst: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Representative."

Parkhurst: "I'd like you to join me in welcoming my Page for a day, Sydney Hazelrigg. She is a freshman... going to be a freshman at University of Alabama where she's going to study economics and communications. Her goal is to be an attorney. Her mother's in the gallery. Please join me in giving her a warm Springfield welcome. Thank you."

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

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

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

Brady: "Point of personal privilege, please."

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Sir."

Brady: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I, too, would like to introduce my Page today. And please give a nice Springfield welcome to Madison Zimmerman, a recent graduate from Normal Community High School, incoming freshman at St. Louis University, and she'll be Paging for me today. Joined by her folks which are up in the gallery. How about a nice Springfield welcome for Madison."

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

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

Crespo: "A point of personal privilege."

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Sir."

Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. We filed House Resolution 1137... which I'm not sure is going to be heard today. However, we have some visitors from Ameren. If... I have some folks from Ameren, they're behind the gallery to my left. The Resolution has to do with the power restoration in Puerto Rico. We had a Resolution last week for Common Wealth Edison. And just for the record, and just a reminder, that September 20 of last year Hurricane Maria made landfall in Puerto Rico as a Category 4. It hit Puerto Rico just 14 days after Hurricane Irma. As a result, all 3.5 million residents of Puerto Rico lost power. And seven months after Hurricane Maria made landfall, we still have more than 40 people on the island

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

without electricity. Puerto Rico's experiencing perhaps the longest blackout in the United States history and the second longest in world history. And we are thankful to Ameren. In times of need, you find out who your true friends are. Ameren sent 98 employees voluntarily to Puerto Rico to assist in restoring power. These employees, along with utility workers from Ameren Missouri, Ameren Transmission installed over 500 poles, over 400 transformers, and more than over 100 miles of power. But they went beyond just what they were supposed to do and they worked with a little young boy, seven-year-old Avery Huddleston from Mechanicsburg, Illinois, that instead of birthday gifts, what he wanted was school supplies to donate to the kids in Puerto Rico. And I want to thank Ameren 'cause they went out there. They delivered 20 pounds of supplies collected by Avery to La Escula Rafael De Jesus in Rio Grande. I was proud to say I was born in Illinois. I spent my formative years in Puerto Rico. And on behalf of my family, my friends, on behalf of Puerto Ricans in the island, on behalf of Puerto Ricans on the mainland, I want to give a huge thanks to Ameren and thank you for all the good work you did for us. Thank you, guys."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you so much, Representative.

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

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

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Sir."

Severin: "I also stand with Representative Crespo on the Ameren people that are here today. What a fine job that they've done for Puerto Rico. And with that... with that thought, I just

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

want to say thank you to them. What a fine... there's, I think, over 90 people that went to Puerto Rico that worked for Ameren that participated in that. So, that was an awesome job. And also, I have in the gallery today, I'd like to introduce Mr. and Mrs. Crawford, if they would stand up, please. This is Foster Care Awareness Month, the month of May. And they have been foster parents for 32 years, 32 years. And they've been foster parents of 80, 80 children. They've been foster parents of 80 children. Mr. and Mrs. Crawford, if you'd stand up, please. How about a round of applause for some people that really care about kids. Thank you very much."

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

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

Ford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege." Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Sir."

Ford: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, today I had a meeting and I talked with the executive director of the Abraham Lincoln Presidential Library, Alan Lowe. And he expressed very much his concern about the fact that the history of the 16th President could come to an end if the state is not willing to assist in funding the library's memorabilia that's stored at the Abraham Lincoln's library. So, I wanted to bring it to the attention to all the budgeteers, and all the Members of the House, and to the Governor's Office to make sure that we protect the history of Abraham Lincoln by funding the library. It's great that we're about to build a library in Chicago and a museum in Chicago, but we also have to remember all that President Lincoln means to Illinois and to the

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

country. So, for the record, the Abraham Lincoln Museum and Library is in trouble and we should do everything we can to fund it. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and all the Members of the House."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative. Members, on page 7 of the Calendar, we will begin with Senate Bills on Third Reading. Please be in your seat and prepared to present. First Bill will be Senate Bill 3295 offered by Representative Breen. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3295, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Breen."

Breen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 3295 comes to us from the Chicago Bar Foundation. It's a... is clean-up language to help ensure that when a pleading is presented in court, there's no need for a notarization if it has the appropriate verification language in it. So, there's certain places... other places in the Code where that's... that affidavit requirement is there. We're going to clean it all up, make sure it's just done by verification."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 3295 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 114 voting 'in favor', 0 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 3295, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 3392, Representative Evans. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3392, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Evans."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker and the great Members of this Assembly. This Bill, 3292 (sic-3392), it amends the Installment Sales Contract Act. It's somewhat of complicated matter but to simplify it, we have individuals who, of the Islamic faith, the exact terminology would be the Murabaha. And they're not allowed to, according to their religion, take upon interest. So, we have certain institutions who provide a product for these individuals. We have individuals that are Islamic faith in the State of Illinois, all over our state. So, the AG, working with the housing advocates, came up with a solution because when we passed the Installment Sales Contract Act, these particular items were seen as sales contracts and other traditional mortgages. So, we worked together. We came up with a solution that can allow our credit unions, banks to offer this particular product to individuals looking to take advantage of this product. And we had some opposition who would like to offer this product. But I think many of the supporters concerns was that we wanted it narrowly tailored to the institutions in which could ensure that the product would be offered in legitimate fashion. Therefore, I request your support on this legislation."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 3392 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

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

take the record. On a count of 116 voting 'in favor', 1 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 3392, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 3404, Representative Mitchell. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3404, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Mitchell."

Mitchell, C.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This is a Bill that is a series of changes made to mirror the Federal Survivor's Bill of Rights that provides immunity from prosecution for... basically, the goal of the Bill is to increase reporting of sexual assaults and make sure that, similar to what we do right now with alcohol, if someone wants to report a sexual assault that they are not deterred from doing so by the presence of alcohol or narcotics in their system. This is... this would, however, make sure that if there is suspicion, reasonable suspicion, by the police of criminal activity that is not incidental to that particular incident that they could still arrest that person. And also adds a series of other rights for survivors and extends, currently... currently, right now, for five years, a rape kit must be held. It would extend that out to 10 years to ensure that we're doing all we can to cut down on sexual assault in the State of Illinois. I know of no opposition and I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 3404 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 117 voting 'in favor', 0 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 3404, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Bryant, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

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

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed."

Bryant: "I have in the gallery today, a family from Murphysboro. Great family, Darren and Nikki Fager and their boys Gibson and Jackson. We're preparing Gibson or Jackson to replace me in a distant future. But one quick thing, Darren's brother Kyle is the guy that I went sky diving with this past year. So, I've gotten to share some adventures with that family. So, appreciate it if we'd welcome them today."

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

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

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

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Sir."

Wheeler, K.: "Thank you. I'd like to also thank Representative Martwick for his generosity with the calculators that he gave us here... Rob Martwick. I'm thanking you right now for the calculator. I wanted to point out one small thing to my friend. I tried to type in this \$224 billion deficit and it does not fit in the number of columns we have. I tried to subtract from it and it still gave me an error. We have work to do, Bob. We have to get a bigger calculator to solve this

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

- state's problems. So, I'll work with you on that, as well, my friend."
- Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative. Senate Bill 3411,
 Representative Barbara Wheeler. Mr. Clerk, please read the
 Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3411, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Wheeler."
- Wheeler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm presenting Senate Bill 3411.

 It provides that a workplace, school, or place of worship may petition through an authorized agent for a stalking, no contact order. This is also one of the very few Bills that all of the public safety working group has agreed upon and, I believe, they're all Members in cosponsoring this particular Bill. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 3411 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', Senate Bill 3411, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 3443, Representative Davis. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3443, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Davis."
- Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 3443 is an effort of the Secretary of State's

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

Office with regard to notary misconduct. The proposed legislation authorizes the Secretary to conduct investigations and allow for reprimand or suspension where currently only revocation is authorized. With regard to notary misconduct, the legislation also requires the notary surety to notify the Secretary of State when a complaint against a notary has been made or payment has been rendered to an injured party. I'd be more than happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 3443 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 118 voting 'in favor', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 3443, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 3464, Representative Manley. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3464, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Manley."

Manley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 3464 amends the Counties Code and Municipal Code to clarify provisions related to audits of cable and video service providers conducted by an appropriate local unit of government. The Bill does three things. It clarifies the existing obligation of the counties and municipalities to provide... address data... excuse me... the address database in order to ensure and assist in completing accurate audits. Number 2, clarifies that these

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

audit provisions are the exclusive audit procedures and that these audit procedures will apply to all future franchise and audits conducted after the effective date of this Bill. And 3, imposes confidentiality requirements on cable providers and video service providers with respect to the address database. I'll take any questions."

Speaker Turner: "This Bill is on the Order of Short Debate.

Representative Breen is recognized for two minutes."

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

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

Breen: "And Representative, I just want to make sure what we're trying to do is ensure that local governments are getting their franchise and service fees that they are entitled to that somehow a cable provider could be liable if they accidentally send the money to the wrong place."

Manley: "Exactly."

Breen: "Isn't that right?"

Manley: "Yes."

Breen: "Yeah. Now, I see there was some small opposition because the certain municipalities apparently don't have an address list of their own addresses. Is that something you've heard?"

Manley: "Nobody has approached me. None of the opponents have approached me about this."

Breen: "Okay. Because it just seemed absurd that a municipality..."

Manley: "It seems absurd. I was going to use that word."

Breen: "Right."

Manley: "I'm glad you used it first."

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

Breen: "Well, and just that they wouldn't have their own addresses and then they're going to tag the cable companies for not giving them the money for their own addresses."

Manley: "Exactly."

Breen: "So, I'm very much in support of your Bill. I think it's a very measured and solid way of ensuring that municipalities get the moneys that they are owed in this process through their tax and franchise agreements. Thank you."

Manley: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Manley to close."

Manley: "Appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 3464 pass?'
All in favor will 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 116 voting 'in favor', 0 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 3464, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Leader Currie in the Chair."

Speaker Currie: "Thank you very much. It is my great honor to introduce to all of us Pedro de Morenés y Álvarez de Eulate, who is the Ambassador from Spain to the United States. He is accompanied by the Consul General who serves in Chicago and represents various other states in the Middle West, Federico Palomera. But let me just tell you a bit about the Ambassador. He spent many years in the ship building and maritime industry. He has many, many degrees. Starting in 2011, he became the Minister of Defense for the Spanish Government. And he's had so many awards I cannot tell you all of them or

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

we'd be here all day, but among the highlights would be the Grand Cross of Isabella Lacatomica from Spain and he is a Commander of the French Legion of Honor. So, it is my honor to introduce to you his Excellency Ambassador Eulate."

Ambassador Eulate: "Thank you very much. Thank you very much for your introduction. Honorable Congressmen, for me, as you can understand to speak to these chamber Representatives means something very important because not only is an Ambassador because a Spaniard to have the opportunity to speak in this chamber full of predecessors and people who fight for the good of the people. It is something that encourages me especially to say what I am going to tell you. For a Spaniard, the United States is a country in which we always came back. Since many years ago, many centuries, Spain was present here and Spain was helping this country in the times of the Revolution. And we are very proud to have that footprints in that important part of the history of your country, but also in the history of the world because since then your country has been the beacon for freedom, for peace, for fighting for the others in other countries. And I would like to say thank you here to the United States and to the people of Illinois that they have been and continue being involved in the... in the peace of the world and in the peace of all of us. So, that... that is something that I will like to start saying. But today, we have to speak about today and we are... Spain has changed the mentality that we had in the past years and we have decided to... to come again to the United States as cooperation with you... in the cooperation... sorry, with you in this stability of the world, I would like to tell you that

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

within NATO on... on the northern alliances at work that we are having with your country, we are today doing things in Afghanistan, in Iraq, in Turkey, in Africa, in the Atlantic Ocean, and next year we will be with the (unintelligible) also in the Pacific escorting one of your groups over the aircraft. And this means that not only that we consider you an ally and a friend. This means that Spain has changed from the mentality that we inherited for the recent past and we have decided to involve ourselves for responsibility and for gratitude, with all the with other countries in the world, that's why we are trying to build our world better for all of us. In... regarding the... the cultural of links, we are receiving in our country... and this is very important for us... we are receiving in our country many students from the United States, thousands of students from the United States. And this will create this world... a very important link for the future next... for the next generations. And this is something that for me that the verge of the 70 years, it is... it means something very important. I remember and I take advantage today before all of you to say that when President Kennedy was killed in Dallas in '73 [sic-'63], my father called the four brothers to his office and told us, whatever happens in the world you should be always with the American people. And this is something that I have done since then and I have done in... in my business and I have done as well in politics. When I joined the government in Spain in 1996, the Secretary of State for Defense and after that for Homeland Security. I visited this country and I can tell you this country helped us very much regarding a fight that we are having in those times against

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

the past terrorism of ETA. And this country there was a... I repeat, very helpful with all the state agencies and the government and I would like to say here, thank you for that help, which fortunately now this problem that we have then has finished and has finished... has finished the world. Spain today is... is an investor in the United States that for the sake... for the size of our country, it is ... I think it has changed from completely the mentality. We are investing... we have a stock of investment of more than... more than \$65 billion. We are employing 82 thousand high-qualified people in this country. And there are more than 600 companies... Spanish companies in this country. And we are very proud of that because the more we advance in these investments, the more we understand that even if this country's very efficient regarding quality, delivery the time, competition. Once you get your position here, your constituency in business here, you can present this to the whole world as a way of presentation card which is leading to... leading to success. In Illinois, we are employing 2,800 people and there are several companies, out of which and I would like to (unintelligible), (unintelligible) Technologies and (unintelligible) Energy, (unintelligible), (unintelligible), (unintelligible) U.S.A, (unintelligible) and Iberia our Airline. And all of them, which I will... I will meet tomorrow, all of them are happy to be in Illinois. But frankly, I think that we should do better here. And for that reason, I will meet your... your... I mean, the Governor to understand exactly what are the structures under which we have fiscal structures and also all the type of regulations that you have here in order to promote Illinois

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

in Spain. In fact, the way that we are living now while coming to this country and to spend... to spend our time, to spend our people, to hire people here, and to have a very good business. I think that not only the military or the political things are the most important things among country... or between the countries. I think that business is very important, creates a long-lasting gains and also with culture are granting a future of friendship. Today, where a friendship and union is more and more important to danger all over the world. I would like to tell you something about... about the other allies that we have in Spain, which are the European... allies the European Union. I would like to make a consideration regarding what something that we understand here and I mean, and in Europe that it is very important for both sides of the Atlantic. Today... today, we are investing in the European Union... as a whole, we are investing more money in this country and in this country... in the European countries. And this is something that is not to come here to be pretentious saying this. No, it is something that reflects the economies between both sides of the Atlantic and amounts... 50 percent of the economy of the whole world. And this is something that I... I would like to stress and to... and to bring to your thoughts because we should preserve something which is very important and is really important, not for Europe, not for the United States... is very important for both parts of the ... of the Atlantic. And we invest more money, we hire more people, and we buy more from you than you buy from us. And this is an idea that all the Ambassadors of the... of the European Union, we have decided to explain... to put the facts in the... in its real terms, no. We

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

are together as well preserving the values... values which this country has been... also I repeat a beacon for the last... for the last, I don't know, 70 or 100 years, since the very beginning of the Revolution, I would say. I think that the ... today our values, our principles, our system of the Democratic system, our freedom of... of any activity of human activities is put into question in the world. We should be very careful, and for me and I finish with that thanking you, thanking you for listening to me. I think that in the end... in the end, the only and the most important... the terrorists that we can present to people who are... to countries who are questioning our values, our principles, our friendship and our unity is precise to show unity to them. We should go and together and defend together what we... this ... what we believe it is our common heritage. And this common heritage many a part of that belongs to you. So, I offer from here this (unintelligible) formerly the oath... the compromise of Spain, our country, and of Europe as well, to fight together with the United States for that values. Thank you very much. I am very much honored to be here to see these comrades and all these people and thinking about all the wonderful and deep speeches that's happen from us from here. I only can say thank you again and count on Spain for whatever you want. Thank you very much."

Speaker Currie: "Thank you very, very much. His Excellency, the Ambassador, has graciously agreed to stand over here just outside the well so that the Members may greet him and have their pictures taken with him. Representative Turner back in the Chair."

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

Speaker Turner: "Members, going back to page 7 of the Calendar with Senate Bills on Third Reading, we have Senate Bill 3466 offered by Representative Davis. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3466, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Davis."

Davis: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 3466 is an effort to try to... to try to help students succeed. Often, there are truancy fines issued to students because, obviously, they're not... not in school. This is an effort to prohibit truancy fines from being levied against students. It doesn't mean that caregivers and others can't be fined by local police departments, but this is an effort to... to prohibit the levy of ... truancy fines against students. It's to ensure that families are not subject to truancy fines before also being offered support of services. In some municipalities throughout the state, children and caregivers are fined for truancy before they're given the opportunity to address the underlying causes. So A, it stops truancy fines from being levied against students, but it also does mandate that services are being offered to the families to help address the underlying causes of those truancy issues.

I'll be more than happy to answer your questions."

Speaker Turner: "This Bill is on the Order of Short Debate.

Representative Breen is recognized for two minutes."

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

Speaker Turner: "Move for Standard Debate will be granted."

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

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

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

Breen: "And Representative, I want to make sure I'm understanding your Bill correctly because it appears that it's changing current law by prohibiting a school district from referring a truant, chronic truant, or truant minor to any other local public entities, so that'd be police or a municipality or whomever, for that local public entity to issue a child a fine or fee as punishment for his or her truancy. So they... they can't refer at all if the other entity has the ability to issue a fine or a fee against the truant, chronic truant, or truant minor?"

Davis: "Your question is confusing, Representative. Can you..."

Breen: "Well, I'm trying to figure out..."

Davis: "Can you not speak lawyer... can you not speak lawyer to me and just..."

Breen: "Well, I'm reading your Bill."

Davis: "Okay."

Breen: "So, I'm reading your Bill and asking how is this changing current law, 'cause it looks like what it's doing is preventing school districts from reporting truancy to the appropriate legal authorities."

Davis: "Well, I won't... well, you say reporting. I spoke to actually levying fines against the students. So, it does prohibit levying fines against the students for truancy. And also, it prohibits that without offering services to the student and their families before you do that as well. But the families, or the caregivers, I'll use that term caregivers, are still eligible for fines if the local police department determines that is the case."

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

Breen: "So, under current law, you can fine a truant student and we would be changing that? Is that..."

Davis: "Yes, we would."

Breen: "Okay. So, I guess I'm looking at the analysis about prohibiting a school district from doing a referral, even, which seems... it just seems like an odd way to frame it."

Speaker Turner: "Representative, your time has expired. Can you please make your final remarks?"

Breen: "Did I get five minutes?"

Speaker Turner: "Only got two minutes."

Breen: "Isn't that Standard Debate? Standard Debate's five minutes."

Speaker Turner: "Standard Debate means we extend how many people can speak on... on each side."

Breen: "Well, okay. If someone else would yield me some time, 'cause I'm confused by this Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Batinick is recognized."

Batinick: "I yield my time to Representative Breen."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Breen for two additional minutes."

Breen: "Thank you. So, Representative, what your... your language says a school district may not refer one of these students to any other local public entity for that local public entity to issue a child a fine or fee. So, what you're saying is they can still refer the child, but the entity being referred to cannot issue a fine or fee. Is that what..."

Davis: "Well..."

Breen: "...that's what your language is trying to mean... trying to say?"

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

Davis: "But... but I also think what the language is also suggesting is that it also suggesting that services must be offered as well. So, maybe to your point about referral that services to try to address the underlying causes of truancy must also be provided as well. But it does suggest that the... that the student cannot be fined for truancy."

Breen: "Okay. Fair enough. As I, again, as the support services required, we are lifting a fine off of truant students prohibiting the referral of the truant student for fining by some other entity but you're allowed to refer the student for other corrective action or what have you?"

Davis: "Yes. That doesn't..."

Breen: "Okay."

Davis: "...stop the school district. Absolutely."

Breen: "Okay. Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Bryant for two minutes. Representative Will Davis to close."

Davis: "I ask for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 3466 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. And on a count of 77 voting 'in favor', and 39 voting 'opposed', and 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 3466, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 3489, Representative Guzzardi. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3489, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

- Speaker Turner: "Representative Guzzardi."
- Guzzardi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Members. This Bill pertains to the violent offender registry. There are some individuals who are on that registry who believe that they're on there in error. So, the Bill creates an appeals process by which those individuals can appeal their status on the registry. It's negotiated language with the State's Attorneys. There's no known opposition and it passed out of the Senate, I believe, unanimously. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Breen, this matter is on the Order of Short Debate and you're recognized for two minutes."
- Breen: "All right. But I asked you to move for Standard Debate, yet again. So..."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing the requisite number of hands, this order...

 this Bill will be moved to the Order of Standard Debate.

 You're recognized for two minutes."
- Breen: "Representative, I just wanted to check. Our analysis doesn't have a position from the State's Attorneys. What do they believe about your Bill? What's their position?"
- Guzzardi: "Oh, they're listed as proponents on our analysis. They were very involved in negotiating this language in the Senate and they're supportive of where we ended up."
- Breen: "And if you would briefly describe how this changes the existing practice of murderer of the… Murderer and Violent Offender Against Youth Registration Act."
- Guzzardi: "So, this is simply a process by which people who are on the registry can appeal their status there, because there are some people who believe that they've been placed on the

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

registry in error. So, this creates an appeals process by which they can seek reassessment of their status to make sure that they're there correctly."

Breen: "What's the current process if you're not on there appropriately?"

Guzzardi: "There isn't an appeals process currently so we're creating one."

Breen: "Fair enough. That does seem like a good Amendment to this particular registry, which is obviously not something that one wants to be on improperly."

Guzzardi: "Correct. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Guzzardi to close."

Guzzardi: "I ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you, Members."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 3489 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... Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 53 voting 'in favor', 65 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'... The Representative requests Postponed Consideration. Senate Bill 3503, Representative Cassidy. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3503, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Cassidy."

Cassidy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Today,

I present Senate Bill 3503, which is a very simple but
important step to allow parents full access to our... our
justice system. It simply requires that all court houses have
space available for lactation rooms so that nursing parents

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

are able to pump and express milk so that they can participate as jurors, or as attorneys, or witnesses. And I know of no opposition. It passed the Senate unanimously and I ask for your support."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 3503 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 111 voting 'in favor', 3 voting 'opposed', and 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 3503, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 3504, Representative Stewart. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3504, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Stewart."

Stewart: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 3504 is an initiative of Illinois Commerce Commission, and it's clean-up language to implement Public Act 100-286.

I'm aware of no opponents. It's a Senator Elgie Sims Bill and passed in the Senate 58-0. I'd ask for the House's support."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 3504 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 115 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', Senate Bill 3504, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed.

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

- Senate Bill 3509, Representative Hurley. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3509, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Hurley."
- Hurley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 3509 simply removes the ticket writing quota from the Chicago Police Department.

 I know of no objections. I'm here for questions and I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 3509 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 118 voting 'in favor', 0 voting 'opposed', and 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 3509, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby passed. Senate Bill 3532, Representative Wallace. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3532, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Take your time, Representative."
- Wallace: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the chamber. This is a Bill to create a task force. It was borne of a young woman who actually became very ill with sepsis. And so we would like to look at better ways to prevent this very deadly disease from being transmitted or going undetected and untreated."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 3532 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

- 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 111 voting 'yes', 3 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 3532, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 3547, Representative Chapa LaVia. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3547, a Bill for an Act concerning service members. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Chapa LaVia: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 3547 is an initiative of the Illinois Attorney General's Office. It consolidates numbers of executive orders to create the Illinois Service Member Employment and Reemployment Rights Act. I'll take any questions, Sir."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 3547 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 3547, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 3560, Representative Connor. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3560, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Connor."
- Connor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 3560 takes the existing Vendor Payment Program, or VPP, which is currently only in Rules, and turns it into a statutory Section. It also

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

expands the type of information about qualified purchasers and requires CMS to report on some additional information that wasn't currently in the program. Again, not a huge change and I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 3560 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 109 voting 'yes', 7 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 3560, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 3561, Representative Currie. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3561, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. The Public Building Commission in Chicago is in charge of construction of firehouses, school buildings, police stations. They've had for the last 10 years the opportunity to enter into designed-build contracts. All this measure does is give them another five-year period during which they can continue to operate in that fashion. I know of no opposition. I'd be happy to answer your questions. I hope I will have your support."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 3561 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 3561, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 3604, Representative Kifowit. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3604, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Kifowit."

Kifowit: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is an initiative of the Better Government Association. It passed unanimously in the Senate. It creates a Government Severance Pay Act, which means that if the state or boards, commissions, agency entering a contract for employment, and it contains severance pay, it needs to have an amount of limitation in the pay and it also has a provision for prohibiting severance pay when the worker has been fired for misconduct."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 3604 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 114 voting 'in favor', 1 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 3604, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 5 of the Calendar, we have Senate Bill 1851 offered by Representative Greg Harris. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1851, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Harris."

Harris, G.: "I believe there is an Amendment."

Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk."

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment 2 was assigned to committee."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Harris."

Harris, G.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I did not realize the Bill had gone to Third. Could we move it back to Second Reading for purposes of the Amendment?"

Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, please move this Bill back to the Order of Second Reading. Senate Bill 2407, Representative Hoffman. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2407, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Hoffman."

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

This would amend the Child Death Review Teams and make sure
that the Inspector General has the authority to appoint the
child death review members. We removed any issues with regard
to budgetary concerns. I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Breen is recognized."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor indicates they will yield."

Breen: "And Representative, I see on my analysis that DCFS remains opposed. Is that an accurate recitation?"

Hoffman: "I believe they are opposed, yes."

Breen: "Okay. It came out of committee, looks like on a partisan Roll Call, out of Human Services."

Hoffman: "I don't recall. If that's what the analysis says, it probably did."

Breen: "Yeah, 7 to 5, I think."

Hoffman: "Yeah."

Breen: "Yeah. All right. And the..."

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

Hoffman: "Can I... can I just say something?"

Breen: "Sure."

Hoffman: "In light of the recent activities and how DCFS has acted, I don't see why they would be opposed to this."

Breen: "I think you could make that statement about DCFS at almost any time over the past 10 or 15 years."

Hoffman: "That's fair."

Breen: "So, that's not really recent activity. So like, which ones?"

Hoffman: "Right."

Breen: "So, but either way. Okay. Let's move to Standard Debate if... Mr. Speaker, if we could go Standard Debate, if that's not on Standard Debate already. What would you say in terms of not believing that the OIG should replace the director in making appointments? Why is that necessary? What's wrong with the director of DCFS versus the OIG? Why does the OIG need to come in to a process where they don't necessarily have the expertise or necessary ability to do this... to run this council?"

Hoffman: "Well, I can just tell you where this comes from. I was the original Sponsor of the Child Death Review Teams that we would be able to learn from the tragedy of a child's death, that we would have multidisciplinary groups throughout the state. And the members of the child death review team from my area came up with this proposal. A gentleman by the name of Dr. Dan Cuneo, who has been one of the original members of the child death review team, I don't believe that the director..."

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

- Breen: "Just to be clear, Mr. Speaker, we're on Standard Debate, right? We're on Standard Debate? It was 7 to 5 out of committee."
- Speaker Turner: "You can make the Motion, but we'll move to Standard Debate."
- Breen: "Okay. Sure, I thought... figured it'd be there. Okay. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Bryant, you'd like to yield the rest of your time to Representative Breen? Representative Breen."
- Breen: "I believe... I believe Representative Hoffman was giving his history of the child death review team."
- Hoffman: "And what I was saying is the members of the child death review team don't believe that the director has been as responsive in... to their needs. And as directors come and go, each of them have different philosophies regarding the advisability of this multidisciplinary review. However, generally, the Inspector General is a more constant figure over there at DCFS."
- Breen: "Fair enough. And it says in our analysis that DCFS had offered language to the Child Death Review Team Executive Council to address the concerns of the department and that the child death review team does not need full access to the SACWIS System, which obviously is a pretty secure system. So, what's the answer to those objections?"
- Hoffman: "I wasn't... I don't believe that I received that proposed Amendment. And if I did, I apologize. I don't recall it."
- Breen: "And what about the concern about the SACWIS System because that's a..."

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

Hoffman: "Well..."

Breen: "...I mean, I think that's a concern. We don't want to have a lot of folks having access to that system."

Hoffman: "Well, I think that, number one, you are deemed to be...
have the information as confidential. We've had... I know of no
problems in the history of the child death review team where
members have dealt with the information inappropriately. For
them to make recommendations in order to avoid child's deaths
in the future, they need... they need access to information. I
don't believe that they're going to, any of them, intend to
use it inappropriately. They intend to review children's
deaths that are a tragedy and make recommendations for change
to avoid them in the future."

Breen: "And then, thank you, Representative. I know this is a very difficult topic. It's a intricate topic and one that, obviously, is a very serious subject matter. I just don't know that doing this against the department's... and what appears to be, it's looking like a partisan attempt, is the..."

Speaker Turner: "Final remarks, Representative."

Breen: "I don't know that a partisan attempt is the best way to do this. It would seem like we could come to a bipartisan compromise on this instead of doing it in a unipartisan way. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Wallace."

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

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

Wallace: "Throughout your presentation of the Bill, you noted the history of this task force and I want to commend you for what

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

- you've done in this regard. How many directors have we had of DCFS over the last several years?"
- Hoffman: "I, yeah... it's been a merry-go-round of directors. I can't tell you the exact number, but some have stayed for, you know, less than a few months, some have stayed for a year, but I think it's been five or six over the last several years."
- Wallace: "Absolutely. So, I... I can't recall either. I believe I might've read somewhere that it's upwards to nine in the last five years. How many Inspector Generals have we had in the last few years? Just a couple, I think, right?"
- Hoffman: "It's much more stable and they would be in place in order to ensure that the continuation of these teams are in place."
- Wallace: "Thank you. Again, thank you so much for bringing this Bill. I'll go to the Bill. I understand the concerns from the other side of the aisle, the idea that this is perhaps a partisan move. But we don't have time for partisanship when we're talking about the children of the State of Illinois, especially the children that we've decided to take into our care and place them in our foster care system. I believe that any and everything that we can do to bring stability to those children is important. And anything that we could do to bring stability to the department is important, especially where the death of a child is concerned. We've been charged to provide for them everything we say that their biological families cannot provide for them. And I think in the tragic event that one of them passes away, we..."

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

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

Wallace: "...we must also provide answers to their death. So, I commend the Sponsor. I encourage everyone to bring stability to this particularly tragic issue and vote 'aye'. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Bellock is recognized."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. We all care about the children in DCFS and we want to make that safe. In this case, DCFS, of which we have a new director that I think is doing a good job, they believe that the... they believe that the director should make the appointments and not the OIG, in this case. Two, additionally, we believe that there should not be open information to everybody on the death review team because there already is a staff member from DCFS that is aware of that information. This SACWIS System contains all the confidential information about the children, the families, every one of those cases. And in this Bill, that would open that up to everybody on the death review team. Not that we don't like that team, but DCFS believes that that information should remain confidential and yet there is a staff member on that Council that does know that information and can give that information upon request. But you're not opening up the entire SACWIS System, which I think everybody would agree, is confidential for the children and the families involved. And that's... those are the reasons why we have serious concerns about his Bill and voted 'no' on it."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Hoffman to close."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Really briefly, I believe that what the department is doing is just trying to throw a red herring into the discussion. Looking at what they have done in the past with regard to taking care of the children of

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

this state is reprehensible. And now, they want to avoid being able to do something that's going to allow experts in the field to make long-term recommendations to stop the future of children's deaths. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2407 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 77 voting 'in favor', 40 voting 'opposed', and
0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 2407, having received the
Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page
23 of the Calendar, under Total Vetoes, we have Senate Bill
193, offered by Representative Hoffman. Mr. Clerk, please
read the Bill. Representative Hoffman is recognized."

Hoffman: "Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 193, which passed the Illinois General Assembly, would provide that there would be units within the Illinois Attorney General's Office would be the Worker's Protection Unit and the Worker's Protection Task Force. It would ensure that laws concerning prevailing wage, employee classification, the minimum wage, the Day and Temporary Labor Services Act, and the Wage Payment and Collection Act would... if they're in violation of that, would give them the ability to investigate and give them the ability to move forward with prosecution of any violations. These... these Acts are to protect workers in the State of Illinois. This is an initiative of not only the Attorney General's Office but also all of organized labor in the State of Illinois. I ask for a Veto override."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Breen."

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

Breen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Inquiry of the Chair. What is our debate rule on this Veto override?"

Speaker Turner: "You may proceed, Representative."

"Okay. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, we saw this Bill before. We are in the midst of a... what appears to be a blatantly partisan power-grab to accumulate to the Attorney General's Office a power that it has never known in the history of this state. And so they could open the books and demand the opening of the books of any private business based on the Attorney General's belief, or even just a slight inclination, that someone might have violated the Prevailing Wage Act, the Employee Classification Act, the minimum wage law, the Day and Temporary Labor Services Act, Wage Payment and Collection Act with no check on the authority of that office. This is a grave violation of our separation of powers and our due process. This is absolutely something that we do not need or the Department of Labor to investigate claims, not... without need of an Attorney General to be empowered with broad authority to force businesses to open their books for an unlimited inquiry. We've seen at the federal level what happens when you have a government that runs amok, starts investigating its political opponents. There's nothing... nothing stopping this measure from allowing the same thing to happen here. There's nothing stopping an Attorney General down the line, Republican or Democrat, from looking into the affairs of a business that it is not fond of, or that may be politically unpopular at that particular time, or might've done something to them that they don't like or that their allies don't like. So, for that

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

reason, Ladies and Gentlemen, there is absolutely no need for this Bill. It is a horrendous, horrendous Bill that sends the wrong message to our business community. It sends the wrong message to our people. And it should be rejected soundly by this Body."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Ives."

Ives: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. This Bill is nothing more than the union harassment squad embedding themselves in the AG's Office. That's all it is. They're going to have their own special little task force that can go after any private business if it wants to, any nonunion business that it wants to, and it'll be fully funded by the Illinois taxpayer. That is outrageous. In an Attorney General who can... Office that cannot even go after public corruption correctly. The people who really deserve to have this type of a special unit inside the AG's Office are those people who want to protect the taxpayers' interest. So, those people who want answers when open meetings are violated, those people who want answers when FOIA law is violated around the state. Instead, what you're trying to do with this Bill is imbed instead public sector union dominance in our state, ahead of taxpayers. It's outrageous. It's absolutely outrageous that you would use the taxpayer money against the taxpayer and fund something like this. It's nothing more than a harassment unit. You have to vote 'no' on this. It's appalling. This Bill's appalling."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Keith Wheeler."

Wheeler, K.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Motion. Ladies and Gentlemen, we talk a lot of times about how Illinois does

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

things that are upside down when it comes to building a business climate in this state. This is a huge leap in the wrong direction. I know we've talked to this Bill when it was on the floor the first time and I spoke against it then, I'm speaking against it now. And I just want to emphasize that this is a really terrible Bill for small business in this state. Mr. Speaker, should this Motion receive the requisite number of votes, I request a verification."

Speaker Turner: "Members, a verification has been requested by Representative Wheeler. The Chair recognizes Representative Willis."

Willis: "Hi, Jay. Will the Sponsor yield, please?"

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

Willis: "Mr. Hoffman, this Bill does a number of things. It protects our workers. Is that not correct?"

Hoffman: "Yes. And let me just say to some of the previous speakers. Right now... right now in Illinois, the Prevailing Wage Act, the Employee Classification Act, the Minimum Wage Act, the Day and Temporary Labor Services Act, and the Wage Payment and Collection Act are not being enforced. There's not been proper investigation when there... when there are questions regarding the violation of these Acts. It has not be enforced and people are not getting their protections under these Acts. This simply says, the Attorney General has the ability to look into violations of these Acts and to make sure that they're being enforced. This is a worker protection Act and nothing more. That's what it's designed to do."

Willis: "Does it create a task force to do this?"

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

Hoffman: "Yes. It would... in conjunction with the establishment of the Workers Protection Unit within the office of the Attorney General, the legislation also calls for the creation of a Workers Protection Task Force with the same... its members, who will serve without compensation, would include the Attorney General, Assistant Attorney General, as appointed by the Illinois Attorney General, and elected State's Attorneys or their designees. The task force would elect a chairperson and it would look into worker protection laws to make sure that we are protecting the rights of workers in this state."

Willis: "So, earlier, you stated a number of things that you feel that... that need to be investigated to protect our workers: the Prevailing Wage Act, the Employee Classification Act, the minimum wage law, Day and Temporary Labor Services, and wage payment. Who is supposed to be doing that right now?"

Hoffman: "Well, currently, the Department of Labor has jurisdiction to do this. They are woefully understaffed and I'm not going to indicate that they're not doing it purposely, but the cases take an average of nearly nine months to resolve about two months longer than they did in 2010. If the case ends up going to hearing, resolving it could take well over a year. That doesn't help a person who hasn't been paid adequately. It doesn't help an individual who's not receiving the correct minimum wage, and it doesn't help workers in the state. I'm not being critical of them; I'm just saying that's how long it's taking. And this would address that issue by allowing the Attorney General to also investigate and prosecute these cases."

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

Willis: "So, we're not really creating anything brand new. We're just going and spreading out the authority to investigate laws that we already have on the books. Is that not correct?"

Hoffman: "That's correct."

Willis: "Okay. So, in that being, that means that we're actually just continuing to protect the workers throughout the State of Illinois. These workers do not need to be members of the unions, do they?"

Hoffman: "No, they don't."

Willis: "So, any worker throughout the entire state is given these protections, correct?"

Hoffman: "And I would say that if you are a member of organized labor, you have the protection of your organization and the grievance procedure, if one of these Acts are being violated. However, if you're not a member... and to the previous speakers, where I believe that they were wrong, if you're not a member of organized labor, you don't have the protection of that organization to advocate for you. So, the people who are not members of organized labor actually get this protection that they don't have as a result of being a member of the labor union."

Willis: "Okay. So, with that being said, this is actually a good Bill for all people that work throughout the state. It is not, as someone previously stated, a union protection squad or anything like that. It protects all workers throughout the state. With that being said, I would urge this Body to vote 'yes' on this Bill because this is a good Bill to protect all of our workers, to make sure that many of the Bills that we have passed bipartisanly across the aisle on protections for

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

our workers, whether they are state workers, private workers, whatever... if they're not being protected by these laws, that's a problem. This puts into place another mechanism to help protect that. And I would urge this Body to vote 'aye' on this. Thank you very much."

Hoffman: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative McDermed."

McDermed: "Mr. Speaker, I call the previous question."

Speaker Turner: "All in favor of the Motion say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'nays' have it and the Motion does not carry. Representative Lang is recognized."

Lang: "Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Turner: "Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Lang: "Mr. Hoffman, how are you today?"

Hoffman: "I'm good. You look very nice today, Representative."

Lang: "You're looking good from this angle, Sir. So, what's all the hubbub on this Bill? I've been off the floor for a second or two. What... what are they all so exercised about over there?"

Hoffman: "Well, some people believe, I guess, that this would hurt businesses. I would say to them that it doesn't hurt businesses to do things the right way, that pay the prevailing wage according to the law, that follow the law with regard to the minimum wage, that follow the Day and Temporary Labor Services Act, and the Wage Payment and Collection Act. Good, legitimate businesses do that. The ones that are... that don't are the ones that should be... that this Bill would penalize and enforce on behalf of workers."

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

- Lang: "So, was the original goal of your Bill to make sure that workers were protected and that agencies and employers were simply following the law?"
- Hoffman: "That's the only goal, not only the original one. It is the goal."
- Lang: "And so, would it be fair to say that those who have spoken against the Bill might be considered to be, oh, I don't know, anti-labor?"
- Hoffman: "Well, if tradition... if tradition and voting records were to be looked at, yeah."
- Lang: "And so, let me see if I understand your Bill correctly.

 This would allow the Attorney General to create a workers' protection unit to make sure the Prevailing Wage Act was being followed correctly. Is that... would that be correct, Sir?"
- Hoffman: "Yes. Currently, an investigation by the Department of Labor takes months, if not years. And when there's a backlog of those cases, then individuals who are working are not getting their proper pay. So, this would allow the Attorney General to also have, basically, a dual jurisdiction with the Department of Labor."
- Lang: "And so, this should also be the case for the Employee Classification Act, the Minimum Wage Law, and the Day and Temporary Labor Services Act, correct?"

Hoffman: "Yes, that's correct."

Lang: "As well as the Wage Payment and Collection Act?"

Hoffman: "Correct."

Lang: "And so, what this Bill does is provide an extra layer of protection and justice that's more efficient for the worker

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

who has a potential claim under one of these Acts. Is that right, Sir?"

Hoffman: "Yes, and it... this is an initiative of the Attorney General's Office. They indicated that they would use existing staff to do this work. It wouldn't cost any additional money. And it would make sure that the time period to investigate one of these types of violations would be shortened dramatically."

Lang: "So, when you raise the issue with representatives of the Department of Labor who are opposed to this and you said to them, you guys are taking too long, these workers are not getting appropriate justice in an efficient amount of time, what was the Department of Labor's response to you?"

Hoffman: "They just believe that the jurisdiction should remain with... solely with the Department of Labor. I disagree with them. You only have to look at this current Governor's attitude towards working families and his disdain for organized labor. When you appoint... and you are the Chief Executive, and then you appoint the head of the Department of Labor and you have an anti-working families vent and you use... and utilize working families as a bludgeon in order to get your way in the state, in your vision, that would mean that I think the Department of Labor as currently stands does not have the best interest of working people in mind."

Lang: "So, when you confronted the Department of Labor with the information that these cases were languishing and not getting completed and they asserted that they think that they should have the jurisdiction, not the Attorney General, what did they say? Did they... did they offer up some remediation plan

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

to do this more quickly? Did they say we're going to fix this, Representative? Did they say we'd like to work with the Legislature to ask for more tools, more employees, more opportunity to get this job done? Did they do any of those things?"

Hoffman: "Well, you always get the lip service. And as a matter of fact, in the Appropriations Committee when the Department of Labor was there, I indicated if they came to me and told me the number of hearing officers they needed in order to get rid of the backlog before the Department of Labor, I would personally sponsor the appropriations. I have heard nothing from them regarding that request."

Lang: "And none of that seemed to matter to the Department of Labor. Is that correct?"

Hoffman: "Well, if their actions are any indication, they don't seem to care too much."

Lang: "So, do you know, approximately, how long it's taking the Department of Labor to adjudicate these various types of cases?"

Hoffman: "It's my understanding with regard to wage enforcement cases, more claims are dismissed, 58 percent in 2014, up from 41 percent in 2010. The state doesn't track why these cases are dismissed but most are scrapped early before workers get a chance to have the merits of the cases weighed. In addition, cases now take an average of nearly nine months to resolve. That's two months longer that they did way back in 2010. If a case ends up going to hearing, resolving it could take well over a year. Even when workers win their cases before the Department of Labor, they might not get paid. Only about 1 in

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

10 of the nearly 500 cases that the Department of Labor forwarded to the Illinois Attorney General's Office for collection resulted in payment and collection could take years. So, what's happening is the bad actors, the bad employers, are just stretching out the case, making sure that it either goes away, they go out of business, and they then are not... the workers don't receive their fair compensation. This would ensure that we have another eye, another ear to the ground, making sure that these payment plans are enforced and prosecuted."

- Lang: "Representative, did I hear you say that only 1 in 500 of these claims that are filed results in payment to the worker?"
- Hoffman: "Yes. Only one in 1 in 10... 1 in 10 of the nearly 500 cases forwarded to the Illinois Attorney General for collection resulted in payment. One in ten of five hundred cases."
- Lang: "And often, particularly under prevailing wage when a contractor is doing work and being paid for by local government's money and they don't comply with prevailing wage, would it be fair to also say that when some of these claims are made, by the time they are adjudicated, some of those contractors are out of business?"
- Hoffman: "Yes. So, they could be a contractor in another state and then tracking them down and enforcing the claims is difficult at best. Let me just say this about the prevailing wage really quickly. We pay a contract, a state contract, based on the prevailing wage. When an employer is not paying their employees a prevailing wage, they are being unjustly

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

enriched because the state and local governments are paying in contracting based on the cost of the prevailing wage."

Lang: "Just briefly to the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I think Mr. Hoffman has made the case, again, as to why this Bill was appropriate when we passed it in the first place. The Department of Labor isn't getting the job done. The statistics show that. I would recommend a 'yes' vote on the Gentleman's Override Motion."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Ammons."

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

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

Ammons: "Thank you. I just wanted to clarify the purpose of the creation of this Worker Protection Unit and understand what it is that the Sponsor is attempting to do legislatively here."

Hoffman: "That's a question, Representative? Okay. Let me give you an example. Currently, the laborers, the Chicago Laborers... Chicago Area Laborers have 16 prevailing wage cases that remain open at the Department of Labor for over five years. The statute of limitations is a five-year statute of limitation under the Prevailing Wage Act. Therefore, if the Department of Labor doesn't refer these cases to the Attorney General's Office, the statute of limitations has run. This is very simple. We would allow the Attorney General's Office to investigate these Acts whenever the Prevailing Wage Act, the Employee Classification Act, the Minimum Wage Law, the Day and Temporary Labor Service Act, and the Wage Payment and Collection Act are violated because the Department of Labor, I don't believe, is doing its job."

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

- Ammons: "So, do you recall, Representative, one of the Bills that I worked on in last Session really was to deal with an aspect of this Bill which was the wage theft portion of that Bill. Would this unit be able to hear those kind of cases?"
- Hoffman: "Yes. I believe that that would be under the Wage Payment and Collection Act and they would... this unit would investigate and then the Attorney General could prosecute those cases."
- Ammons: "And in addition to the wage portion of that particular Bill, we also dealt with some aspects of unsafe working conditions. We did make some changes in the Bill that I sponsored but my understanding of this unit, if it were to be instituted, would give the Attorney General's Office a little more breadth to address additional safety concerns without a agency or organization having to come to the General Assembly to change one small provision in the compiled statutes. Is that what this would do?"
- Hoffman: "It would not only do that, but it'd also create a Workers Protection Task Force that would make recommendations to enforce issues that... such as were addressed in your Bill."
- Ammons: "And just to clarify... last question on this. The task force that would be initiated under this provision would follow all of the other appropriate appointment process of task force members. Is that correct?"
- Hoffman: "Yes. It's contained in the… in the Bill who would be working on the Workers Protection Task Force."
- Ammons: "Thank you so much, Representative Hoffman. I wanted to do… clarify into the Bill. I wanted to clarify a few questions as to what this unit would do and the provisions that it would meet. The important part, in my opinion, of us supporting a

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

piece of legislation like this and voting affirmatively for the override, is to ensure that incidents that may come up as a result of working in any particular field under labor or manufacturing or any other place where there are some concerns of safety, that the work could be addressed by this task force in connection with business owners, in connection with Legislative Members, in connection with legal representation from the Attorney General's Office. And so, this is just simply good government. And in that case, I urge a strong vote of 'aye' in support of this override. And really thank Leader Hoffman for taking this initiative because we work so hard to get some of these provisions in some of the Bills that many of our Members have had. And this becomes a comprehensive look at workers' rights and workers' protection and I think it's a positive step forward. Thank you so much."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Fine."

Fine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In reading the Governor's Override, it almost seems like he was very concerned with the fact that this might overwork the Attorney General's Office. And there were a number of fiscal notes that were filed and found inapplicable. Mr. Hoffman, I was wondering if you could walk me through these fiscal notes and talk a little bit about why they're inapplicable and how the Attorney General's Office would actually be able to participate in this without putting undue burden upon them."

Hoffman: "Yeah..."

Fine: "Go ahead."

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

Hoffman: "Were you finished, Representative? I'm sorry, Representative."

Fine: "So, for example, there was a balanced budget fiscal note that was filed and they said that the balanced budget note does not apply to this Senate Bill as it is not a supplemental appropriation. Could you elaborate on that a little bit how this would not change what is done in the balanced budget with the Attorney General's Office?"

Hoffman: "Well, I don't believe the Balanced Budget Note Act applies to the Senate Bill as it is not a supplemental appropriation that increases or decreases the appropriation. Under the Act, a balanced budget note must be prepared only for Bills that change a general fund appropriations for the fiscal year in which a new Bill is enacted. And with regard to the fiscal impact, the Attorney General has indicated that this will have no additional fiscal impact. They would use existing employees to do the investigation and existing employees to do the prosecution."

Fine: "Thank you. There was also a judicial note filed that was also found to be inapplicable and this is on our analysis that is found on the computer as well."

Hoffman: "And that's because this would neither increase nor decrease the number of judges that are needed in the state. And according to the Attorney General's Office, in other cases where they have similar powers of duties, when they investigate and inform the business of their investigation and the findings of their investigation, the businesses remedy the current problem and the need for a suit is negated."

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

Fine: "So, this would almost be a double protection for the worker. Is that right?"

Hoffman: "Well, yes. Unfortunately... I would like to say it would be a double protection. Unfortunately, I don't believe the Department of Labor is doing an adequate job protecting initially. So therefore, it would be... the protection would be given to the worker through the Attorney General's Office because the current Department of Labor, in my view, is not protecting workers here in Illinois."

Fine: "So, how would this better protect the workers?"

Hoffman: "Well, what it would do is it would give the investigative power... an additional investigative power, to the Attorney General, to then try and remedy the violations of the acts that we talked about earlier. They could then... if they found that there is an infringement, they would notify the business and most times, as in other cases that they investigate and enforce, the business would then remedy the situation. If they don't, then they would take an action against that business."

Fine: "So, the goal of this legislation is to remedy what could've been an issue for workers. Is that correct?"

Hoffman: "Yes."

Fine: "Thank you. I'd like to thank you for bringing this Veto Override forward. I think it's very important that the Attorney General's Office steps in and gives us the protection we need for the workers in the State of Illinois."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Phillips."

Phillips: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think if... To the Bill, Sir. If we keep going down this route, the way we do it in Illinois...

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

I've been here, like, almost four years now. We're not going to really need the Department of Labor. They're not going to have a job. It's amazing that so few can affect so many people's lives. And if we could just get out of the way, labor and business people could work together and create jobs. For example, just two miles down the road, I've got a job going on where we put our money where our mouth is. We have three sets of union people working on our job. We just met with them and we work it out. And that's the way it should be. And if this Body would just get out of the way, you'd see jobs grow in Illinois. But unfortunately, we do this stuff. I think the challenge is, Mr. Speaker, what would really be nice is if we could stop, sit back, and see how many of us would like to create jobs and actually get out there and work and see what these guys do for a living. The rank and file of these people, they want to work. They want a place to show up. That's all they want, the respect of a job. But we, in Illinois, stifle job growth. And you know who stifles the job growth, Mr. Speaker? This House. For God's sakes, when will we stop doing that and give the people of Illinois real jobs? That's what we do. I'm working with union people. I'm a Republican. I like it. Let's do that for once. Mr. Speaker, I urge us. Let's get out of the way of the Illinois worker and let's put them to work. Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Wehrli."

Wehrli: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to yield my time to Representative McDermed."

Speaker Turner: "Recognizes Representative McDermed."

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

McDermed: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. We've heard a lot of interesting things here today about how workers in the State of Illinois are going to be a lot better off if this Bill passed. Ladies and Gentlemen, this Bill is nothing but a political ploy. How do we know that? We know that because they've said that it takes no new money to do this. Well, we know that's not true 'cause the Attorney General's Office can't even do the work that it has right now. We know that because, oh, they don't prosecute any political fraud or corruption in one of the most corrupt states with one of the most corrupt cities in the entire country and they don't even do it. So, we know they don't have the resources to do that. And now we're going to create a whole new unit to protect workers? Where are they going to get the people to do that? What are they going to take it away from? Are they going to take it away from Environmental Enforcement, one of their main duties, something which in fact they do carry out at this time? Well, I certainly hope not because all the environmental matters that they handle take a very long time to reach conclusion because, guess what? They don't have enough resources. How do I know this? Because quarry owners who are using so-called clean construction debris are in fact being prosecuted for putting dirty construction debris in their quarries and it takes years, and years, and years for the Attorney General to get rid of these bad actors. So, don't believe anything about how this isn't going to cost any money and they have plenty of resources to do it. If fact, workers will be better... will not be better off. They will be much worse off because this office is already too far extended,

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

already doesn't carry out its statutorily mandated duties. This is a bad Bill. It's a complete political charade. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Hoffman to close."

Hoffman: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I would just say to the previous speakers, I represent... or respect you greatly for your service. But to say that this side of the aisle doesn't care about job creation, to say that we don't care about job growth is absolutely wrong. All we care about is making sure when we create jobs that we don't screw the worker. That's it. That's it. So, to say in any way that this is against job creation and job growth is absolutely wrong. It is wrong. The Department of Labor is not doing its job; it's not enforcing the laws that are on the books. And we want the Attorney General to be able to do that, to be fair to workers, to make sure they're paid fairly, make sure that people that work on Temporary Day Labor are treated fairly. That's wrong? That's against job creation? I say that's B.S. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Members, a verification has been requested by Representative Keith Wheeler. Please be at your seat to vote your switch. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 193 pass, the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding'? This Motion requires 71 votes. This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 67 voting 'in favor', 49 voting 'opposed', and 0 voting 'present', this Motion, having failed to receive the

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

required Three-fifths Majority, is declared failed. Mr. Clerk, House Resolution 1144, offered by Representative Spain."

Clerk Bolin: "House Resolution 1144. Be it

RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ONE HUNDREDTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that we join the many friends and fans of the Dunlap Lady Eagles in congratulating them for winning the 2018 Girls' Class 2A Track & Field State Championship and we wish them continued success."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Spain."

Spain: "Thank you so much, Speaker and Members of the House of Representatives, and thank you for the debate we just had. We now turn to one of our other favorite traditions, which is the opportunity to welcome and celebrate state champions here in the great State of Illinois, here in this very special House chamber. In the Speaker's Gallery, it is an honor for us to be joined by the 2018 Girls Track and Field 2A State Champions, the Dunlap Lady Eagles. They defended their 2017 state championship and repeated their great success. In fact, they dominated this year by such a strong margin they scored a total of 102 points. The first track and field team in our current system to score more than 100 points. Ladies and Gentlemen, we're so proud of our young student athletes, the role models that they are here for all of us. Please, let's give a very warm Springfield welcome to the 2018 State Championship Dunlap Lady Eagles. Congratulations."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you. Congratulations, and welcome to your Capitol. Representative Spain moves that the House adopt

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

House Resolution 1144. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. On page 12 of the Calendar, under Senate Bills on Second Reading, we have Senate Bill 2808, offered by Representative Demmer. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2808, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. The Bill was read for a second time previously.

No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read Senate Bill 2808."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2808, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Demmer."

Demmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 2808 is an initiative of the Alzheimer's Association to provide for Alzheimer's disease and related dementia services curriculum to be completed by folks who provide those kind of services. I know of no opposition and ask for your support."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Carroll."

Carroll: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

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

Carroll: "Thank you very much. Can you just add me to the Bill, Sir? Thank you."

Demmer: "Absolutely. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2808 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On the count of 111 voting 'in favor', 0 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 2808, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2858, Representative Greg Harris. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2858, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. The Bill was read for a second time previously.

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

 No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 2858. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2858, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Greg Harris."

Harris, G.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill is an initiative of Treasurer Mike Frerichs and it really gives us a number of benefits as a state at this time. This Bill would establish a procedure by which the Comptroller could borrow money directly from the Treasurer of Illinois. We... this would allow us to pay down \$1 billion in back bills that we still hold on our accounts. Plus, it would have the benefit of earning the state money on the interest at both ends of the transaction. The Treasurer, by purchasing this debt from the Comptroller's Office, would be earning more in the interest rate markets than it is currently earning with its private investments. And on the Comptroller's side, we would be saving substantial money because the rate of interest that we would be paying the Treasurer would be far

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

below the market rates. Current projections show that, given the market conditions as they exist today, the State of Illinois would be making between 35 million and 100 million dollars a year in additional GRF revenue through this type of transaction. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Breen."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Breen: "And then are we on... an inquiry of the Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "The Bill is on the Order of Short Debate."

Breen: "Well, we ought to move to Standard Debate then, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing the requisite number of hands for a Standard Debate, this Bill will be moved to Standard Debate."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Breen: "Very good. Representative, just so the folks understand what your Bill does, the idea is that the Treasurer has a lot of money, and he's got somewhere between 11 to 14 billion dollars at any particular time."

Harris, G.: "Yes."

Breen: "Now, a lot of that money is dedicated to various purposes, cash flow, and all of that. But what the Treasurer is looking to do here is to take, on average, about a half billion or a billion and instead of investing it, he's got to invest the money, instead of putting it in a local bank, he would do an agreement with the Comptroller to actually pay off some of our back bills. And so they get a little higher rate of return, so say three and a half percent instead of the two

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

percent at the bank, and then the bills would get paid. So, we would save money as a state. That's... that's what you're trying to do, right?"

Harris, G.: "That's one portion of the transaction, and on the other end, the Treasurer would actually be earning more interest on those investments than it's... they are currently earning in the marketplace."

Breen: "Right. And one of the questions someone put to me was, well, why doesn't the Treasurer just pay off, you know, use all of his money to just pay off all the bills right away?"

Harris, G.: "Right. Because while these funds exist as a pool of investable cash that the Treasurer holds, much of that money belongs to and is owned by the Special Funds of the State of Illinois and could not be just used to pay down bills from other funds."

Breen: "Right. And in fact, I think some of them are in the Road Funds, so they would..."

Harris, G.: "Yes."

Breen: "...be constitutionally prohibited from being moved.
Others..."

Harris, G.: "Yes."

Breen: "...are in funds that would require a fund sweep from us, the General Assembly."

Harris, G.: "Yes."

Breen: "So there are constraints on this."

Harris, G.: "Yes."

Breen: "And the process, as it was described to me, it's an intergovernmental agreement in about 50 or 100 million dollar

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

- tranches between the Comptroller and the Treasurer to get this done. Is that... that's it?"
- Harris, G.: "Right. And just as in the same way today, the Treasurer makes investment decisions of different lengths and amounts, depending on their cash flow needs as they project them to be."
- Breen: "Okay. And then just so that I..."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative, can you make your final remarks?

 It looks as if Representative Keith Wheeler will yield his time as a second opponent to you. So, you may continue for two more minutes."
- Breen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So again... again, Representative, so the idea is... and I understand that there may be some opposition from the Governor's Office. Can you explain the nature of the opposition?"
- Harris, G.: "Actually, no one has come to me and spoken about opposition. There may very well be, but it has not come to me personally. It may have come to the Comptroller, or the Treasurer, or somebody."
- Breen: "Fair enough. Fair enough. And as I understand the current practice, the Treasurer has essentially plenary authority within statutory constraints to do the investing for the State of Illinois."
- Harris, G.: "Yes."
- Breen: "So, this is really just an extension of his... I mean, it's within his authority currently. We're just allowing him now, or we're creating this package that he can now invest in."
- Harris, G.: "And to set up a framework that would give legal authority to be sure that the transactions were done

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

appropriately, that would require the rates to be tied to things like LIBOR or Federal Funds so that there would be some standards involved."

Breen: "And just..."

Harris, G.: "So, a lot of the details, again."

Breen: "And just to be clear about the Comptroller's authority. Comptroller has plenary authority to structure our bill payments. So, she can pay or not pay as she sees fit. So, this is not changing anything about the timing or spacing of bill payments, just allows a little more money into the pot that can then allow for bill payment."

Harris, G.: "Yes. This is why I think this is such a good idea because there's a win for everyone at each of the three steps of the transaction."

Breen: "Okay. And then how much are your savings to the State of Illinois each year, you estimated?"

Harris, G.: "If you're using currently available market rates, if you were to invest \$500 million in this program, the savings this year would be about 35 million on the low end, if you were doing it very conservatively. If we had invested the full billion, we would've made \$100 million in that for the state."

Breen: "Okay. Thank you, Representative. To the Bill. I understand there were concerns. I think some of those concerns have been obviated by the Amendment and so I will be supporting the Bill but I'd be looking forward to hearing the rest of the debate."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative David Harris, two minutes."

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And a question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Harris, D.: "Representative, under the current Prompt Payment Act, what's our rate of interest that we pay?"

Harris, G.: "Depending on the type of bill, it's 9 or 12 percent."

Harris, D.: "Well, Prompt Payment Act, I believe, is 12 percent."

Harris, G.: "Twelve is prompt and then there's a..."

Harris, D.: "Under the... under the Timely Payment Act..."

Harris, G.: "...Timely Payment Act is 9."

Harris, D.: "...is 9 percent. So, here, the Treasurer would in essence be charging the State of Illinois roughly 3 and a half percent, correct?"

Harris, G.: "Yes."

Harris, D.: "So, those individuals under the Vendor Payment Program that are now collecting the interest, they let the vendor... they pay the vendor, and then they collect the interest on that money. They're collecting 12 percent. Great deal for them, right? Here, we're cutting the interest rate from either 12 or 9 percent to 3 and a half percent. Do I understand that right?"

Harris, G.: "That's correct."

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

Harris, G.: "And right now, the current state investment yield is
 about two percent..."

Harris, D.: "Right."

Harris, G.: "...so we'd be almost doubling the amount that the state is earning."

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

Harris, D.: "And when we borrowed money in the bond market most recently, we paid 4 and a half percent, correct? Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen, to the Bill. Some on my side of the aisle might think this is an expansion of authority for the Treasurer, and it is, and because it's a Democrat Treasurer we shouldn't ... we should look a stance at this Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm here to tell you this is one of the most creative and innovative programs to save money that has ever come before the House, in my opinion. What they're doing here is indeed lowering the interest rate that we, the State of Illinois, have to pay on these outstanding bills from either 9 percent to 12 percent... and 12 percent down to 3 and a half percent. And we paid \$800 million in interest alone last year. That's money that the taxpayers had no benefit of other than to pay interest. This Bill is absolutely the right idea. And I congratulate the Treasurer for thinking of this innovative... innovative approach and I hope you'll vote..."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Ives for two minutes."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Ives: "First of all, I'd like to state that this actually is not a new idea. It was actually suggested that, what are we doing with the \$14 billion that the Treasurer controls? This was actually in a question mark as to whether or not we should use it to pay down back bills. This whole concept was put into the public's fear well over a year ago by a guy named Mark Glennon who runs the Wirepoint site. So, this is not a

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

new concept. It's all in how it's executed and what happens. So, to that degree, I have a couple of questions. First of all, why are we not doing just a direct payment to pay down bills? Why are we instead making the Treasurer himself part of the Vendor Payment Program instead of just saying, here you go, Comptroller, you've got a billion dollars to pay down some of the bills? Why instead are we taxing ourselves, so to speak, or collecting interest from ourselves instead of a direct payment?"

- Harris, G.: "Okay. Yeah Representative Ives, I think if you look through the original Bill, it did provide for the Treasurer to give the Comptroller money to pay down specific invoices. Under the Wirepoint article that appeared, and I think the procedure of this in place, under the Amendment that was adopted and now becomes the Bill, is just what you said it is. The Treasurer provides 500 million or a billion dollars, whatever the agreed tranche is, directly to the Comptroller as a payment, which is then used to reduce obligations of the state."
- Ives: "Okay. So, there won't be sort of a, the dog chasing the tail thing with... inside it. Okay."
- Harris, G.: "No. I think everyone is asking that idea got into the public's fear. People believed that was... it was a better way to go so that is what the Amendment adopted in committee does."
- Ives: "Okay. And then what specifically are these... what specific
 funds are being used within the Treasurer's discretion?"
- Harris, G.: "Let's see..."

Ives: "I'm just trying to get this straight."

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

Harris, G.: "Sure."

Ives: "So essentially, every year we've done fund sweeps to pay
 for it. So..."

Harris, G.: "So, there are three... there are three restrictions..."

Ives: "Okay."

Harris, G.: "...in the Bill. One is that..."

Speaker Turner: "Please make your final comments."

Harris, G.: "Health Insurance Reserve Fund and three litigation funds under the AG are not allowed to be used in these transactions."

Ives: "Okay. Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Pritchard, do you rise in support of opposition of this measure?"

Pritchard: "In favor."

Speaker Turner: "We've already heard from three in support of this measure. Representative Greg Harris to close."

Harris, G.: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. And thank you for the very good comments. I mean, this is actually, you know, an incredible piece of legislation where with this vote we can pay down \$1 billion of the backlog of bills, \$1 billion of about the 7 billion that is outstanding. That's a huge percentage. And in the process, we can earn \$100 million in interest income, which the state would not have otherwise had. So, this is a tremendous win for everybody. I would ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2858 pass'?

All in favor vote 'aye'; 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

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

count of 115 voting 'in favor', 0 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 2858, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Chair recognizes Representative Jimenez. Chair recognizes Representative Breen."

Breen: "Thank you, Speaker. Inquiry of the Chair. I... or Speaker. I understand our Standard Debate rules are five minutes, three speakers or we kind of have a little bit of a hybrid version that we use where we allow for unlimited speakers, but we limit them to two minutes. I noticed we did the three limit and two minutes in the last debate, which I don't believe is comporting with the rules."

Speaker Turner: "Three minutes and two minutes?"

Breen: "I'm sorry, Sir. Three speakers, two minutes is not within the rules. So, three speakers, five minutes is our minimum on Standard Debate. Again, or we have this modified version where we just do two minutes for everybody. Either, one of the other, we're fine with. We just didn't want to get limited on that in the furthest."

Speaker Turner: "So, the difference in Short Debate versus Standard Debate is the number of speakers that are recognized on each side, whether in opposition or in support of the measure. The time is at the call of the Chair."

Breen: "I would respectfully request that we look at the rule book again and I don't have the rule right in from of me, but I can get it. It's 3 for 5, so 15 minutes total or again, we had our modified version where we just let folks go for 2 minutes per. And we can look at the rule again; I just want

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

to make it clear for our future debates. Not that we're trying to extend things. We all want to go home, but certainly."

Speaker Turner: "On page 15 of the Calendar under Postponed Consideration, we have House Bill 4165. Representative Greg Harris."

Harris, G.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a matter we have heard before. This has to do with proposed changes in laws and regulations in Washington D.C. that would allow states to opt into reducing protections in health insurance for their constituents. There are proposals moving forward in Congress now that would allow states to apply for waivers to waive the protections for people with preexisting conditions. And it would also allow states to waive coverage of things like maternity care, behavioral health care, and pharmacy benefits for people with private insurance. There are also provisions that would allow states to waive certain parts of the Medicaid Program requirements. Currently in Illinois, all these waivers may be applied for unilaterally by the Governor of Illinois. What this Bill would do is say that before any waiver is sent to Washington that would reduce the health coverage for people in either private insurance or in the Medicaid Program, if we were to take away existing benefits from our citizens who have health insurance, whether through a health insurance exchange, a private business plan, or Medicaid, that the General Assembly would have to pass a Resolution to support that reduction in benefits. I would appreciate an 'aye' vote." Speaker Turner: "All right. This Bill is on the Order of Short

Debate. The rules that we will be using for Short Debate are

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

- one in... two in opposition and one in favor, including the Sponsor, for two minutes. Representative Breen is recognized for two minutes."
- Breen: "And thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move for a Standard Debate under House Rule 52 (a)2."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing the requisite number of hands, this Bill will be moved to the Order of Standard Debate and the rules for Standard Debate will be two proponents, including the Sponsor, three opponents, five minutes apiece."
- Breen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Inquiry of the Sponsor."
- Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor indicates that he will yield."
- Breen: "And Representative, I wanted to check into this. The...
 your Bill impacts 1115 waivers, correct?"
- Harris, G.: "It would. Future ones, not... it would affect 1115 waivers in the future. This has no affect on the one just granted to the State of Illinois."
- Breen: "Okay. It just... it prohibits the state for in any way reducing or eliminating any protection or coverage in effect on January 1, 2017, for any individual anywhere in the state. Right? Any protection, anything at all can't be... cannot be reduced?"
- Harris, G.: "Well, no. It could be reduced but what this Bill does... the Governor has no unilateral authority to do that. We, as the Representatives of the people, would have the opportunity to vote 'yea' or 'nay' on whether to submit a waiver that would reduce health care benefits for people in Illinois. So, we'd have to look at our communities and decide do we want to vote to, you know, reduce their health care coverage or not, but it would allow us to have a voice."

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

Breen: "To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, there was a reason that we didn't vote for this the first time through. It's 'cause it's a very bad idea. And the idea that somehow this General Assembly should be consulted every time for an actual vote on an 1115 waiver, which we had just celebrating... we just celebrated having makes no sense. And even with the most recent 1115 waiver, it's taking some percentage of our Medicaid money and using it for a different purpose. Well, the department might need, in a future 1115 waiver, to alter a benefit that folks didn't necessarily need. And certainly, you're freezing the benefits in time as of January 1, 2017, as if that was a magical date, you know. It was the date just before Donald Trump took office. And I know that, you know, for some Democrats, that is a magical date and a magical time and they've kind of, you know, aren't living in the, you know, mid-2018s yet. But for the rest of us, health care flexes, healthcare needs of our state move. We also still have a terrible issue with fiscal management and fiscal discipline and that is something that we should not be restricting the ability of the state to flex back and forth without having to come to what has been a pretty dysfunctional General Assembly. I don't think we want to see that the horse trading that goes on in this General Assembly tying the hands of the Executive Branch. There's no need for that restriction. It's not provided under Federal Law and there's really... I don't know if that many other states, if any, that have this law in place. There's a reason that all of the relevant agencies oppose it. It's just not a good idea. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

- Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Bellock for five minutes."
- Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I think we already... well, excuse me. Representative Harris, can I ask you a question? So, we've already voted 'no' on this Bill once before, correct? Is this on Postponed?"
- Harris, G.: "There was a vote earlier. It is now in Postponed Consideration. But I just want to point out something that the previous speaker said that's just totally incorrect. Illinois is not an outlier in trying to do this. Illinois is an outlier because we are one of the few states that does not require the Legislature to vote already on taking away health care benefits from its citizens. So, by approving this measure, we would fall in line with the majority of other states in this country."
- Bellock: "Okay. But on... so, going back to what originally, if... say like regarding the expansion, all right, with the Affordable Care Act. So then, we... that would be a change..."
- Harris, G.: "That would be a change..."
- Bellock: "...and we would not be able to make that change?"
- Harris, G.: "Certainly, they would be able to change... make a change to expand. But for instance, if we... if there were an opportunity to take away protections for people with preexisting conditions, or to reduce maternity benefits, or pharmacy benefits, or mental health benefits, we would have to vote as a Legislature on taking those benefits away."
- Bellock: "I see. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I still find that it takes away... I think, it slows up the process. It takes away some of the flexibility that we have by mandating this

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

into statute. And therefore, I would suggest that we still be a 'no' on this Bill even though I totally respect Representative Harris for all the work that he has done. I work with him, but on this issue, I think that there's still some problems with this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Andersson is recognized for five minutes."

Andersson: "You didn't ask me if I was a proponent or an opponent."

The answer is I don't know. A question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Andersson: "Representative Harris, does this have any sort of a sunset clause? Sun..."

Harris, G.: "It does not."

Andersson: "It does not, so this is permanent?"

Harris, G.: "Yes, like many of the laws we pass."

Andersson: "Like most of the laws that we pass, right? And my understanding is, I rather wish that it didn't have the words Affordable Care Act in it. I mean, really what you're doing is, it's not so much about the Affordable Care Act as it is shifting from the Executive to the Legislative Branch the ability to apply for waivers with the Federal Government, correct?"

Harris, G.: "Yeah. And it just so happens that the place where the protections for people with preexisting conditions came from and where the requirements for coverage for mental health, substance abuse, maternity care, and pharmacy benefits came from happen to be within the Affordable Care Act. So, that's the only reason it's mentioned."

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

- Andersson: "Indeed, but at the same time, what I think I... I remember the debate on this Bill the last time. And it..."
- Harris, G.: "No. You're absolutely right. This is just about, you know, who makes the decision..."

Andersson: "Right."

- Harris, G.: "...about the health care of our folks. Should we have that obligation or do we want to cede it to whoever the Governor may be to make an irrevocable decision with the Federal Government, over which we have no control. I think that as a Member of Legislature, we should have a say in that process."
- Andersson: "And in fact, that say would allow us to vary all of this. It would allow us to go for a Medicaid waiver. And correct me if I'm wrong, but let's take the 1115 waiver that we just successfully got, I believe that started before... the application process started before I was a State Representative. So, this isn't like a flexing and moving that is quick and rapid. This... all these waivers take years, correct?"
- Harris, G.: "It did. And the 1115 waiver, in its previous incarnation under Governor Quinn, there was a lot of objection to that waiver as he proposed it. It never moved forward. Now, when Governor Rauner came with the 1115 waiver now on behavioral health, I think everyone in this Body and, you know, people across the state said this is good and it went off to Washington and now it's been accepted and is being implemented because people genuinely believe it would help the system."

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

Andersson: "Thank you. To the Bill. Here's... I've decided. I'm going to support this Bill and the reason I'm going to support this Bill is that the concept is good. I trust the Legislative Branch. I trust it more than the Executive, whether it's a Republican or a Democrat there. I think that we do a good job of debate and deliberation. This isn't something that moves on a dime. These waivers do take years to go into account. This sort of a Bill grants us that ability to make those informed decisions. The previous debate last time seemed to focus around, do you like the Affordable Care Act, or do you like Donald Trump, or do you like Republicans or Democrats. It became... it became something that the Bill wasn't. The Bill is very simple. It does one thing. It gives us, the Legislative Branch, the power to decide about waivers. I think that's a good thing. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Oh, and I yield my... can I yield the balance of my time? Can ... "

Speaker Turner: "To another... to another proponent? We've heard from two proponents and two opponents at this time."

Andersson: "I think he doesn't know. I think he might be a 'yes'.

Yeah, he's an opponent. Never mind."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Demmer."

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

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

Demmer: "Representative Harris, a couple of years ago, we passed a measure in this... in this Legislature to expand the population who's eligible for enrollment in Medicaid as a part of the Affordable Care Act. In that legislation, there was a trigger that indicated that should the Federal Government's Match Rate for the expansion population ever

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

fall below 90 percent, that that population would no longer be eligible for Medicaid enrollment in the State of Illinois. Given that a change like that in the population would require a waiver, and that would be a reduction under the definition of this Bill, would the Legislature have to first approve a waiver to do what's automatically triggered by a statute we previously passed?"

Harris, G.: "First off, Representative, I'm not sure that it requires a waiver. I think that the action in the Bill you're talking about was should the reimbursement rate drop below a certain percent; at that point, the Legislature would have to vote up or down on whether to continue to extend to the expanse in population. We would probably have to file a State Plan Amendment, if my memory serves me."

Demmer: "And I appreciate that answer. I think this points to one of the problems that I run into with this legislation. To the Bill. We do a lot of actions in the General Assembly and sometimes we put in trigger language that says that in the event of a certain circumstance happening that a law may be repealed, it may be amended, it may change some of the definitions, or some of the terms may change. This legislation we have here today is a block in that process. So, I think that there's a chance, a very real chance that a legislation like this could contradict action the Legislature has already taken. Legislation that was, you know, language that was crafted as a part of working out a significant expansion of the Medicaid population. So, I think before we say that the Legislature is going to stand in the way of any kind of change that happens, we have to think about first what changes we've

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

required or changes we've empowered various departments to make. I think that we have a way of dealing with this already. We can enact legislation that directs agencies to do anything we'd like. To put us in a place that we have to say for any kind of change to a waiver the Legislature has to approve it, I believe doesn't respect the separation of powers; and therefore, I urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Greg Harris to close."

Harris, G.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. Thank you to all those who rose in debate for or against. You know, just a couple of things I just want to emphasize here. You know, from what the last speaker said, I think, yeah, he's absolutely right. We are going to be confronted with a decision in the Legislature about that issue as a regular course of business that we have to vote on. I don't believe it would be impacted by this waiver legislation. But what this does is it gives us, as Legislators, a chance to say either 'yes' or 'no' to a waiver before it's submitted to the Federal Government. Once those waivers are submitted regarding health care, they leave our control as a state and we could see a reduction in maternity benefits, pharmacy benefits, or mental health and substance abuse benefits, over which we had no control. So, I think it's appropriate for us to at least have an opportunity, as almost every other state in the union does to have the Legislature vote on these issues, before a waiver is submitted to the Federal Government. It's what we were elected to do and I'd sure like to be able to, you know, have that authority in this Legislature. I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 4165 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 67 voting 'in favor', 48 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. House Bill 4165, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Currie in the Chair."

Currie: "Thank you, Members. It is my great pleasure to introduce to you Hong Lei, who is the Consul General in Chicago for the Country of China. He covers nine states, but as we all know, Illinois is the most important one. And before his service here, Mr. Lei had done stints in the Netherlands, in San Francisco, and before his 2016 appointment, he served as the Spokesperson for the Foreign Ministry and Deputy Director General in the Chinese Foreign Ministry. He has graciously agreed to have his picture take and shake your hands after he speaks. He'll be right down here at the well. Please join me in welcoming Hong Lei, the Consul General in Chicago."

Hong Lei: "Thank you, Representative Currie. Thank you, Representatives. Good morning... good afternoon. It is such an honor to meet you here in the Illinois General Assembly. As Consul General of the People's Republic of China, my primary task is to promote the exchanges and the cooperation between Illinois as well as the other eight states here in the Midwest with China. China-Illinois partnership has made new headway since the new century with bilateral trade volume, investment stock, and people-to-people exchanges achieving historic new high. In 2017, Illinois's trade with China exceeded 36 billion

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

U.S. dollars. China has remained the second largest trade partner and third largest export market for Illinois. Accumulated investments by Chinese companies in Illinois has reached 4.2 billion U.S. dollars, creating 5,100 new jobs for this state. Great companies from Illinois like Boeing, ADM, Caterpillar, all achieve great achievements in China. China has now become important strategic market for all the companies I mentioned. There are over 18 thousand Chinese students nowadays studying in universities in Illinois, and the University of Illinois in Urbana-Champaign alone has more than 5 thousand Chinese students on campus. So, Chinese students have become the largest international students group Illinois universities. These achievements attributable to the concerted efforts by people from both China and Illinois, as well as the contribution from State Representatives. The cooperation outcome between China and Illinois are stellar example of the great potentials and the huge common interests between China and the United States, highlighting the possibility and significance strengthening coordination and cooperation between our two countries. Dear Representatives, in the past 39 years since China and the United States established diplomatic relations, thanks to the concerted efforts by China's successive leaderships and the U.S. Governments led by both Democrats and the Republicans as well as the support from Legislative Bodies of our two countries, China-U.S. relationship has made historic progress and grown into the most important bilateral relationship in the world today. In 1979, the official exchanges between China and the United States were numbered.

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

Today, the high-level exchanges between China and the U.S. are close and the dialogue mechanism is smooth. Since the new U.S. administration took office, the two countries have set up four high-level dialogue mechanisms on diplomacy and security, comprehensive economy, law enforcement and cyber security, as well as social and people-to-people exchanges, so as to incubate cooperation, promote communication, and properly handle our differences. In 1979, bilateral trade between China and the U.S. was only 2.45 billion U.S. dollars and direct investment between our two countries was zero. In 2017, China-U.S. two-way trade volume of goods amounted to nearly 645 billion U.S. dollars and bilateral service trade volume reached 75 billion U.S. dollars. China and the United States are each other's largest trading partner, and China is the third-largest export market for the United State. In 2017, bilateral two-way investments amounted to 213 billion U.S. dollars with Chinese companies' investment in the U.S. surpassing U.S. investment in China for the third year consecutively. In 1979, less than 10 thousand Chinese people and the U.S.... 10 thousand people from China and the U.S. visited the other country. In 2017, nearly 6 million people from the two countries traveled across the Pacific Ocean. Up to now, the two countries have forged 47 pairs of sister province/state relations including the state's province/state relationship between Illinois and the Liaoning Province in China and 215 pairs of sister-city relations. Three hundred and thirty thousand Chinese students study in universities in the United States, accounting for one-third of America's foreign students and becoming the largest group of

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

international students in the U.S. It is fair to say that the common interests of China and the United States far outweigh our differences. China-U.S. cooperation is good for good global stability and the prosperity, and also in line with the expectations of our two peoples and the world. As we speak, China-U.S. relations have come to another crucial junction. The two countries should draw on the historical experience of bilateral relationship and sustain sound and continuous development of bilateral ties. To achieve this, we think the following proposals are very important: first, stay committed to the right choice of foreign strategic partnership... foreign strategic partnership, not rivalry. It is only natural that there will be some competition between our two big countries, but such competition is not knocking each other down in a boxing game. It is the competition that two runners in a race have as they run to their respective goals. China and the U.S. will realize our own development in this process and become more competitive and the ready for more cooperation. Second, stay committed to the strategic direction of enhancing mutual trust, not suspicion. China seeks development only to improve ourself rather than overpower the U.S. China has no intention to replace the U.S. leadership in the world. China is willing to join hands with the U.S. to safequard the international order with the United Nations at its core. China and the U.S. should view each other's strategic intention in a holistic, objective, and a reasonable manner so that we can avoid misconception and misjudgment strategically. Third, stay committed to the way of mutual respect. It is only natural that China and the U.S.

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

don't see eye to eye on everything. The key is to respect each other's core interests and the major concerns. The sound and the steady development of China-U.S. relations will be at stake if our political foundation for the relationship is undercut. We hope that the U.S. side can handle the Taiwan question with prudence, which has a bearing upon China's sovereignty and the national pride. Fourth, stay committed to the path of increasing common interests, not unilateral protectionist measures. Being each other's largest trading partner, China and the U.S. will have differences from time to time in our economic and trade time. What is most important is to increase common interests, expand trade, enhance mutual investment, so that we can make our differences being resolved through dialogue. Honorable Representatives, since the founding of the People's Republic of China and the reform and the opening-up in particular, China has made great strides in the past of development. China has developing itself into the second largest economy in the world and lift over 700 million people out of poverty, equivalent to over 70 percent of the poverty alleviation population in the whole world. The 1.3 billion... 1.3 billion Chinese people has risen above material scarcity, lived a moderately prosperous life nowadays. However, China is still the largest developing country in the world. Development remains the primary task of China, and we will continuously commit ourselves to improve people's livelihood. To achieve this goal, the 19th National Congress of the Chinese Communist Party convened last year proposes an action plan that will build China from the largest developing country into a moderately developing country 'til 2050. This

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

year also marks the 40th anniversary of China's reform and the opening-up, a policy that has fundamentally changed China as well as the world. China is committed to the basic national policy of opening up. China's door of opening-up will not be closed and will only open even wider. Looking ahead, China will significantly broaden market access, create a more foreign environment, attractive investment intellectual property rights protection, take the initiative to increase import and encourage credible and a competitive Chinese companies to invest overseas so as that we can contribute to the local employment and the revenue. In the next 15 years, China is expected to import 24 trillion U.S. dollars' worth of goods and invest in... invest 2 trillion U.S. dollars overseas. In November this year, China will host the first International Import Expo in Shanghai so that foreign companies could promote their products directly to Chinese customers. In the next 5 years, Chinese people will make 700 million outbound trips. So by 2050, China will become a country with GDP reaching 43 trillion U.S. dollars while our GDP reached 12 trillion U.S. dollars last year. So, China will bring an even larger market, more investment, more diverse products, and more cooperation opportunities to other countries. A China that is committed to win-win cooperation will create even more development opportunities for the world. Honorable Representatives, we are willing to join hands with you so that we can contribute more positive energy to enhance the mutual understanding, the corporation between China and Illinois. Let us work together to this end. Thank you very much."

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

- Currie: "Thank you very much, Consul General. The Consul General from the People's Republic of China will now greet the individual Members right here just outside the well. Representative Turner back in the Chair."
- Speaker Turner: "On page 27 of the Calendar, we have House Resolution 1025, Leader Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. I encourage your support of this Resolution. All it does is ask for the Members of the House to support the idea of a Constitutional Amendment that would give Illinois the opportunity of a progressive income tax structure. Today, 41 states in the nation have an income tax. And of that number, overwhelming majority, a full 33, have graduated taxes. The importance of a graduated tax is, first of all, that our current tax structure costs low-income people a huge amount of their resources. A very significant chunk of a low-income working family's paycheck goes to support taxes at the state, at the local level. In those states that have progressive graduated rates, the burden is very much different and lower income people do not bear the brunt of the income tax system. Very rich people in the State of Illinois pay very, very little; very poor people in the State of Illinois pay through the nose. So, a graduated income tax structure, which is not meant to be punitive to anybody, would still make us... our state a fairer state, a state in which everybody is paid a fair share, not the lion's share, of the income tax bill. I'd be grateful for your questions and I'm looking forward to unanimous support."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Breen."

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

Breen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What's our debate rule for this one or are we just going to go at it?"

Speaker Turner: "Just try to keep your comments as brief as possible, Representative."

Breen: "Thank you, and we would request a Roll Call vote on the Resolution."

Speaker Turner: "Put it."

"Thank you. To the Resolution. Ladies and Gentlemen, if the people of Illinois didn't trust us enough, or distrust us already, why in the world would they hand us the power to raise their taxes to levels previously unseen or unheard of in the history of this state? Instead of working on property tax relief, we're sitting here looking at this debate on trying to be able to raise people's taxes to 7, 8, 9, 10 percent at numbers as low as 5 or 10 thousand or even 17 thousand dollars. And we've got actual proposals from Members of the other side showing how low you would have to set these numbers to have any impact on the state budget. And we've got a gubernatorial candidate on the other side that's already promised to raise everyone's taxes. Said well, I'm going to give you a little bit of an exemption while I'm doing it. You know, and forgive me for not trusting an Illinois politician when they say I'm going to raise your taxes, but it's not going to be that bad. There's no one in this state, in their right mind, who would trust such a politician. And so, Ladies and Gentlemen, I'm going to let my colleagues go 'cause I'm sure they've got a lot to say too, but this is one of the worst, most ill-considered and most unwanted Resolutions for the people of this state. Please vote 'no'."

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative McSweeney."

McSweeney: "Mr. Speaker, to the Resolution. This should be called the job disruption Resolution of this General Assembly. Raising taxes will just kill jobs, drive more people out of this state. Make no mistake about it, this is a massive tax increase. This is a bad idea. Stop the madness. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Leader Durkin."

Durkin: "Inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Turner: "Yes, Sir?"

Durkin: "I'd like to know the status of House Resolution 975."

Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, the status of House Resolution 975."

Clerk Hollman: "That Resolution's in the Rules Committee."

Durkin: "One last inquiry. Who is the chairman of that Rules Committee, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Turner: "I believe the chairman is the Sponsor of this Bill."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Durkin: "Leader Currie, about a month and a half ago, I introduced House Resolution 975 in which I have 49 cosponsors, Republicans, who signed their names to this Bill. And I know that my colleague Representative McSweeney has a similar Resolution which has Democrats, eight Democrat or maybe more than one, in support of that Resolution. Both these Resolutions are our opposition to this progressive tax. So the question I have for you, Leader Currie, is that why haven't you released House Resolution 975 to committee or to the floor for an honest debate and vote?"

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

Currie: "So far, it has not been on the Rules Committee agenda.

Why do we not focus our attention today, right now, to House
Resolution 1025, which would provide for a fair tax structure
for all of the people of Illinois?"

Durkin: "We are, as we've been talking privately and publicly on our budget process, of how this has been a very fair bipartisan process in which the ideas and thoughts and concepts of both sides of the aisles have been brought up. This is a very important issue for myself and also for the 49 cosponsors who've signed their name to HR975. I'm asking you, as a Republican Leader, to Leader of the Rules Committee and Deputy Leader Currie, to at least oblige me and my Party and release that from Rules and let's just give us a vote. We can have a vote on yours, I'm glad to do that, but at least extend that same curtesy to this side of the aisle. Can you do that?" Currie: "I'll take that question under advisement, Leader Durkin."

Durkin: "Well, Representative Currie, you've always been a person of your word and I would hope that when you say you'll take it under advisement that you are going to at... you will seriously consider my request and that we would have a fair vote on my Resolution."

Currie: "Exactly what I said, and now we... should we turn our attention to House Resolution 1025..."

Durkin: "Sure."

Currie: "...which is the subject of the current discussion?"

Durkin: "So, this is, as I recall, after the primary for Governor, the nominee, Mr. Pritzker, stated that we need to raise the current rate of taxes, which was raised last summer. And then sometime after that, we have to change the Constitution and

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

get to a fair tax system. So, the question I have for you or for anybody on that side, tell me what the rates are going to be under the Democrat plan, which is before us, or what the Democrat nominee is considering?"

Currie: "Well, first of all, I didn't hear that statement, but I would tell you..."

Durkin: "I did."

Currie: "...that nothing in this Resolution specifies rates. I will tell you that there are people who have put together charts and other kinds of data that shows a way in which you could increase revenue for the State of Illinois while cutting taxes for 98 percent of the populace. So the rates would not be part of a Constitutional Amendment. In the other states, the 41 states across the country that have progressive graduated income tax, I do not know that the rates are confiscatory and there's no reason to think that they would be in Illinois. I'm sure you know that among our neighbors, Missouri, Kentucky, Iowa, and Wisconsin, all of them have graduated income taxes. And I know that our Governor is forever comparing us to our Middle Western neighbors and comparing us unfavorably. Well, I would suggest that this might make for a favorable comparison. I think it is unconscionable that low-income people in Illinois spend twice as much of their income on state and local taxes as do the wealthy. Something is wrong with that picture. And I believe that passage of House Resolution 1025 would set us on a tack that may help... help improve the fairness of our structure for ordinary, everyday people who live and need help in this state."

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

- Durkin: "Well, that's quite a response. Mr. Speaker, I hope that we do not use that response against my time. Thank you. Now, all right, Leader Currie, now you obviously would like to have Republicans support this Resolution, correct?"
- Currie: "I would like everybody in this chamber to support the Resolution."
- Durkin: "So, here's a hint. Tell us what rates that you think would be appropriate to help the middle-class, help the low-class, help Illinois?"
- Currie: "That they... as I told you, there are some groups that have done... done their little work under their green eye shades and their little pencils or erasers are having at it and they're showing us that we can create a tax structure under a progressive tax system in which 98 percent of the people in Illinois will in fact pay lower taxes, lower state taxes, than they do today. I'm not committing to the particular set of numbers. That would not be part of a Constitution. We don't know what the numbers actually would be. My point is only that a graduated income tax may in fact be a lot fairer to lower-income Illinoisans than the current tax structure and it may not be confiscatory for the better off."
- Durkin: "That may be the case, but unless we can... how do we... how can we tell the public that this is actually a good idea unless we... and how can I vote and say that the fair tax that you're asking for in this Resolution is good for taxpayers unless... we have no idea what the rates are? Now in the committee, I recall that one of the proponents, one of the groups, said that we should emulate the Minnesota bottle. Would you agree or disagree with that?"

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

Currie: "I don't agree or disagree with any specific numbers. My point is that we can change the system. We should change the system and we do not have to decide upon specific numbers today. In fact, I don't think any state..."

Durkin: "Well, I'm looking... I'm looking for a reason to vote for this."

Currie: "Pardon?"

Durkin: "And I suggested if you can give me your idea of what you think the rates should be under a fair tax proposal."

Currie: "I think you said it. The rates should be fair. That's what I think and that's what I'm for. And I should imagine that of the 30... 33 states that have progressive income taxes in this country, I don't believe a single one of them started out with specific rates in the Constitution."

Durkin: "What was raised in the committee hearing in Revenue which I was at and that the… we were told that we should look at Minnesota. And as I recall, rates in Minnesota had people under the age of… under the income of \$80 thousand pay anywhere from seven to nine percent. So, that is a kick in the butt to the middle-class, a kick to the curb and that's what we've seen in most other states. I appreciate the fact that we're having a fair, open dialogue about this, but it is very unfair if the Majority Party is not going to at least give House Resolution 975 an opportunity to be called and voted on as a matter of fairness in these finals days in which we are having probably one of the better Sessions we've had in a long time. So, Madam Currie, I would appreciate that you give even more consideration than what you indicated that you would before because that's fair, 'cause that's what our side

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

of the aisle wants. We've got 49 cosponsors. And I'm sure you don't have 49 cosponsors on your Resolution, but that's a very large portion of this Body. So, I'm asking you to do the same for us, extend me that courtesy. It can lose, that's fine, but I want the ability to be able to at least debate my Resolution on the floor. And with that being said, there's no such thing as a fair tax in this country or this state. I'm asking everyone in this room to say this is not the right policy. Mr. Pritzker can go around and he can campaign about fair tax. It's easy for someone who has his wealth to do that, but most of the people in this room can't do that. And most people who are in the middle-class can't do that either. And if you look at the states that have been imposing upon the middle... they've been imposing this tax on their citizens, they will find in due time that the ones who are left out are the middle-class. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "Members, there are many people seeking recognition on this Resolution. So, for the remainder of the debate, we will move to a five-minute timer, unlimited on either side. Representative Martwick is recognized for five minutes."

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

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

Martwick: "Thank you, Leader Currie. After listening to that, was fascinating remarks from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, I noticed that one thing was missing in all of their remarks. And... and I'm wondering if you noticed the same thing. Did you hear any math involved in any of their remarks?"

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

Currie: "No, I did not."

Martwick: "And see, it's fascinating 'cause I delivered to them all today a calculator so that they could work on their math and yet, what you hear is mostly rhetoric about it's a bad idea, it's more taxes, taxes are bad, we hate taxes. Well, Leader Currie, wouldn't you suggest that everyone would prefer low taxes to high taxes?"

Currie: "I think that's probably a general... a generally accurate statement."

Martwick: "Poor people, middle-class people, wealthy people..."

Currie: "Right. Right."

Martwick: "...we all prefer low taxes, right?"

Currie: "Right."

Martwick: "The problem is that you can't get there with pixie dust and magic beans. You actually have to have a plan."

Currie: "Absolutely right."

Martwick: "And so recently, Leader Currie, I asked the Commission on Government Forecasting and Accountability to conduct a study. And I asked them if we paid our pensions, which everyone would suggest that we do, and we lived up to our commitment to fund education and all the rest of our expenses just grew at their historical levels, they said that we would need, in order to balance our budgets, as of January 1, a 6.45 percent flat tax. Now, does that sound fair to you?"

Currie: "Doesn't sound fair to me."

Martwick: "It doesn't sound fair to me either. And that's why I think that if we mathematically accept the fact that we have a financial problem, and we came up with a mathematical solution, we could then discuss the best way to distribute

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

those taxes so that they are not a burden to the middle-class and the low-class."

Currie: "Absolutely right."

"Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. The idea that when we are Martwick: faced with a problem that we are faced with, that one side of the aisle would just say they absolutely will not consider a that could lead us to lower taxes acknowledgement that that's not what you stand for. We are, according to the Commission on Government Forecasting and Accountability, we are putting a one and a half percent surcharge to every taxpayer in this state on a credit card and we're asking them to pay it later with interest and that's unconscionable. You, by not addressing our problems, are forcing this burden on to the next generation and it's wrong. We can find a path to lower taxes if we work together. You might not like the idea of a progressive income tax, that's okay. You don't have to. But why would you just take it off the table? That is the most ridiculous and it is the wrong way to solve our problems. We should be working together and every option should be on the table. My... one of my colleagues over there talked about my little calculator gift and said that there's a minus button on there too. I agree, but let's find a way to solve our problems. A progressive income tax will give us the tools and it has worked in every state that has done it. The states that have decided that they will arbitrarily lower taxes to spur business income, like Kansas and Louisiana, have seen their state finances go in the toilet. Thankfully, their Republican Legislators were smart enough to overturn their Governors and raise taxes so they

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

could balance their budgets. We need to be fiscally responsible in this state. We need to create a path for lower taxes in the future for the next generation so they don't have to deal with the same things we did. You can join us by voting 'yes' for a progressive tax."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Keith Wheeler." Wheeler, K.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Resolution. We talked earlier today about a Bill... actually over a Motion to override that was bad for small business in this state and here we are again, another shot at the Illinois business climate. We just raised taxes last year on every business and every family in this state. We took an income tax that was once one of the few things we could point at as an advantage that Illinois had over states and now we've taken that to one of the worst. And now, we're trying to make it, apparently, the very worst. Please keep in mind that we already have among the highest property taxes in the country. And if you're a business owner, these are things that matter because you have to pay them in order to be in business. This gives you another reason to not look at Illinois when it comes to how you prepare your business. It's been discussed so far, this comparisons to neighboring states. Well, if you're a small business owner, you look at neighboring states, you're looking at not just what we pay in income taxes, you're looking at what we pay in those property taxes, and recon costs, litigation potentials. All those things make a difference. All those things hurt our ability to compete at a time when we desperately need to compete for jobs... desperately need to compete for jobs. Before I got here, I thought the term fair tax actually was referring

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

to a book I read a few years ago about the consumption tax, which actually is a fair tax, not an income tax. By no means did anyone ever, at that time, anticipate you could call a progressive income tax a fair tax. But here we are, in Illinois, trying to pull that off. Remember, Illinois already has, per family, is the highest local and state tax burden in the country according to some measures and here we are not helping them. So, in light of what was done earlier today with the calculators, my good friend Representative Martwick had brought up his calculator, I went and got myself a bigger calculator. One that has enough zeros to show how much debt we have and one that might actually explain how under a set of rates that were proposed before, I think they've been withdrawn, but they're still out there, the only set I can find in our analysis of what a progressive income tax might look like in this state, but the analysis of that, with a fancy calculator, shows it is going to raise taxes on 77 percent of Illinois's taxpayers. That's too many zeros, too many digits for me. We cannot support this. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Reick."

Reick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Resolution. I can't put this explanation into words of one syllable, but I will try to do my best to make it even understandable to the people on the other side of the aisle. A flat tax is not a regressive tax. Yes, we have regressive taxes in this state, but they become... but they're regressive because of the other things that we overtax people on. The one thing that Illinois does right in its income tax is a flat tax. The money is in the

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

middle, folks. Every time there's tax reform proposed, federal or state, we have to understand the fact that the bulk of the wealth... the bulk of the overall wealth of the state is in the middle. It's a bell curve. The money is in the middle. You're not going to ever be able to create a progressive tax system that puts tax liability... that increases the tax liability to people on the right hand side of that curve to the extent where it lowers the taxes on the people in the middle. As my friend said just now, 77 percent of the people under... under my friend's proposal would see a tax increase. That's because the money is in the middle. We all got a calculator today. Well, you can't figure a tax until you know what the rate is. And I don't even want to talk about the rates because to me it's irrelevant. Our ability to raise money to bring people into this coun... this state to create jobs depends upon stability. Yeah, Minnesota's got a great economic system. They've got a... they've got a fabulous progressive income tax. But you know something, they don't have \$200 billion in unpaid debt. Income taxes should not be used to pay debt. Income tax... we should find a separate way to pay for that debt. Income taxes should fund operations of State Government and we are not being very efficient in doing that either. So, I would say here, look. Talk about a progressive income tax all you want but what you're going to do is you're going to end up chasing the people, the very people in this state, out of this state who are creating... who are doing what they can to create wealth in this state. You need those people here and money is fungible, money is transferable. Though at... that money is mobile, those people

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

will leave. And what will we be left with? We'll be left with a progressive income tax where the rates are eating down further and further into lower and lower incomes in order to get the kind of money that this Body demands every single year to spend on more and more projects, more and more programs, with less and less accountability. We're supposed to be passing a budget here. I don't see any real movement toward it. We're three days away from... from adjournment. We should've had a budget three months ago. This ... this whole ... this whole enterprise is backwards. This whole enterprise is backwards. We need to focus on how much we spend, who we spend it on, and where we spend it. We need tax revenue, yes, but we also need tax relief. We need property tax relief. We need sales tax reform. We need a whole lot of things that aren't going to be answered by a progressive income tax. I don't care how high you take your rates, or how low you think those rates can go for the lower income people, or how much you can stick it to people who are making a billion dollars a year, it isn't going to work. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Batinick."

Batinick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to go straight to the Resolution. I'm going to use my calculator here a little bit since that was requested. I want to talk about some other states. We keep talking about states here. I think if everybody wants to read The Minnesota Myth that was in the Springfield Journal Review, if you see that you'll understand why the Minnesota model is not a good comparison to us. But let's talk about two other states. I want to talk about North Carolina. North Carolina, in 2013, they went from a

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

progressive tax to a flat tax. North Carolina's property tax are amongst the lowest in the nation at .78 percent of property value. North Carolina now enjoys a \$1.8 billion Rainy Day Fund. I just checked the basement; there's just cobwebs down there. We don't have a Rainy Day Fund. So, North Carolina goes from a progressive tax... a state of about 10 or 11 million people... goes from a progressive tax to a flat tax and experiences a good fiscal... fiscal future. I also want to do some... talk about some more math. This is the most important one, I think, California. California folks is 12 percent of the population, there are 33 percent of the people living under poverty. One of the richest states, most resources, Silicon Valley, and a third of their population lives in poverty. How's that progressive tax working out everybody? You know, I kind of made a joke about the addition button, but there's one purpose to use the addition button. There is really only one way out of this. All this other stuff that we're talking about nibbles around the edges. The one way around it, growth. We need to add jobs. We need to add businesses. We need to add people. You don't do this with a progressive income tax. There's one Resolution that's bipartisan and that's a Resolution against it. A progressive income tax, we should be ... we should be debating that and not this. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Skillicorn."

Skillicorn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Straight to the Resolution.

Today is Tuesday, May 29, and we are here talking about a gimmick, a phony Resolution that's not going to change anyone's taxes. It's not going to address our budget

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

situation. It's not going to address our fiscal debt or health. This is a gimmick. This is a gimmick to do political ads. And let's go into this a little more. So, we're two days end of the Session. We do not have revenue estimate. We have not seen a budget filed with the Clerk yet. Just this morning, you know, I'm seeing a 1.5 percentage point increased to our taxes that was put on our desks, suggesting that someone wants tax hikes here, and we're going to debate an idea that would have to change the Constitution. So the deadline for changing the Constitution has long since passed, yet we're sitting here today debating this idea to change the structurally tax people. I would say to the other side, if this is what you really want, put it on the board as a Constitutional Amendment. Why are we doing gimmicks like this when we're two days away from the end of Session? If this is such a big deal put... we should've put the Constitutional Amendment to a vote and we would've either debated it and passed it or not. This is a gimmick and this is a just a symptom of some of the problems we have. So, there are times when we work great together. There's lots of things that we get done together, but they're sitting... just like this, that's a gimmick. And I want the people up in the gallery, I want the media in the well to know that we're debating a gimmick. This is not going to change our tax structure. This is just something that you're going to pass to score political points and it's not going to be brought up again for another year. So, I would urge people to vote 'no' to gimmicks. Let's talk about real solutions. We'll happily talk about solutions. I happen to have a whole bunch of Bills that would

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

have many, many reforms. Now, maybe there's not the bipartisan agreement on that. I can understand that and I'm adult enough to realize that we can have big boy and big girl conversations about ideologically what we agree on or we disagree on. But let's do serious reforms, not gimmicks, not Resolutions. If we want to talk about a Resolution, my colleague from Barrington has a Resolution, HJR135, that would actually give us a revenue estimate that would repeal the tax hike. Now, that's something I'd love to go back to my constituents and say that I got done. I'd love to be able to say I got that done. But if we're going to talk about gimmicks, this is what we have here. So, thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Ives."

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

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

Ives: "So, as one of the, you know, just rank and file Legislators here, I've not been really privy to any of the budget discussion. So, I remember last year how this all played out in... at the end of June, going into the beginning of July. And essentially, it started out with a 32 percent tax increase and then it came out with a brand new big budget. So, I didn't know, is this Resolution here because you're anticipating needing more tax money for this year's budget? Maybe you could give me some indication of what revenue number is being worked with, what expenditure number, and some idea of what's happening on the budget 'cause I don't understand why we're doing this Resolution in the absence of that."

Currie: "We're not dealing with specific numbers. The question that, were it to go on the ballot, would be do the voters of

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

Illinois think that a fair progressive tax is a better solution than the current flat rate tax structure that we have."

Ives: "I understand, but... so are you running this because you think that we need additional revenue? I think that you had indicated that in earlier debate."

Currie: "There are some who would support this on the grounds that you could create a tax structure that could bring in more, but remember, we can do that today. Nothing about whether it's a progressive tax or a flat tax ties the Legislature's hands in terms of setting rates. So, nothing changes."

Ives: "No, I understand that."

Currie: "And many would say that the problem is that our current structure leaves us unable to meet basic responsibilities and if we just raise the flat rate income tax, we know we will be disproportionally hurting low-income Illinoisans."

Ives: "Okay. Thank you. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. So, basically in her last comments there, which you understand if you listen carefully, is that she does think that we need additional revenue. So, this is not about spending reform. This is not about transformative business reforms that we actually need to attract new capital and new income. No, this is about getting additional income from those who are currently here. But I'm telling you right now, as my colleagues have said... and Representative Skillicorn was the man who made the best comments so far... this is all just a scam. This is all just playing with reality because if they really wanted progressive income tax, they would actually put the

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

Constitutional Amendment on the floor for a debate and a vote. But they're not doing that. They're just trying to, you know, I guess get us all fired up about a progressive tax increase. But it is the wrong direction for Illinois. Currently... you know and actually I don't have it. After the new tax increase when it but, in just a couple years ago, 19 percent of the taxpayers who made \$100 thousand or more paid 61 percent of the taxes in the State of Illinois. Sixty-one percent of the taxes from 90 percent of the taxpayers. Also, I'd like to remind the Body here that Chicago had the largest number of millionaires who left the city nationwide. The largest number of millionaires left Chicago. And they were a third, overall, in the world. So, people flee when they're overtaxed. And you know, you like to talk about the 33 states who have a progressive income tax. Guess what? I like to talk about the 9 states... the 9 states that have no income tax and have lower property taxes than us. Why don't we learn something from then... them. Why don't we look at what they spend their money on? Why don't we look at their business rules? Why don't we look about how they attract new residents and new businesses to expand the tax base, not trying to extract more from the same taxpayers who are stuck here? So, I mean, that's the direction that we have to go. Make no doubt about it. This is the wrong direction for the State of Illinois and this is the wrong Resolution to be running at this time."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Leader Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of the Resolution. In so doing, I just think I want to address a few things. First, one Gentleman on the other side of the aisle

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

suggested this was a gimmick. You can call it a gimmick if you wish, then maybe that person wants to tell us why he's on both Republican Resolutions on the progressive income tax. I quess two gimmicks are better than one. Secondly, I heard some conversation about California, and I heard that from folks who are consistently talking about how people are leaving Illinois because of our tax burden and yet, San Francisco, California, is the fastest growing major city in America despite the large amount of taxes at the upper end in the State of California. Finally, perhaps we should title this something different so that your hair doesn't light on fire over there. The fact is that under the last substantive Bill that was prepared a few years ago, 'cause I was the Sponsor, that went in conjunction with a Constitutional Amendment that would have to be passed, 99.6 percent of Illinois taxpayers were to get a tax cut. I want to say that again; 99.6 percent of all taxpayers in the State of Illinois were going to get a tax cut. And so, the rhetoric flying from over there about the horrific taxes to be bounced on top of the people of the State of Illinois is just that, rhetoric. Ninety-nine point six percent of your constituents and my constituents would get a tax cut under the last progressive income tax plan that we put forth on this side of the aisle. And yet, people are emailing me like crazy talking about how I wanted to raise their income taxes. Progressive income tax only raises income taxes on .4 percent of the population of the State of Illinois. So, if you consider that a tax increase, then I guess we know what part of the citizenry matters to you. If you consider taxing a little higher, .4

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

percent of the population, as a tax increase when 99.6 percent of the citizens of Illinois would get a tax cut, it tells us about your priorities. And so, a 'no' vote on this will tell us about your priorities. The sponsorship of those other Resolutions will tell us about your priorities. And so, we should have this vote because, Ladies and Gentlemen on the Minority side of the aisle, we're anxious to see your priorities. We've been talking rhetorically for years about what they actually... about what we think they are, but we're about to find out after the other 40 speakers, or whoever... how many lights are on... we're about to find out what your values actually are, what your priorities actually are, who it is you're elected to come here to represent. So, let's vote. Let's go. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Hays."

Hays: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know it's an interesting dynamic. We have a lot new Members. Sometimes I feel like I have to put on the decoder ring. I don't spend a lot of time on the partisan stuff. I don't spend a lot of time on the talking points that staff gives us. The last speaker talked about this percentage will get a tax cut and that percentage will get a tax cut. Yet, we don't know what the rates are. So that's, by definition, absurdity. The question is, why isn't this the law of the land now? How would it even be possible to have a supermajority and the Governor's Office and this is not the law of the land? An earlier speaker said we can't move forward because you won't participate. You didn't need our participation. You had all the votes in the Executive Branch of government, yet, it's not the law of the land. Why

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

is that? How would that even be possible to have all the votes in the Executive and this is not the law of the land? It's because you don't care if it's the law of the land. You need it more for a campaign issue than you do for it to be the law because you know the 99.6 percent stuff is nonsense. You know, you get up in the morning and you get in your sock drawer and sometimes you don't know, you just pick. Maybe these will match what I'm wearing. But today, fortuitously, I wore my I call bullshit socks. Never has there been a better selection in my 55 years on this planet. This morning, minutes after selecting that pair of socks, I was supposed to go to the Executive Committee. And I get down there and they say 30 Bills on the docket, no Bills called. They walked back to the Stratton Office. Literally, two minutes later, get back over here, we're going to have Bills. And I asked somebody in the room, did anybody count how many clowns got out of a car this morning because in all the nonsensical times I've gone to that committee, I've never seen anything like it this morning. And then, there are probably 19 Bills in a row called and the Members weren't even there to present the Bills. And I thought, Lord, am I'm glad I don't have to tell a group of junior high children what just happened here today. So, my decoder ring says if you cared for this to be the law of the land, you'd have voted on it when you had all the votes and the Governor. You're kidding nobody here. This is silliness and it's folly. And for the love of God, let's do something that's serious."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Jesiel. Leader Lang in the Chair."

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

Jesiel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Resolution. I just took a few minutes... we've heard that progressive income tax would not hurt low-income people or middle-class people. So, I took a look, like some of my other colleagues had previously mentioned. But I took a look at Wisconsin. Wisconsin has a 5.84 percentage income tax rate between 11 thousand and 22 thousand dollars of income a year. Over that, it's 6.27 and that's the middle class. California, 19 thousand to 30 thousand, it's a 4 percent increase. Over 30 thousand to 41 thousand, it's 6 percent. And from 41 thousand to 83 thousand dollars of income is an 8 percent tax rate. That's on the middle class. Illinois, if I would remind you, is 4.95. Minnesota has the same issue, 25 thousand to 85 thousand is 5.35 over. Over 85 thousand is 7.05. Both of which are higher than Illinois right now. I think we would be kidding ourselves to think that we would pass a progressive income tax that would not include similar rates, especially considering the desperate need for revenue that we purport to have in our state. So, representing a border district, I bring this up very frequently. I did a post last week on property tax increase. I would encourage you to visit my web... or my Facebook page because you can take a look at the comments that are made by people who read of these things and say that they are either out of here or they are going to be out of here. This is nothing but another move to get people to move out of Illinois because that's what they do. They vote with their feet. They do it in my district. If you have a border district, they will do in yours as well. They are looking for relief. If you combine an increase property tax with... or an

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

increase progressive tax with a property tax, there is no reason for people to stay here and they will move. Not only that, there's no reason for businesses to come here. If we have business investment and our EAV grows, then our property taxes are going to be reduced and people will see some relief. If that doesn't happen, we have to continue to increase our rates because we are losing our property values and therefore, having to get our money from other places. These are natural things that happen. They happen in my district. They happen in yours, but they are particularly difficult for districts that border other states. So, we have to start looking at other ways to reduce our expenditures. I haven't heard any conversations regarding that today. I can give you an example. I... I sit on Audit Commission, we hear all kinds of ways that the State of Illinois is wasting money. Recently, we heard about an issue in Department of Corrections in violation of a union contract. Fifty million dollars are paid out in overtime and other grievances that are in violation of the union contract. Fifty million dollars that we could use to help some of our other programs. Nobody's enforcing the union contract. There are many things we see like this in the Audit Commission and if we were serious, we would be addressing some of these issues to move the revenues to places where we really need it instead of putting it, again, on the backs of the taxpayers in my district who will leave the state. I appreciate it. I encourage you to vote 'no' on this."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

- Davidsmeyer: "So, what is the... what is the reason for not including any rates?"
- Currie: "We didn't... I don't believe that there was a rate included when the Illinois Constitution was amended to say that we could go to an income tax at all. And I don't know if any of the other states have done a decision to do a progressive tax by virtue of including the rates in the Constitution. It would seem to me that that's not a very good idea because economics change, needs change, and the idea that one is forced under a Constitution to have specific numbers doesn't make any sense to me."
- Davidsmeyer: "Well, it's just a Resolution so, apparently, it doesn't have an effect. Why wouldn't you put your proposed idea of what you would think a progressive income tax should have as rates?"
- Currie: "I don't think that that's my job. I don't think that today it's your job. It's seems to me the important point is that we should be supporting the idea that we have a tax system in Illinois that is fair to low-and moderate-income people. That's the point of House Resolution 1025. I encourage your support."
- Davidsmeyer: "And... and you know, as you said, we've heard a lot of comparison with neighboring states and their progressive income tax and their rates. And if you look at the majority of the ones that you talk about, rates on people making as low as \$11 thousand or \$25 thousand would see a tax increase. So, I think it's easier... to the Bill... or to the Resolution. I think it's easier to try to pass a Resolution with full of fairy tales that somebody else is going to pay the bill,

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

right? And we heard a speaker earlier say only .4 percent of the people were going to pay the bill. Well, remember, that .4 percent are people that are the most able to leave. They have the ability to leave. We are pushing out the payers and the people that we're trying to help are being hurt in the process. Earlier, the Gentleman from Cook County who provided these wonderful calculators, which I really appreciate 'cause I used it just to do some back-of-the-envelope mathematics, when you sent out this letter, you said something about the pension debt and the Education Funding Reform Bill that was recently passed. Just my back-of-the-envelope calculations say that that Education Funding Reform Bill, over the next 27 years, is almost 40 percent of that increased cost over the next 27 years. That was done last year. Actually, that was done this year, wasn't it? Right? So, we put additional burden on the State of Illinois just this year. And it happens every single week. It happens every single week; this place tries to make new promises, right? If politicians could stop making new promises, we might be able to pay our bills. But you can't. You like headlines. You like your, you know, name in... you like to get on the news or wherever. You like to tell people that you did something. The reality that you... the reality is you didn't actually pay for anything. You just made another false promise. So, we wouldn't be talking about changing our tax structure, if people could stop making new promises. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wehrli."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

- Wehrli: "Leader, does this Resolution actually change the Constitution?"
- Currie: "No... no."
- Wehrli: "What... could you remind me, I'm kind of new down here.

 What is the process for actually changing the Constitution to facilitate this?"
- Currie: "That would take a proposed Constitutional Amendment, which would require an extraordinary Majority vote in both the House and the Senate. This is merely an expression of our support for a really, really good idea."
- Wehrli: "Would... would that, if it passed both chambers with the Supermajority, would it then have to go to the voters of Illinois as well?"
- Currie: "That's what a Constitutional Amendment requires, voter approval."
- Wehrli: "Okay. All right. Thank you. To the Bill. Earlier the Representative from Chicago that gave us these calculators said something that I actually agree with and that is that we need a plan. This... you know, this is just a wish right now that those on your side of the aisle, those that support that, they wish for this. This will not change the Constitution. This doesn't provide a solution. We need solutions to our problems but that does require a plan. It also requires something that this state, quite honestly, has never shown and that's fiscal discipline. We cannot continue to overpromise people of this great state things that we simply cannot pay for. That practice has to end. I want to say... our last Session, we wanted to spend, on this House Floor, \$4 billion more than we actually had in just new ideas. Luckily,

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

we were able to kill most of those and they never became the law, but those things just need to stop. If you want to bring something forward, find a way to pay for it. There's also reference that the most recent Democratic proposal would actually cut taxes by... for 99.6 percent. Well, I don't recall seeing that Bill this General Assembly, but there was a Bill filed, actually, back in February of 2017. It has since been tabled, but it actually had rates in there. And it raised taxes on people making \$15 thousand or more. So, if you think that this progressive tax is just a way to tax the wealthy in this state, the only proposal, the most recent proposal, that shows actual math, 'cause math matters, is one that raises taxes on those making more than \$15 thousand. If fact, that Bill, if you run the math out on it, it would've increased taxes on the residents of Illinois \$5 billion. We still have zero reforms. We still do not have a process that is logical and one that the general public can follow. Here it is on the end of the month. We're supposed to have a budget in two days and it's still... it's hurry up. It's go time. We need a... we need a logical process. We need a fiscal plan. Excuse me, I have the floor, Sir. Our priorities... it was asked by the Leader from Skokie, what are our priorities. Full-year budget, balanced, no new revenue. And when it comes to this, let's put both Resolutions on the floor for a debate. By the way, House Resolution 975 is a bipartisan Bill that opposes a progressive income tax. So, on one side we have bipartisan opposition to a progressive income tax and on the other side we have the Majority Party whose only solution is to simply raise taxes. It's time to stop this rhetoric. We need a plan.

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

Everybody knows that investment... in the investment world that investment dollars flow to where they're treated the best. Illinois does not treat investment dollars well. We need to encourage business to grow here. We need to give people a fine... financial solution to our problems and right now we simply don't have one other than just raise taxes. This is going nowhere. It's not a Constitutional Amendment. This is all the kill time while we're working on other things behind the scenes, apparently. I look forward to seeing how some of the targets on your side of the aisle vote for this. I kind of hope they vote for it; certainly provide for some interesting times down the road. This is a bad Resolution at a wrong time. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Olsen."

Olsen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Resolution. Mr. Speaker, earlier you asked, what are our priorities, and I can tell you what my priorities are. My priorities are fighting for the middle-class and fighting for the people of the 81st District, whom I was elected to represent. The middle-class cannot afford another massive tax increase that this, this ... progressive tax would impose upon them. And that is why I'm opposition to this standing in Resolution because, ultimately, the middle-class cannot afford this. People in... across the state and people in my district are concerned about the condition of our state. They're concerned about the fiscal condition of our state. They're concerned about our ability to work together to solve problems. They're concerned about our ability to get things done here in the State of Illinois. And I think it's important that we do work together and I

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

appreciate all the positive comments that have been said so far about the budget process and the collaborative nature of that process. And I hope that continues and I hope that we are able to pass a balanced budget, key word there, balanced budget, in the next three days. But I think this Resolution would go in the wrong direction. This Resolution would take us toward a higher tax structure without considering any fundamental reforms to State Government, without considering any reforms that encourage people to stay in Illinois, that encourages businesses to stay in Illinois or to relocate to Illinois. Because ultimately, my priority is the middleclass. The middle-class voter, resident, the middle-class person, who wants to be in Illinois because this is a great state. We have a wonderful state. It should be the envy of the world, not just the nation. But a move toward a progressive tax, a move toward increased taxes on the middleclass, and on the business owners, and the wealth creators that we are aiming to attract to this state would be a move in the wrong direction. So, I would urge a 'no' vote on this Resolution. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bellock."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. So, to the Bill. We've already discussed a lot of things over and over again. I'm just going to say, Representative Martwick, thank you again for the calculators. We appreciate them. But you said let's put every option on the table when you were talking. Representative... Leader Durkin said nicely that he would hope that we would be able to look at his option, which is Resolution 995, of which there's 49 speakers on that. So, I

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

hope that we would be able to be given the opportunity to do that down the road. I would just say we had a major tax increase in 2011. We had another major tax increase in 2017. This is a major tax increase on a certain group of people. But the facts speak for themselves. I'm not going to go over everything else. We are the number one highest outward migration of any state in the United States. We have the second highest property taxes of any state in the United States. We are the most overall tax-burdened state of any state in the United States. When asked what we stand for, we stand for reducing those property taxes, reducing the burden on our constituents. We're for keeping people in Illinois. And in order to keep people in Illinois, you have to reduce their taxes, not increase their taxes no matter where you're coming from. If we hadn't have had two major tax increases over the last six years, that would even be a different situation, even though we wouldn't agree on this. But coming from that, our citizens need tax relief. We want to not only keep our businesses here, we want to attract new businesses to Illinois. And we want to keep... every one of us, every 118 of us, wants to keep our constituents here. We don't want our families moving to Indiana, Michigan, Iowa, or any of those states. We want to keep our families here and by doing that, the only way you can do it, is not tax and spend your way to prosperity but it's to keep our taxes and our constituents in our businesses and jobs. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sauer."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

Sauer: "Thank you. To the Bill. I've heard a lot... to the Resolution, pardon me... I've heard a lot today. I've been listening a lot today to the floor debate, and I keep coming back to, do we have some shared interests on this? And I feel as though we do. One shared interest would be, how do we properly fund government to support the most vulnerable. And the other, I think there's a shared interest, is how do we combat Illinois's out-migration. Well, this, 'fair tax' that many of us would call an unfair tax, your progressive tax, your graduated income tax, in the long run and the short run is not going to help Illinois. It's not going to help. It's not going to help on either of those fronts. So, I'm going to quote... I actually had this in my office and I brought it down. I'm going to quote from somebody that knew taxes incredibly well. He... he ended up reforming the Tax Code at the national level that's spurred on some amazing economic opportunity. Many in the chamber will probably know the name Jack Kemp. He's a former Congressman. He ran for Vice President; he ran for President. Anyway, he puts it pretty nicely and I think it outlines a very good visual of what our shared responsibilities are, but really what increasing taxes does. So, Kemp says think of a wagon. It's a pretty simple but a forceful way of visualizing an important aspect government. The wagon is loaded on this end over here and it's unloaded on the opposite end. The folks unloading the wagon, they're called Democrats. And you need this group. You need both Parties. But Democrats are the Party of redistribution. Republicans are the ones loading the wagon. They're called the Party of growth. And it's useless to argue

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

as some do that we don't need redistribution at all. The people, as the people, rightly insist that the whole look after the weakest of its parts. This is a primary function of collective action of what we call government. Obviously, you can't unload a wagon faster than you load it. Sooner or later it's empty. And while you're there living hand to mouth, the unloaders will complain and they will persuade the populace that it's since the loaders have failed, that we need a new system of loading that rewards the collective instead of rewarding the individual. That is exactly what we are talking about in this instance. Now, Congressman Kemp wrote that and gave that speech almost 50 years ago when he ran for Congress the first time. Well, let's think about that wagon. Let's think about this General Assembly and that we have parts to play. We have an important role as Republicans. You have an important role as Democrats. But sooner or later, if we're unloading that wagon faster than we can put things into it, we're going to look through that wagon one day and go, there's nobody there. There's no resources to allocate. If we tax higher, and higher, and higher and higher, pretty soon folks are going to go to a different wagon train. They're going to go to Florida. We're seeing it. They're going to go to Arizona, and Colorado, and Texas, and states where their wagon train is pretty even and equitable. We have got to reform the way that we conduct our government. Increasing this, passing this Resolution, just continuing to pull as opposed to having balance... we're talking about a balanced budget right now. We've talked about it for years. I think we can do it, but we have got to make sure that we don't tax ourselves to death.

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

Government has a reason and a responsibility and this side of the aisle will admit that. But we had better be reasoned and responsible in the way we execute that responsibility. We need a balanced budget. We need to lessen the tax burden, not raise it. We have to grow our state. I would urge the Body to vote 'no' on this unfair tax Resolution. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative McDermed."

McDermed: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Resolution. One of the rules that we learn when we... the minute we get down here is that you have to represent your district. So, I've taken a real interest on behalf of all the residents in District 37 on the whole so-called fair graduated progressive tax because I know this is one of the most important issues to people in my district. And I've looked at some of the numbers and run them against the average income of the people in my district. And what I learned when I ran the numbers of the one Democrat Resolution that's out there that actually has some numbers in it is that the average person in my district, the average family in my district, would pay more than \$1 thousand in additional income tax under this progressive tax. So, I'm not exactly sure what folks and, in particular, one of our former speakers was talking about when he talked about 96 percent of the people will pay less. I'm quite, quite confident that the people in my district are not the top four percent earners in this state. They're not. They're right smack dab in the middle. So, when you hear that people in the middle are going to pay less tax, that's not true if you actually run the numbers. When the average person in my district would pay more than a thousand dollars, it's like \$1,031 more, under

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

the proposal that... with which we have numbers, and of course under any of the other states that we've heard mentioned, they would pay four figures more tax. In no way does that say that this progressive tax would exempt people in the middle. There's nobody in my district that would say they're a wealthy person or that they're not a member of the Illinois middleclass. So, when you hear progressive, when you hear graduated, when you hear fair, that is just a lie. It's a way of trying to get you to think that it applies to you. But guess what? In the world of the fair graduated progressive income tax, you people in the 37th District, are the wealthy. You are the ones that are going to have to be taxed more. You, in fact, not part of the middle-class according to this calculation. You are the ones that are going to have to be paying this debt. So, don't be fooled. This is a bad Resolution. It's a bad concept. It actually hurts the middleclass more because where's the income? It's in the middle. If it doesn't impact the middle, it's not going to be sufficient to cover the needs of our state. Don't be fooled by this, anybody in District 37, or any middle-class person anywhere in this state. It is coming for you. This is a bad Resolution.

It would be bad if it were Amendment. Get rid of this idea."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mitchell."

Mitchell, C.: "Thank you. I'm going to go straight to the Resolution. Wow, this has been a fun debate and I have learned so much. I am not, though, from the 63rd District school of condensation, so I will be not be promising to use small words. I want to run this down sort of one person at a time. Now, we got a lecture from my friend in 51st District about

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

Jack Kemp, who I respect. But it is notable that federal spending is a percentage of gross national product went up 4 percent under Ronald Reagan from 21 to 24 percent. And the deficit went from 74 billion under Carter, to 200 billion under Reagan. So, not really the best model, although I understand a lot of people think that Ronald Reagan actually helped the economy. There was a revealing comment though, I think, from my friend in Jacksonville who cited the Education Funding Reform Bill we passed last year as a burden on the people of the State of Illinois. Putting 350 million new dollars in education for all of our children, most of which goes downstate was cited as a burden on our kids. I think that is revealing of the priorities of those who are against this Resolution. My friend from the 97th District cited the example of North Carolina. What he didn't tell you is that in going from a progressive income tax to a flat tax, one million people in North Carolina, including 64 thousand military families, are paying more in taxes than they did before. So, if you want to talk about myths, that's a whopper for you to have. The young Lady from Wheaton talked about the idea that while these other states, they don't have an income tax at all. They also have a lot of mineral wealth. If we had as much oil under Illinois as under Texas, and didn't care about our planet, we wouldn't need an income tax either. But we do. We do care about our planet and we don't have those kind of natural resources. Our surrounding states, Iowa, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Missouri, Kentucky, all have a progressive income tax. Indiana doesn't at the state level, but they have a county and local income tax. And by the way, nobody's going

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

to live in Indiana in the first place. Now look, every income tax structure that anyone on this side of the aisle would actually support and get behind would cut taxes for no less than 90 percent of working people, going up to 99.6. Ninetytwo percent of small businesses would see a tax cut. And for all of you decrying the idea that we need property tax relief, first of all, if we have more income tax revenue from the wealthy, not the middle-class, we could provide property tax relief. Second of all, most of y'all voted against the property tax cap every single time. So, you've had a chance to do property tax relief and you didn't vote for it. So, there's no sincerity on this. There is a.m. there is a single question that is an issue in this debate. Do you believe it's right for middle-class people to pay twice as much of the share of their income as the top one percent? If the answer is yes, vote against the Resolution, vote against the Amendment, keep setting the tax structure the way it is. If the answer is no, knowing that by the way the biggest tax cuts will go to people south of I-80, then maybe you should vote for this Resolution. Because we want to cut taxes to fund schools which are not a burden but an investment. And because we believe that the middle-class is the backbone of this state and deserves a tax cut. Vote 'aye'."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bryant."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Bryant: "Thank you. Just to the last speaker, Representative from the 26th District. I just want to remind him that this is the most energy rich state in the country with coal and natural

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

gas but often that side of the aisle doesn't want to let us get to it or use it when we do. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "And the last speaker, Mr. DeLuca."

DeLuca: "The last speaker for now."

Speaker Lang: "For now."

DeLuca: "Will the Majority Leader yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

DeLuca: "Leader Currie, I speak to many constituents about this issue in my district. Many support it, many oppose it, and many are just confused by how it works. So, currently... you can just walk me through this. Currently, what is our individual income tax rate?"

Currie: "I think it's 3.94 percent."

DeLuca: "I didn't hear that. Say that again."

Currie: "Four point nine five percent."

DeLuca: "Okay, 4.95."

Currie: "It was briefly 5 percent, but then it went down."

DeLuca: "Okay. So, for the purpose of just easy calculation here, let's just say 5 percent for the purpose of this. So, if someone has a taxable income of say a million dollars, so what would they pay at a 5 percent rate in income tax to the state?"

Currie: "Fifty thousand."

DeLuca: "Okay, \$50 thousand. So, if someone has a taxable income of \$100 thousand, what would they pay in state income tax?"

Currie: "Five thousand."

DeLuca: "Five thousand?"

Currie: "Actually, I've got... Mr. Martwick is going to help me with this."

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

DeLuca: "Okay. He's going to bring that calculator over? That's perfect."

Currie: "He did not give... you know, he gave all of you a calculator, but he didn't give one to me."

DeLuca: "Thank you, Representative."

Currie: "So, you... you operate it."

DeLuca: "He skipped the front row on this side."

Currie: "Mmm, what?"

DeLuca: "He skipped the front row on this side. We didn't get a calculator."

Currie: "Well, he skipped my row too."

DeLuca: "All right. So, one person's paying 50 thousand that's making a million. The other person's paying 5 thousand that's making 100 thousand. So, that difference between the 5 thousand and 50 thousand, what is that considered? How would that be described as that difference?"

Currie: "Well, it would say that the... that the percentage that each pays is the same but the person with more money is actually paying more just because they have more money to pay. But it doesn't say that there is a decrease in income in equality. In fact, one of the points of a progressive income tax is to try to diminish income in equality between the haves and the have nots."

DeLuca: "So, the... the individual that's paying 5 thousand, is that unfair? Is it... is the 5 under the... the example that I provided, is the person that's paying 5 thousand compared to the person that's paying 50 thousand, is that unfair?"

Currie: "I'm not quite sure I understand what you mean. I would say that overall, a tax structure that is not progressive is

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

likely to hit harder to take more of the share of income from lower income people than it does from wealthy people. And in fact, that's absolutely true in Illinois."

DeLuca: "So, the..."

Currie: "That what we find is that the lower income people are spending twice as much of their resources on taxes as our millionaires."

DeLuca: "Okay. The example that I presented, though, the person is paying 10 times more."

Currie: "That's exactly right, but..."

DeLuca: "So, the progressive example will... that will expand from the 5 thousand to 50 thousand, it would be expanded from less than 5 thousand to more than 50 thousand. Is that correct?"

Currie: "It would depend on how you set the rates and that's not what this Resolution is about."

DeLuca: "Right. I know we don't have rates, but in theory..."

Currie: "You could do it ... you could many ..."

DeLuca: "...in theory..."

Currie: "You could do it many different ways."

DeLuca: "In theory, that's what would happen?"

Currie: "In theory, there would be a different tax rate for people at different levels of income, yes."

DeLuca: "Right, which most likely would reduce the person paying 5, would probably pay less and the person paying..."

Currie: "Or maybe they'd still pay 5 but maybe the person at 100 thousand would pay a higher rate. Or in the examples I earlier cited, they actually go well..."

DeLuca: "No, I'm saying in..."

Currie: "...above 100 thousand."

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

- DeLuca: "I'm saying in my example. The person that's paying 5 thousand now, would most likely be paying less?"
- Currie: "Could be, yes. Or could stay the same and raise rates some place higher in the income structure."
- DeLuca: "Okay. And the person paying 50 thousand will most likely be paying more?"
- Currie: "You know, I don't think so and I'll tell you why. Just because the calculations I have seen from many different people suggest that you probably don't want to add to the tax burden of people at that level. Right now..."
- DeLuca: "No, no, no. That's the person that's making... remember, they're paying 50 thousand in taxes."

Currie: "I thought you said..."

DeLuca: "They're making a million."

Currie: "I thought you talked about the person making 50 thousand."

DeLuca: "No. I was saying about the person paying 5 thousand... Now I ran out of time. Okay. Thank you very much for an..."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie to close."

Currie: "All right. Let me just talk for a minute about Minnesota. Minnesota's interesting. It's come up in several discussions during the debate on this measure. And one of the things that, to me, is interesting about Minnesota is that a couple of years ago, they do have a progressive tax structure as you know, they raised taxes. They raised taxes and there were two effects. One effect was that they actually reduced income inequality, according to the Illinois Policy Institute, when they did it. And second, the Minnesota economy is booming. The Minnesota economy is doing a whole lot better than the

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

Illinois economy. So, it's not a question of whether you have a progressive tax or what your tax rate, many other factors go into making a state an attractive place in which to live and in which to do business. Many people have talked about flight. People want to leave Illinois if we raise the rates. They'll be leaving in droves. Well, the last statistic I saw said that of the millionaires leaving Illinois, the majority of them are going to Seattle and San Francisco. These are not low tax jurisdictions, Members of this Assembly. These are high cost of living places to go. So, it isn't isn't the low tax states that are calling them. In fact, it's the wealthy. Remember, that low-income people in Illinois are paying twice as much of their resources in state and local taxes as are the wealthy. And according to the other statistics I've seen, the second highest effective tax rate for ordinary Illinoisans making 59, 60 thousand dollars a year. We have the second highest effective tax rate in the Midwest. And for millionaires, we have the second lowest effective tax rate in the Middle West. So, I would say it's time to be fair to our lower-income people, our middle-class people, our working families. It's time to join me in supporting a really good idea, House Resolution 1025."

Speaker Lang: "Those is favor of the Lady's Resolution will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves, Members. Please record yourselves. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 61 voting 'yes', 52 voting 'no'. And the Resolution is adopted. Mr. Phillips is recognized."

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

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

Speaker Lang: "Proceed, Sir."

Phillips: "I think this is an excellent time to talk about House Resolution 1138 that I filed earlier in the week. I'd like to give you a few details about House Resolution 1138. The City of Chicago passed a Resolution in 1925 to form the State of Chicago. And in 1981, State Senator Howard Carroll, who was a Democrat, passed Cook County Succession Bill through both chambers of the State Legislature. Illinois is a divided state at this moment. The City of Chicago and downstate Illinois approach issues from completely different perspectives and have very little in common. We often recognize this fact in legislation that we pass all the time. The fact is Chicago is frequently exempted from legislation being considered in Legislature. As a downstater, I find this extremely frustrating because while Chicago is exempt from various types of legislation, the City of Chicago often comes to the state seeking more and more way of funding. So, I think it's time we thought very seriously about making the City of Chicago its own state, separate from the rest of Illinois. If we can carve them out of legislation we can pass, why shouldn't Chicago be its own state? The idea of dividing up and existing state is making news these days as the strong movement in California to divide the golden state, Mr. Speaker. Why can't we have this discussion here? There's certainly is history of efforts in the past as we've talked about from Cook County wanting to carve themselves out. Because Hilary Clinton won Cook Country by such a large margin, she easily carried Illinois in the last Presidential

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

election even though Trump won 91 of the other 102 counties. I know the idea of separating Chicago from the rest of Illinois is probably not going to become a reality any time soon, but I think we should at least look at my Resolution and have a frank conversation on the differences that exist between the City of Chicago and the rest of Illinois. The people I represent are tired of having people who have no idea what life is like in rural communities set policies for us. The longer we ignore these divisions, the greater the divide between downstate Illinois and Chicago will be. Other states are looking at separation. Let us please at least explore the idea of the two state. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield? I just want to..."

Speaker Lang: "No. No. He's not..."

Flowers: "Well, I..."

Speaker Lang: "We're not going to have a discussion during a point of personal privilege, Representative."

Flowers: "Oh, okay. Well, I just wanted to ask if this was his last Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wheeler is recognized for an announcement."

Wheeler, K.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Republicans request an immediate caucus."

Speaker Lang: "Both Parties will caucus immediately in their respective caucus rooms. The estimate is one hour, but we will recess to the call of the Chair. The House will be in order. Page 9 of the Calendar, Senate Bills-Second Reading,

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

Senate Bill 482, Mr. Zalewski. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 482, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day.

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

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to adopt Floor Amendment #2 and Floor Amendment #3. They become the Bill relating to the use of jet fuel sales tax revenue to be repurposed."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of Amendment 2 will say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

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

Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 482, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 482 is designed to comply with a federal rule relating to the sale of jet fuel. Approximately four years ago, the FTA came forth and it said that any locally imposed tax... or sales tax on jet fuel in the State of Illinois above and beyond a certain amount imposed in 1987 had to be redistributed for the purposes of aviation related funds or aviation-related purposes. In Illinois, our statute is out of compliance with respect to that... with respect to the rule to the tune of about a point and a quarter

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

percent. Senate Bill 482 seeks to remedy that by creating a fund for the purposes of airport-related purposes. I'm happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Harris, D.: "Representative, we know we've had this issue for a while. It would've been nice that we would've shared the Floor Amendment ahead of time. Can you kind of give us an idea of exactly what it does?"

Zalewski: "David, to be fair, this is the Amendment that was adopted last fall in committee."

Harris, D.: "So, it's the same Amendment?"

Zalewski: "Yes."

Harris, D.: "All right. And that's..."

Zalewski: "I apologize for the startling way in which this came about..."

Harris, D.: "Okay."

Zalewski: "...but we're doing it at this moment."

Harris, D.: "So, if it's the same Amendment... To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Gentleman is correct that the Federal Aviation Administration issued a regulation that said that taxes on aviation fuel and jet fuel that are collected have to be used for airport purposes. Now anyone in this chamber that has an airport in their district that the municipality may get sales tax revenue from needs to pay attention to this Amendment because if this is the same Amendment that was introduced or adopted last year, which is what the Gentleman just said, the bulk of the moneys go to

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

O'Hare and Midway. So, if you pay a dollar or if your aviation fuel taxes paid a dollar in, let's say, Lake in the Hills, or Champaign, or Peoria, or any other airport, Springfield, any other airport in the State of Illinois, that dollar is now not... that sales tax dollar on the motor fuels in now not going to go to your municipality, but rather is going to be diverted to O'Hare and to Midway. I really question the fairness of that. I have in my district... I border Chicago Executive Airport one of the feeder airports in O'Hare, or reliever airports at the O'Hare area. So, look closely at this before you simply jump on and say yes. If you have an airport in your district or your municipality has an airport in its city limits, then the effect of this sales tax diversion is going to hit you. And I respect what the Gentleman's doing because we are up against a very tight timeline, but I think we can come up with a better formula for distribution of those motor fuel... excuse me, those aviation fuel tax dollars. So, I urge caution. I urge a 'no' vote. And Mr. Speaker, if I may, an inquiry of the Chair. Does this Bill in any way preempt Home Rule?"

Speaker Lang: "We'll get an answer to that question for you, Sir.

Have you completed your remarks? We'll get an answer for you."

Harris, D.: "All right. Thank you. And I'd also ask that the Bill

go on to Standard Debate."

Speaker Lang: "That will be done."

Harris, D.: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Pritchard."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

- Pritchard: "Representative, we talked about this issue some months back because it's an issue that I think local units of government have been aware of what the Federal Aviation Administration is doing. But what are the percentage breakdown that you have in this Bill?"
- Zalewski: "When... what do you mean by percentage breakdown, Representative?"
- Pritchard: "So, is it... according to the previous speaker, in this Amendment we're diverting some of the local sales tax dollars to other airports."
- Zalewski: "We're basing the metric of how jet fuel sales are portioned based on the metrics of enplanements. And under an enplanement standard, the money is redistributed through the... through this new fund based on that standard."
- Pritchard: "So, all the sales tax dollars is coming into one fund and then distributed from that fund?"
- Zalewski: "Correct, correct."
- Pritchard: "And the distribution is based on what? How will a local airport be able to get funds to maintain and operate their airport?"
- Zalewski: "So, there'll be a system by which data will be submitted to the Illinois Department of Transportation for administration due to airport-related fund. And as a result of that enplanements data... and enplanement is who gets on and off a plane. Based on that metric, the department will use a formula to determine how much money from the sale of jet fuel go to that airport."
- Pritchard: "So, why isn't the formula based on gallons sold rather than deplanement?"

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

Zalewski: "Repeat that, Bob?"

Pritchard: "Why isn't the distribution based on gallons sold rather than deplanement?"

Zalewski: "I don't know the answer to that other than to say that this is the language that was adopted by the Revenue & Finance Committee last... last fall."

Pritchard: "It just seems unfair if we're talking about highways, for example. There's needs for highway repair around the state that don't get a lot of transportation, don't get a lot of vehicles. The same thing could be true at an airport where airport maintenance is important, but they may not get a lot of passengers. It could simply be a pilot landing. The formula needs to change, Representative. And I have deep concerns about diverting funds away from around the state and concentrating them into the very high trek passenger areas, which is what, half a dozen in our state."

Zalewski: "Well, to be clear, Bob. I want to... we need to clean the record up on that a little bit. The federal rule requires us to divert money from the sale of locally... of jet fuel to various airport-related purposes throughout the state. And it's left to the state to determine how that money is... how that money is... is distributed. So, it's... it... we're not recreating the wheel here. We're choosing our own standard by which we can divert the money to the... to the locally... to the locals."

Pritchard: "But local airports are still going to be starved in this formula. If there's no provision in there for how a local airport can get dollars that are necessary just to maintain the airport. They don't get a lot of passengers, they're not

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

going to get the dollars. That's what's unfair about this formula."

Zalewski: "I don't... Bob, I can't... I mean, if your... if your concerns are with the formula as it's written in the Amendment, I don't know if I can give you a better answer than we have a complicated airport structure in the state where we have large commercial airports in one portion of the state and small, regional airports in another. And this is the best way at this moment we can decide how to divvy up the money."

Pritchard: "And why are so many agencies against your Amendment?"

Zalewski: "Repeat that message."

Pritchard: "Why are so many of the agencies against your Amendment?"

Zalewski: "Well, who's opposed from your analysis?"

Pritchard: "According to our analysis, most of them."

Zalewski: "According to your analysis what?"

Pritchard: "The airlines."

Zalewski: "The airlines are opposed?"

Pritchard: "If I've got the right Bill. So, who is opposed to this Bill?"

Zalewski: "Pull it... Mr. Speaker, we're going to pull this Bill from the record."

Pritchard: "So, or was it their main..."

Zalewski: "Bob, we're going to pull this from the record. We're going to pull this from the record."

Pritchard: "Pardon?"

Zalewski: "I'm going to pull it from the record."

Speaker Lang: "Do you wish to take the Bill out of the record, Sir? Gentleman takes the Bill out of the record. Page 4 of

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

the Calendar, Senate Bills-Third Reading, Senate Bill 211.
Mr. Moylan. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 211, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Moylan."

Moylan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the General Assembly. House Floor Amendment #1 is a gut and replace Amendment that becomes the Bill. This states that we can have a special scratch off for homeless. And also says if you ma... if you win above a certain amount of money, you do not have to declare yourself the winner. And I respectfully ask for an 'aye' vote."

'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Members, please record yourselves. Manley. Please take the record. There are 107 voting 'yes', 9 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 337, Representative Willis. Out of the record. Senate Bill 486, Leader Currie. Please read the Bill. There's an Amendment, Representative. We'll place this Bill on the Order of Second Reading. And Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 486, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. This Bill was read a second time a previous day.

Amendment 3 was adopted previously. Floor Amendment 4, offered by Representative Currie, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

- Currie: "Thank you very much. This is a... the program that establishes how we would assess... how the county assessors would assess commercial solar systems. The Bill originally introduced would have defined the cost at \$199 thousand per megawatt. This Amendment moves the... moves the needle and says it will be \$218 thousand per megawatt. I'm... I'm unaware of any opposition. I'd appreciate your support."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Batinick on the Amendment. Gentleman 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 Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 585, Mr. Walsh. Mr. Walsh. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2332, Representative Lilly. Representative Lilly, do you wish to proceed? Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2332, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Lilly."
- Lilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the General Assembly. I rise to present SB2332. It is commonly known as Tobacco 21. And this piece of legislation is critical in combatting the lifelong addiction and suffering of people who are using tobacco products. Tobacco 21 is proven effective and predicted to reduce the teen tobacco use by 25 percent. Tobacco 21 applies to 18 to 20 year olds, but impact all youth. Tobacco 21 helps prevent the next generation of adult smokers, cutting adult smoking rate by 12 percent. Seventyone percent of our youth, ages 17 to 24 are unfit to serve in

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

the U.S. military because they are unable to pass the written exam, the physical test, and they have criminal backgrounds. The military resigns... realizes tobacco endangers not only our youth, but our combat readiness. This is an issue of national security. Use of tobacco products is not permitted during basic training. And the Department of Defense is making all military installations around the globe tobacco free in 2020, two years from now. It is... it is not a reward for young military recruits or young Illinoisans to have access to products that will harm them with cancer, heart disease, COPD. These are not rewards. Tobacco 21 protects young people, reduces smoking rates, saves millions in health care dollars, and it saves lives. Many current smokers and former smokers started at around 21. It is difficult to find a smoker who doesn't wish they had not started smoking. Raising the legal age to 21 reduces teen access to tobacco products and removes tobacco from our social circles of our youth. The adolescent brain is particularly sensitive to the effects of nicotine. Studies indicate that nicotine during youth it increases the risk of developing psychiatric disorders, incognitive, impairments later in life. These are the facts. Nicotine removes an individual's ability to make clear and intentional choices. You are not an adult until you are able to take care of yourself. Many 18-year-olds are living at home with their parents who are taking care of them. Tobacco 21 helps ensure the next generation will never know the lifelong health effects of tobacco. It will keep our children tobacco free until they are 21. Odds are that they will pick up this deadly disease are minimal. Public... public opinion states that a

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

statewide survey revealed that 65 percent of the registered voters are supportive of Tobacco 21 and 47 percent of those supporters are current... are current smokers. Eighteen thousand three hundred adults annually die each year from their smoking addiction. Fifty percent of the women diagnosed with lung cancer will not survive one year from their diagnosis. Smoking kills more than all of the other forms of preventable deaths. Five point forty-nine billion annual health care costs in Illinois is directed towards smoking illnesses. This does not include the loss of productivity by tobacco use. Of that, 1.49 billion 1 point... oh, no. I'm sorry. ...additional 1.9 billion of these costs are Medicaid costs that we Illinoisans pay for those individuals who are smoking. Other states that have taken up the measure of tobacco 21 or a T21 is California, Hawaii, Maine, New Jersey, Oregon, and over 300-plus municipalities nationwide have jointed this measure. In Illinois, 26 municipalities have already joined and is growing. In Evanston, it has been proven the high school tobacco use rate has decreased more than 37 percent... percent since the purchase of tobacco to the age of 21. The City of Chicago has passed Tobacco 21 in 19... in 19... excuse me... July 1, 2016. There has been no border issues reported. St. Louis and St. Louis County both have adopted the local Tobacco 21 policy. Ladies and Gentlemen, it is important that we begin to address the issue that are striking our communities down, which is poor health. Tobacco is the leading cause in addressing the poor health in our country, in our state, and in our cities. We are talking prevention. With

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

that being said, I'd like to ask for an 'aye' vote. And I will take any questions."

Speaker Lang: "The Chair will remove this Bill from Short Debate.

There will be two more proponents, three opponents. Mr. Breen is recognized."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Breen: "Representative, I want to direct you to page 51, lines 11 through 13 of your Bill. It reads... and you're striking from the Bill... or from the law of the State of Illinois you would be striking the Section that says, no minor under 18 years of age shall possess any cigars, cigarettes, smokeless tobacco, or tobacco in any of its forms. So, you are removing the prohibition on possession of tobacco by those under the age of 18."

Lilly: "That is correct."

"Okay. Thank you. Just for the sake of the debate timing, Breen: to the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, I have two communities I very strongly support that have recently raised the age of sale in their communities to 21: the City of Wheaton and the Village of Glen Ellyn. I'm very supportive of those efforts. I think they have made the correct decision for their communities. But they certainly did not make those efforts thinking that somehow we, in the General Assembly, would essentially undermine the current state of tobacco enforcement on prohibiting those under the age of 18 from possessing these products. And I don't think anybody in this General Assembly wants 14-year-olds starting to smoke now because the prohibition on the possession of the products has

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

now been... would be wiped off the books with this particular initiative. Our local communities are going to 21 for sale. They're doing that in greater numbers. That is the right way to handle this issue not to withdraw all of the penalties or the prohibitions at all for children to be possessing and using tobacco. I would yield the remainder of my time to Representative Wheeler who, I believe, will also ask for a verification."

Speaker Lang: "Mr... you... you squeezed a lot into there. Mr. Wheeler."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Wheeler, K.: "Representative, I'm looking at our analysis here and I see a pretty good long list of opponents here. Have you worked to address their concerns in your Bill?"

Lilly: "I'm very glad you asked the question. I'm Representative Camille Lilly. I've been in the General Assembly since 2010, April and not one of the opponents have come to me and asked me any questions related to Tobacco 21. And I would love to have... I've asked many Members to send these, I would call them fictitious persons, to me so that I can answer their questions. Not one of the individuals that may have spoken to my colleagues on both sides of this aisle had the respect from my tenure to come and ask me a question related to this particular piece of legislation that is affecting the future of our young people. And I really thought that was amazing."

Wheeler, K.: "Well, Representative, I'm going to ask you a couple of questions then because I'm right here with you right now."

Lilly: "Thank you."

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

Wheeler, K.: "I'm assuming that some of the concerns had to do with the fact that we have a long border with other states that may not have the same legislation in place. Do any of our neighboring states have a 21-year-old tobacco age for purchase?"

Lilly: "I didn't hear you, Representative."

Wheeler, K.: "I said do any of our neighboring states currently impose a 21-year-old requirement for the purchase of tobacco products?"

Lilly: "Yes. The five states that I mentioned."

Wheeler, K.: "Okay. I honestly, in this long list of things, I missed what those are. Are those our neighboring states?"

Lilly: "No, they're not. California, Hawaii, Maine, New Jersey, and Oregon; however, we have bordering states, St. Louis and Iowa have taken up the measure."

Wheeler, K.: "Okay. But just..."

Lilly: "And Missouri."

Wheeler, K.: "So..."

Lilly: "Oh, I'm sorry. Missouri. Well, the county... the county."

Wheeler, K.: "Okay. Thank you. The concern I have is that we are...
we are doing this in a vacuum, like we do a lot of things in
our chamber here where we think of a good idea, but we don't
measure... counterbalance it; it has to take place with our
neighboring states. And what happens on those bordering
communities where they may have an emergent situation where
they feel like there's going to be a loss of their product in
sales to a neighboring state that doesn't have the same
regulations that we do. I told the nurses that came and talked
to me, Representative, that... that if this were a national

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

movement, I'd probably be supportive of that. If this were even a regional where all the states around us decide to do it together, I can understand that. At the time, I'm just struggling with that. And Mr. Speaker, should this Bill receive the requisite number of votes, I request a verification. Thank you."

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

Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all, I just want to say thank you to the Sponsor and the amazing advocates for their passionate and had work on this Bill. So, I don't smoke and I've never smoked. But these days, not a day goes by that don't think about cigarettes and their destructive devastating power. Every day I think about addiction. How it starts with a bad decision, a wrong choice, but then evolves into an incredible force over time, which can render those in its grip quite powerless. It's not really a choice in the way we think about choices. It's an addiction which truly works the meaning of the word 'choice'. I didn't really understand this until the past year or so as I've watched someone very close to me struggle with this addiction for years while battling cancer. I've now seen nicotine for what it really is, a cruel thief which steals a person's will to live and thrive all in favor of cigarettes. The less a person has... the less strength they have the more the addiction takes hold. I've seen it firsthand; it's not pretty. We've all seen sick people smoking, maybe smoking while wearing an oxygen tank. It's horrible to see. Just like me, you probably thought, how could someone do that to themselves when they're

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

that sick? Why can't they just quit? But after watching my family member devastated by cancer continue to smoke throughout, I've learned about the cruel power, of the addiction and its incredible power. Think about it, when someone has no will to eat, to exercise, or to do much, does the addiction subside? No, it becomes more powerful the less you have. It simply tightens its grip and replaces everything else. Sure, smoking kills in its own right, as the Sponsor outlined, but it's also a great and very helpful partner in helping cancer kill you by preventing you from taking the steps necessary to heal, replacing it with the craving for what is nothing less than poison. Many of you believe that smoking is a choice. I've already started to hear that in the discussion. So, I understand you're hesitant to limit to ... limit the ability of a young person to make their own choices, but would you feel the same if you saw what I saw, watched what I'm watching every day and understand the choice part of smoking is fleeting. It may have started as a choice, but it doesn't stay a choice forever. Please consider voting 'yes' and buying some time for the thousands of young people who eventually lose their ability to make the choice to smoke or not smoke."

Speaker Lang: "Representative McDermed."

McDermed: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I rise in support of this Bill. And I'm dedicating my affirmative vote on this Bill to my mom, Eleanor McDermed, who passed away at age 55 after being a lifelong smoker. And one of the biggest regrets of my life is that she was never here to meet my children or for me to have an adult relationship with her. And I would

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

really strongly urge everyone here in this Assembly, and I know there are many others of you who have suffered a similar loss, as my fellow Rep from Chicago has spoken, to think about your family members and to think about how when an addiction can start this early how it... in spite of the many, many times that my mom tried to quit, she never could... and this is a story that many of us have had to live with. And I would really strongly urge all of us to vote 'yes' on this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "We have now had three speak in favor.

Representative Ives, do you speak in favor or in opposition?

Five minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ives: "Representative Lilly, I was just wondering. How do you
feel about legalizing marijuana? That's another product that
is smoked."

Lilly: "It is. And it's not an issue in this particular measure."

Ives: "Well, how do you feel about it? Are you for that or against
 it?"

Lilly: "Representative, can we address the Tobacco 21. It's a very critical Bill that's causing a lot of issues in our great state."

Ives: "It's still... it's still a product that would be smoked. And if you legalize marijuana, it'd be in the same realm. It still creates the same issues by inhaling a harmful substance into your lungs."

Lilly: "At this time, we are discussing a legal product, tobacco."

Ives: "Okay."

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

Lilly: "And that's the product. Thank you."

Ives: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. All right. So, you know, first of all, this is... this is just a Bill honestly that's going to create an underground market for tobacco products. It's going to create cross sales across state lines rather than any of that tax revenue staying in Illinois. And it's really going to create sort of more of nanny state disposition here in the State of Illinois that we currently have. And then, when you think about what you can do at age 18 from military service, to voting, to paying taxes, to marrying, signing contracts, all your property rights, medical treatment. You know, at age 18 when my kids go into the doctor, even though I go in there with them, you know what, they have their own HIPAA requirement now that they're 18 even though we're paying for that insurance. So, at age 18 you're considered a full adult. But I guess you can't make the decision whether or not you want to buy a tobacco product. Now, the truth is, you can ... you can stand right next to a police officer and go ahead and smoke all day long and not be arrested. It's just if you went into the store to purchase the tobacco, then you would be in violation of our laws. That's what your Bill does. That doesn't make sense. If you really wanted to halt people from under age 21 from smoking, you would actually make sure that you prohibited it not just for the purchase but also for the use. But your Bill doesn't do that at all. So, this Bill is just nonsensical. It'll actually cause people to purchase tobacco products over the state line and we'll lose loads of ... of revenue if that happens. And it is big government telling everybody what else to do. So, I'm just wondering what comes

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

next. Are you going to ban all sorts of sugar products? Are you going to ban sugary drinks like they attempted to do in Cook County because that's bad for your health too? Look, I get it. Seventy-five percent of kids aged 18 to 24 are not qualified for military service, but it's not because they're smoking. It's typically because they're overweight; they can't meet the physical standard. And that has everything to do with obesity and yet, I don't see the ban sugary drinks Bill here, I see this one instead. So, if you want to go nanny state, just go full-out nanny state. Nobody's an adult 'til 21. And let's just make that the standard instead. Otherwise, to vote on this Bill, which allows you to use tobacco under the age of 21 but not purchase it, is nonsense. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bristow, do you rise in favor of or in opposition to this Bill?"

Bristow: "In favor, Sir."

Speaker Lang: "I'm sorry. We have already had a sufficient on the proponent's side. Mr. Jones, are you in favor of this Bill?"

Jones: "I rise in opposition to this Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed. Five minutes, Sir."

Jones: "Inquiry of the Chair before I proceed, Mr... Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Jones: "This Bill has some serious constitutional questions. The question is, does this Bill require 71 votes?"

Speaker Lang: "We will confirm, Sir. I... I believe this Bill requires 60 votes, but we will check with the parliamentarian."

Jones: "Okay."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

Jones: "Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Jones: "Representative, thank you for bringing this Bill. This is a serious matter as you... as you discussed. You mentioned earlier that you had... you see the list of opposition that the opposition not only didn't come to you or didn't talk to you, but to my knowledge there was a compromise that was offered to you. Was there a compromise offered to you on this Bill?"

Lilly: "I spoke to a Senator in favor of passing Tobacco 21. I have no idea who this offer is from. To me, this must be some fictitious individual who have ideas of how we can better make law in Illinois. They did not come to me, State Representative Camille Lilly, to discuss anything. And I truly felt that that was very amazing because I believe I could have learned something from them. I... that did not occur. I... what is important that everyone knows that this particular document here has all of the supporters of Tobacco 21 who did come to me and share with me their concern about the lives of their families, their communities, and their youth."

Jones: "Representative, I have limited time. So. you know, I just want to stick to the..."

Lilly: "I just want to say who came to me."

Jones: "Okay. Let's stick to it because you mentioned results in surveys because most of us... I represent a border community. And part of the issue, knowing the south suburbs, all the businesses that are leaving. So, let me direct your attention to the fiscal note that was filed on this Bill. So, if you look at the fiscal note that was filed on the Bill, it states that it would decrease the receipts by 41 to 48 million

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

dollars. So, that... that means that we will have a budget hole if this Bill is implemented, correct?"

Lilly: "No."

Jones: "Why do you say no when the fiscal note says 41 to 48 million dollars that we will lose?"

Lilly: "The fiscal note assumes that 18, 19, and 20-year-olds will quit smoking immediately. We wish all 18, 19, and 20-year-olds would quit, but it's estimated that only 15 percent decline for smoke for tobacco use for this age group. The Department of Revenue calculated smoking and a consumption too high for this age group. The fiscal note uses the 21-plus smoking and consumption rate for 18, 20... 18, 19, and 21-year-old... 20-year-old age group. The 18 to 21 age has a lower smoking prevalent rate and consumption rate."

Jones: "So, Representative..."

Lilly: "The fiscal note is not on cigarette tax data, is on... the cigarette tax rate is much higher than tobacco tax rate."

Jones: "Well, Representative... Representative..."

Lilly: "This fiscal note is inapplicable."

Jones: "Representative, my time is running out. So, I want to get to a couple more questions. I disagree with your analogy of the receipt if the fiscal note says 41 percent. I did a survey of myself and my district and we had only 4 thousand people that contacted my office. We had almost 1500 people on Facebook and almost 500 people who voted and said that we should not be doing this. So, do you agree that an 18-year-old can go to the military?"

Lilly: "That's the law."

Jones: "An 18-year-old can get married, correct?"

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

Lilly: "I'm sorry?"

Jones: "It's legal for an 18-year-old to get married, correct?"

Lilly: "That's... yeah, that's..."

Jones: "Legal for an 18-year-old to..."

Lilly: "...depending on the state, but that's a law."

Jones: "So, Representative, beyond what you're saying, why should we pass this Bill, Representative, when 18-year-olds currently are allowed to go to the military? They can smoke in the military. They can buy a house and smoke in that house, Representative. So, why are we doing this Bill, Representative, beyond what you're asking us to do?"

Lilly: "Again, Representative, the military recognized that tobacco endangers not only our youth but our combat readiness.

This is an issue of national security. Use of tobacco products is permitted... is not permitted during basic training. And the..."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Lilly, please complete your answer.

And Mr. Jones, please bring your remarks to a close..."

Lilly: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "...after she does that."

Lilly: "Thank you. The Department of Defense is making all military installations around the globe tobacco free in 2020."

Jones: "I would just urge a 'no' vote on this. We're going down a slippery slope. This Bill doesn't need to be done. We should've did this when we did the smoking ban in 2008. I would urge a 'no'... 'no' vote."

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Jones, in answer to your previous question.

 The parliamentarian advises this Bill requires 60 votes.

 Representative Lilly to close."
- Lilly: "Ladies and Gentlemen, 18 thousand lives are lost to tobacco use every year. Our young people are our future. Taking up and purchasing tobacco early gives you the reward of addiction. Our young people do not need to be addicted to a product that will shorten their lifespan. I ask for your 'aye' vote. I ask for your consideration. I ask that you protect our young people today and now. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Lady moves for the passage of the Bill. Please be reminded that Mr. Wheeler has asked for a verification. So, Members will be in their chairs and vote their own switches. Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 56 voting 'yes', 54 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And the Lady asks for Postponed Consideration, Mr. Clerk. Senate Bill 337, Representative Willis. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 337, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Willis."
- Willis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is a... what I would call a compromise on what we previously tried to do on gun dealer licensing. It's now called gun certification. What this will do is it takes out a lot of the red tape, but it still makes sure that we have best practices followed by our

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

gun dealers. We've also taken into consideration some concerns by IRMA, some concerns by the gun dealers themselves, and tried to make sure that we're listening to this and working in a bipartisan manner. We reduced the cost of the certification. We certainly streamlined it. And we are hoping that will by this we will make sure that we have best practices followed by our gun dealerships. Couple of the high points in this is we actually reduce the cost for the certification for those businesses that are not brick and It'll be only a \$300 cost for a three-year certification. For those that have more, it will go up accordingly. We've also gone and streamlined the timeline of it. We hope by having them sent through a certification in a quick manner, they'll get back this affidavit on it. We do still have some good business practices in there. We have surveillance cameras on the entrance and exits and places where the guns are housed and the point of sale. We also do have background checks on the employees. And we also have asked for two hours of light... training for the employees to make sure that they can also spot those straw purchase in a better manner. We also ... one of the big things in here is we've also returned and included the chain stores. So, the big box stores that many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle were concerned that were not in there are now back in here. So, that is what we have put in here. I know this is not a perfect Bill. In fact, my intent is to possibly come back with a trailer Bill. There is some concern on one of those components that we added in towards the end on the Amendment that allowed the... the owners of ... to allow transfer

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

licenses to be stored by the State Police does have some concern that it is a slippery slope towards gun registry. That is not the intent of that clause. And we will make sure with a trailer Bill that that is clarified or taken out of the measure. With that in mind, I will at this point just be happy to take questions."

Speaker Lang: "The Chair will remove this from Short Debate. Mr. Breen."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Willis: "Be happy to."

Breen: "And Representative, I wanted to just clarify. House Amendment 2 was seeking to remove the paragraph that said a transferee shall not be criminally liable under the Section provided they provide the State Police with the transfer records. The issue that we had was that if an... the licensee goes out of business or otherwise retires, they wanted to have some repository for their various records so that they would not be criminally liable. But as you pointed out, the language in the Amendment, as it had been drafted, is pretty broad. It doesn't have necessarily the... the constraints that we'd like to see. So, if you could just enlighten the Body as to... we filed House Amendment 2, but we were unable to move it. What... can you enlighten the Body as to what our... what your commitment is as to House Amendment 2?"

Willis: "My commitment to this Body is that I will bring back a trailer Bill that will either take that clause out or get agreed language so that we can take care of the concerns of both sides of the aisle."

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

Breen: "And that is..."

Willis: "That is my commitment that I will do that."

Breen: "And you were fully willing to run this Amendment and move it forward, correct?"

Willis: "I am fully willing to run it and move it forward."

Breen: "All right."

Willis: "I would have held it 'til tomorrow to do so, but I hear the Senate may be getting out of here a little earlier than us and due to time constraints we need to do this today."

Breen: "So, in other words... yeah, we... so, we are unable to do our business because our brothers and sisters in the upper chamber want to go home early?"

Willis: "That's what I'm hearing unfortunately."

Breen: "Really glad to hear they're doing the peoples' business over there so."

Willis: "But we do it well here, so that's what's good."

Breen: "Fair enough. Thank you, Representative. I'd be glad to yield my time... actually, Mr. Speaker. We're in an odd position in that I'm supportive of the measure. I'm not even sure who needs to next get time, but I want to ensure that our supporters are fully apprised of that."

Speaker Lang: "I will count you in as a supporter... and by the way, that is not the upper chamber, it's the other chamber."

Breen: "Fair enough, yeah."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bristow."

Bristow: "Thank... thank you, Mr. Speaker. Does the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Bristow: "In my district, Olin Corporation, which makes ammunition, has four federal licenses. They have two as

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

Department of Defense contractors, a license to manufacture ammunition, and one to manufacture firearms. Under those licenses, they can sell to the public and in fact, do sell to the public. So, now they must have a security plan, one approved by the State Police. And what qualifications do the State Police have to evaluate a site security plan to the tune of about 1,700 acres and many, many buildings on-site in East Alton? Under this Bill, if the licensee fails any part of the Bill, the State Police could pull its certificate and pulling that certificate effects all of the licenses... all the licenses at that location. And under the Bill, they have to report any time a license was revoked in the last four years. So, if Olin lost their certificate under this Bill, they would, in effect, be shutting down a major ammunition manufacturer in our country, the largest employer in my district, and they would not be able to operate if the state had pulled their state license. And then if that happens, they would be shutting down a major defense contractor. And defense contractors contracts are one of Olin's major customers. This is a broad overreach of this Bill that we are now going to have State Police overseeing defense contractors with the possibility that a violation would shut down that plant and put thousands of people out of work. They've already moved two product lines to Mississippi. We need to protect these jobs and this business in my district. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Phelps Finnie."

Phelps Finnie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, on Section 565 requires electronic recordkeeping. And so, we have great concerns with this. So, if the State Police..."

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

Willis: "Actually, Representative, that has been pulled out..."

Phelps Finnie: "Okay."

Willis: "...and the Amendment that is already filed and been adopted by this floor."

Phelps Finnie: "Thank you. But the State Police would be able to...
they're going to have to set up a way to report private
transactions? Is that still... to the Sponsor, I'm sorry."

Willis: "There would be data collection by the State Police in that."

Phelps Finnie: "Okay. So, to the Bill. If this happens, for the first time in the history of the state, we'd be collecting information: the make, the model, serial numbers of handguns, rifles, shotguns, so registration system of guns and gun owners. We who are... who have lots of guns in our home and love that right that we have are very concerned about this because we... it's part of our heritage and our culture that we exchange guns. We pass down guns from family members and to friends sometimes just trading, bartering, what have you. And this idea of that now we have to keep a transaction... electronic transaction is very, very concerning to us. So I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Costello."

Costello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move for unlimited debate on this."

Speaker Lang: "Your request..."

Costello: "Is that a possibility?"

Speaker Lang: "...your request is approved, Sir."

Costello: "Thank you very much. Representative, so real quick.

Tell me about the Amendment that you're claiming... or a trailer

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

Bill, excuse me, that you're claiming to run later. And what I specifically need to know is as I see your Bill right now the registration component, can you explain that as far as if you consider that to be any..."

- Willis: "There is actually no registration component in the Bill the way I read it at all. It has been interpreted that if you went to... in the Amendment in the Bill, the final page, allows people to... if they want, to avoid any type of concerns of being caught on not having the paperwork for a gun transfer, they can then have everything held and filed by the State Police, if they desire. The concern is that the State Police would use that information for a gun registry. That is not the intent of myself or any of the gun... the antiviolence advocates. To make people feel better, we decided that we would pull that part out of this Bill. We have it in now, but we will do a trailer part that will take that out later on."
- Costello: "So, as I read the Bill, currently, you and I would disagree because I do believe there's a registration component. It's something that provides someone to provide a make, model, serial number, you know, of a weapon. So..."
- Willis: "You have to do that with all sales now anyways. When we do gun traces, that's how we find out where the gun was originally purchased."
- Costello: "And so, the process of the State Police actually keeping these records... let me ask you a question. So, we've... we've had gun ban legislation in the State of Illinois here that has not passed yet, but if one of those Bills would pass, how can you tell me that the State Police wouldn't use that information for confiscation of weapons?"

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

- Willis: "Confiscation of weapon is not constitutionally allowed in the State of Illinois at this point. And that is all I can tell you on that. I'm not a State Police Officer."
- Costello: "But we... we are in my mind creating a registry. Also, is there anything in this Bill that prohibits the State Police from charging a fee for this?"
- Willis: "It is not... there is no fee charged by the State Police for this. There is a... there is a certification fee that does go through, which is basically an administrative fee."

Costello: "But there's nothing that prohibits them."

Willis: "And then there's a fine if there's..."

Costello: "Right."

- Willis: "There's fines in there, too, if they are found in default."
- Costello: "So, also from a recordkeeping standpoint, we are... and I want to say this very loudly... this Bill does have a penalty enhancement in it. There's a penalty enhancement in this Bill because we have a Class A misdemeanor for a first offense of not keeping records and then a Class 4 felony... Class 4 felony for a second offense of records, right? So, there's a penalty enhancement in this Bill. Is that correct?"

Willis: "There is a penalty in the Bill."

- Costello: "Penalty enhancement in the Bill. So, implementation of this Bill, how would the State Police afford to implement this Bill? They've already said that they don't have enough Troopers. I don't believe this Bill has an appropriation in it. So..."
- Speaker Lang: "Please bring your remarks to a close, Sir. Mr. Costello."

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

- Costello: "Right. Where... where are these State Policemen that are going to, you know, conduct this? Where are they coming from? Who are we taking them away from? And what appropriation amount are we taking away from the State Police to, in fact, enact this Bill?"
- Willis: "Well, first off, there is no true number that we can put our finger on what this will cost. One of the big important things is that the inspections that State Police will be doing are complaint driven. No complaints, no inspection's required because that's followed under ATF. There would be administrative costs, I would agree, but we also know that there are funds that we can probably move around for that. There is extra money in the concealed carry fund. There's some extra money in some other gun-related funds that we can look at. I also actually, personally, put in a request to increase the State Police in this year's budget. So, we'll see what happens."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Costello, please bring your remarks to a close, Sir."
- Costello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I see this Bill, currently, it absolutely does have a registration component to it. I highly recommend a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Skillicorn."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Skillicorn: "Hi there, Representative. Just a couple brief questions. First, walk us through this recordkeeping, you know, it's a penalty enhancement. Is that correct?"

Willis: "I'm sorry. I didn't hear the second part of..."

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

- Skillicorn: "Walk us through this recordkeeping, penalty enhancement. So, say, a person-to-person transfer of a weapon."
- Willis: "So, if somebody goes and they go and they do a gun trace and you cannot find your record of what happened to that gun and there is... so, your records are not there. You can be file... you can be charged with a Class A misdemeanor."
- Skillicorn: "Okay. And there's another component here. This is what the State Police is supposed to do inspections on gun dealers and Federal Firearm License holders that... tell me about, like, there's supposed to be a security arrangement... cameras and security. Tell me a little about that."
- Willis: "So, what... what you have to do is when you file for the state certification that shows that you are a gun dealer in good standing, there will be an affidavit that you will fill out along with a copy of your FFL. With that, you will state yes I have security cameras on premise or I'll have them by the time frame that is required. Yes, I have FOID cards for all of my employees or I have done background checks of them. So, there are the criteria that are in there. Yes, I have the appropriate signage in my building that states that you cannot go past a certain point without a FOID card and to tell people that they are under surveillance on it. All of these things are checked off, filed with the State Police, and then you are granted your certification. And it is an automatic granted certification as long as you have an FFL in good standing."
- Skillicorn: "And this is in addition with the Federal Firearms License, correct?"

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

Willis: "This is a certification, a state certification, for those people that have Federal Firearm Licenses, yes."

"Well, thank you for answering my questions. Skillicorn: Specifically, to the Bill. There's... there's a few areas that I have concerns about. One, I'll go into this recordkeeping provision. So, it sounds like a great idea, but recordkeeping is not gun running. Recordkeeping is not committing violent crimes. Recordkeeping is simply my file cabinet committing a crime. And my file cabinet, specifically, is getting a penalty enhancement. So, if there's a flood in my basement and the records I kept are destroyed, theoretically, that's a penalty enhancement and a fairly serious crime, not violent, not selling a weapon to a thug, not dealing a weapon to someone who's going to cause harm, literally just a paperwork error. Same thing, if I take a picture of someone's FOID card on my phone or digital camera and I drop that camera into a bathtub, or swimming pool, or something and the camera's destroyed, literally I'm quilty of a misdemeanor crime at that point in time, not violence, no intent to harm anyone, but literally a paperwork filing error that's a penalty enhancement. The next thing I'll go into is... so, I read over the Bill and there's some specific language about adequate locks, adequate video surveillance, but it doesn't go into the details of it. And I'm kind of curious of why those details aren't there. You know, we spell out a lot of details here. And we go through, comb through things. We give businesses regulations. We give individuals regulations. But here there's no detail. Is it going to be 1 lock, 2 locks, 10 locks? Is there a requirement to how clear the video has to be? I mean, does it

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

have to be a certain resolution or something? Do we have to have a facial recognition on that? There's... fortunately, it's not on there. It's not very... it's a little vague. So, that's one criteria there, but then there's another one. This is a little bit more troubling. And I'm going to bring up a movie out of cult lore back from the '80s, the movie Red Dawn. And when the bad guys invaded the town, what did they do? They went to the heart... or the sporting goods store and they wanted to look up the gun registry. They wanted to look up the records of who owned the guns. Nothing's going to stop the State of Illinois from looking up this information if we now we require this. This is a gun registry and that's it. So, I... I urge a 'no' vote. Since I have 40 seconds to go here, I'm going to read off the Illinois Republican platform from my Republican brothers and sisters and where it says in the Second Amendment. It says, specifically, we believe that day to day safety and security for our local communities is critical. Therefore, we strongly endorse and support the Second Amendment of the United States of the Constitution which states in part the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed. As a result, we oppose any effort by the state or municipalities to impede on the right of lawabiding citizens to keep and bear arms. To my Republican brothers and sisters, that is straight from a Republican Party platform. I urge a 'no' vote from both sides of the aisle. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wheeler."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

- Wheeler, K.: "Representative, I'm going to go through a lot of questions here with you. Number 1 on the list here is regarding the copy of the Federal Firearm Licenses filed with the Illinois State Police. Is there a clarification that the surveillance are exempt from FOIA?"
- Willis: "Yes, they are exempt from FOIA."
- Wheeler, K.: "Thank you. With respect to the distance in your language, I understand... it's my understanding that you can't be located within 500 feet of any school, preschool, or day care facility down the line referring back to the issue of gun ranges. In the City of Chicago, those restrictions were found unconstitutional. Can you tell me how this prohibition will be different?"
- Willis: "That's a separate issue from this. But we already have it listed in there as a clause and so, people are grandfathered in where they are right now. Nobody would have to move or shut down their spot. And it's actually up to local control as to where and if any new ones can come in that would violate that... that distance."
- Wheeler, K.: "Okay. Well I'm pointing it out because there's so many times you see a gun range and a gun retailer are in the same facility."
- Willis: "Correct."
- Wheeler, K.: "So, there's clarity there. Question about the inspections. We read this as a knowledge for unannounced inspection by ISP and local law enforcement but only once a year. How do you coordinate who's got... is it ISP that does it or is it the local law enforcement or who knows who's done what. How is that coordinated?"

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

- Willis: "It's... it's going to actually probably be up to where the complaint gets filed. But we'll leave... we left it that way on purpose so that depending upon who has the time, who has the availability, who has the concern of where the complaint got filed. As I stated earlier, ISP is complaint-driven on this. So, there would have to be a complaint that would come through to them."
- Wheeler, K.: "Okay. So, what kind of complaints do you suspect will be lodged against a dealer requiring actually ISP to investigate?"
- Willis: "You know, I am not law enforcement. And I couldn't really tell you that. But I would say anything to where we see a clear violation. If there are guns that are not secured appropriately, if they're just out all over. If there's no signage that says you have to have a FOID card to come into a certain area like that, if there is suspicion of straw purchases. Those are the ones that I would say are probably the most blatant violations. And also, I want you to realize that this is a case of that it has to be something that's substantial. They're not going to go in because they said the sign is crooked or backward or whatever. State Police don't want to waste their time. That is not our intent for them either."
- Wheeler, K.: "All right. So, then, you've kind of given us an outline of some concepts there, but there's no strict definition of 'good cause' in the language, correct?"
- Willis: "It should be 'with cause', yes."
- Wheeler, K.: "Yeah, okay. What is 'good cause'? And you've outlined some ideas."

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

Willis: "And I think I gave you..."

Wheeler, K.: "Those are examples you think are clarification."

Willis: "...what I would consider 'with cause'."

Wheeler, K.: "Okay. Thank you. With respect to the security cameras, and the way I read this, it says including but not limited to all places where firearms and inventory are stored, handled, or sold, transferred and each entrance and exit. If I'm an owner of an establishment and a CCO, I've got potentially a weapon on me. Does anywhere I go in that facility is going to have to be under surveillance?"

Willis: "No. Your private office would be exempt unless you are doing sales in that private office of it. So, it's really to take care of where your inventory is, your entrance and exits for security reasons, and where your inventory is, again, for security reasons and the point of sale. So, concerns have all been... I don't... I carry my gun to the bathroom. I don't get a... there's no camera in your bathroom. There's no camera in your break room. There's no camera in your private office..."

Wheeler, K.: "Okay. Then..."

Willis: "...unless you choose to do that as the owner."

Wheeler, K.: "Oftentimes, our facilities will have classrooms for CCO."

Willis: "As long as there's no sale of the guns going on in that classroom, there is no reason to have a camera."

Wheeler, K.: "But then... okay. But I'm reading this as handled, sold, transfer. Handled could be anything though, right?"

Willis: "Well, if inventory, yes. If inventory from the store is brought in there, then yes. But if everybody just happens to bring in their own private guns... usually in a classroom for

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

CCO, they're bringing in their own private guns and it's not the store's inventory."

Wheeler, K.: "So, bring in... if you bring any inventory into the classroom, you're going to... you're required then to have that."

Willis: "Yes."

Wheeler, K.: "So, that's a clarification. It would be an expense; every owner would need to know that. Let's move on to the... the original, actually... Mr. Speaker, I'm going to get some more time in just a moment here."

Willis: "Use my 20 seconds, go ahead."

Speaker Lang: "Does Representative McDermed wish to give her time to Mr. Wheeler?"

McDermed: "Yes, please, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Then feel free, Sir."

Wheeler, K.: "Thank you. My..."

Speaker Lang: "Go on as long as you wish."

Wheeler, K.: "That's not going to happen. Representative, the... when we first ran the other version of this in Senate Bill 1657, I asked you questions about the cost for this. And you discussed the idea that the ATF didn't have the budget to do the FFL inspections that you thought were necessary. So, we're adding a component here where the state's going to supplement that. Is that a reasonable characterization of what you're trying to do?"

Willis: "That is very reasonable, yes."

Wheeler, K.: "Okay. But the concerns we had about budget at that time at the federal level now we, in my opinion, I mean, we agreed to disagree last time about it, us having enough money

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

in this approach to be able to do that effectively the same way you had hoped to do it. So, my question is, I know you've changed some of the fees in this Bill. Can you explain the difference in the fees from that Bill to this Bill?"

- Willis: "The difference in the fees on... certainly we've included the big box stores. We've also increased the fees for the larger stores and decreased it for the smaller stores, so that we hope that we're offsetting protecting our small businesses. Our larger businesses that can afford to pay more are doing that. By adding our big box stores in, we're looking at some big corporations that can certainly afford to make sure that they put security first."
- Wheeler, K.: "So, tell me how... ISP says there's going to be a \$5 million down store to get this thing started. Do we have funds available for that?"
- Willis: "I beg to differ with ISP on this. I don't think it's going to be that expensive of a startup. I have put in a request through the budget to increase their budgeting for this year to help with this Bill. Both Senator Harmon and I have done that."
- Wheeler, K.: "Okay. Can you cite any statistical evidence that shows the guns used in crimes and gun shops are a direct relationship, so if we can go ahead and take this measure that we're actually going to make a difference?"
- Willis: "Well, I can tell you that in the 26 states that have enacted an additional state licensing program that there has been a 64... 64 percent decrease in the number of guns from those dealers that have been used in crime. So, it has showed us, statistically in the 26 states that already have

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

something, that they have actually shown a decrease in crime guns coming direct their gun dealerships nor has it shut down any of those gun dealerships in those 26 states."

Wheeler, K.: "Okay. Thanks for answering my questions. To the… to the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, we're in another place here where we… we are trying hard to do things that might make a difference, but we're going to fall short, I'm afraid, in the actual outcome of the effort being made. I do applaud the Sponsor for all of her efforts to work bipartisanly and to find solutions. I… I don't think we're there on this one yet. So, in this case, I'm going to vote 'no'. And I appreciate her efforts though. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reis. Mr. Reis."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Reis: "Representative, I want to pick up where the previous speaker just talked about the higher fees. And you said that the fees were lower, but they have to pay fees on every Federal Firearm License that they hold. So, even though you lowered it, they could, in fact, be paying higher fees than the retail businesses. Is that not true?"

Willis: "Actually, it's not true. It doesn't come in that way.

There's a... I'm sorry. If you go to page 3 line 2, it... it

basically says in the event that a person or entity maintains

multiple licenses at different lines, a business requiring

it, they can only have to have one license or one

certification for this purpose."

Reis: "So, was that..."

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

Willis: "We also put a cap on for those big box stores that have...
many, many stores in there. There is a cap that they will
never have to pay more than \$40 thousand for a... I would say
a corporate license for multiple stores."

Reis: "Was that changed in the second Amendment that has not been adopted yet?"

Willis: "That is on the first Amendment..."

Reis: "The first Amendment?"

Willis: "...that the pricing. Yes, that's on the first Amendment."

Reis: "So, for clarification for everybody, what is contained in the second Amendment, real quickly, that has not been approved."

Willis: "On the second Amendment... the only thing on the second Amendment is to actually strike the very last page of this which states that you may go and file your transfer paperwork with the State of Illinois Police to not... therefore, not be liable for lost paperwork. That is the only thing that's on that second Amendment."

Reis: "So, you haven't taken out the registry part of it yet and..." Willis: "Well..."

Reis: "...I think everyone understands that. With regards to the video surveillance requirements, specifically, it provides that licenses must have an adequate video surveillance system. What is adequate?"

Willis: "I believe we clarified that saying that you needed to have cameras that showed on the entrance and the exits of the store, where the inventory is held, at the point of sale, or wherever guns are handled and stored. And we also clarified

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

with the exception of not needing to have it in your bathrooms or private areas."

Reis: "Will there be requirements for level of resolution?"

Willis: "That is not written into the Bill."

Reis: "Will facial recognition features be required?"

Willis: "That is not written into this Bill."

Reis: "Could it be during the rulemaking process?"

Willis: "Pardon?"

Reis: "Could that be included during the rulemaking process?"

Willis: "I would not expect it to be. I would expect that if that ever came through there'd be an awful lot of pushback on that. The intent is to make sure that we cut down on straw purchases and we have best business practices covered. The majority of brick and mortar shops already have surveillance for their own security measures. And I think this is just adding to that making sure everybody follows those best business practices."

Reis: "Okay. Running down on time here. On the State Police actually implementing this, I mean, we've been told that and they've testified that 15 to 20 agency employees will be required to implement this Bill. However, there's no appropriation for this new state program which means whatever manpower the State Police puts or assigns to this is going to come from direct law enforcement. Would you agree with that?"

Willis: "I disagree that it's going to take 15 to 20 State Police Officers on this. The beginning part is mostly administration, so it would not have to be a sworn officer to be able to do that. And the rest of it, for inspection, it is complaint-driven. No complaints, no inspections required."

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

Reis: "Then why the purpose of the Bill?"

Willis: "Well, just to have it in place to make sure if we do have complaints we have them available."

Reis: "Okay. Well, the State Police has indicated it's going to cost \$5 million and you're going to have to have sworn officers so. I think that... to the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I think that there's so many people on this... on this opposite side of this issue, on the opposite side of Second Amendment rights, come at this and think that this is going to stop all the violence. Guns don't kill people, people kill people. Really? They can go across state lines and purchase these things. We're hurting small gun dealers with this. We're entrapping on our constitutional rights. We're making it hard for people to stay in business and that's the objective of the Sponsor's Bill. So, with that, I encourage a 'no' vote. And Mr. Speaker, I would request a verification should this Bill receive the required number of votes."

Speaker Lang: "Your request is acknowledged. Mr. Hays."

Hays: "I call the previous question."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves the previous question. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the previous question is put. Representative Willis to close."

Willis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Members across the aisle and throughout this robust Assembly. I have done my best to work on a Bill that I think is a good Bill. It is a Bill that has bipartisan input. It is a Bill that I think will save lives. I'm not here to burden small businesses, in fact, I think we made some strong efforts to not burden strong businesses. But statistics show us in the 26 states that have

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

this we have done wonderful things to be able to reduce the amount of crime guns that are out there. That's our goal. We know that there is no perfect solution to gun violence. If there was, I would have come up with it, you would have come up with it. We would have had it in place a long time ago. But I think we can all agree, both sides of the aisle, that something must be done. It's easy to say guns don't kill people, people kill people. But if people don't have guns, that much less people get killed and that's the important thing. In the 26 states that have put in a level of gun certification or licensing, they actually have shown a reduction and they have not put gun dealers out of business. I cannot stress that enough. I stated it numerous times. It is not going to put a gun shop out of business. Many, many qun shops are good businesses and they do best business practices. And they are already doing everything that I've asked for in this Bill. And I'm just asking them to continue and to make sure that the rest of the gun shops do the same thing so that everybody is on an even keel there. That is what we need, that is what I ask for. I have reached out across the aisle. I have worked with many, many people. I think we've come up with the best solution possible. And I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Lady moved for passage of the Bill. Please be reminded that Mr. Reis has asked for a verification. Members will be in their chairs and vote their own switches. Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record.

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

On this question, there are 65 voting 'yes', 49 voting 'no'. And Mr. Reis has asked for a verification. Mr. Reis, do you persist in your verification request? Mr. Clerk, please read the affirmative."

Clerk Hollman: "A poll of those voting in the affirmative. Representative Ammons; Representative Andersson; Andrade; Representative Representative Representative Bellock; Representative Breen; Representative Burke, K.; Representative Carroll; Representative Cassidy; Representative Chapa LaVia; Representative Conroy; Representative Conyears-Ervin; Representative Representative Crespo; Representative Currie; Representative D'Amico; Representative Davis; Representative Representative Drury; Representative Durkin; Representative Evans; Representative Feigenholtz; Representative Fine; Representative Flowers; Representative Ford; Representative Gabel: Representative Gordon-Booth; Representative Greenwood; Representative Guzzardi; Representative Harper; Harris, G.; Representative Hernandez; Representative Representative Hurley; Representative Jones; Representative Kifowit; Representative Lang; Representative Representative Mah; Representative Manley; Representative Martwick; Representative Mayfield; Representative McAuliffe."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, the Gentleman withdraws his request.

There being 65 voting 'yes', 49 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Ives is recognized. The Lady does not

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

wish to speak. Page 5 of the Calendar, Senate Bill 2344, Mr. Martwick. Mr. Martwick. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2344, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Martwick."

Martwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 2344 is a piece of legislation that applies to a special education co-op on the near northwestern suburbs. And there is a factual situation behind this. So, basically, what happened was one of the school districts decided to withdraw from the school district... excuse me... from the coop... the special education co-op, but in doing so there were a number of students that were high need special education students that were already attending a school that was part of the co-op and they were going to be pulled from this school. The parents approached the districts, approached Senator Mulroe, and asked for assistance to allow the children to finish through their eighth grade at this particular school. Senator Mulroe put together this legislation. It has been negotiated extensively between the withdrawing district and the ... the remaining districts in the co-op. All of them agree that the children should be able to remain, but they're unable to decide on what the cost of the withdrawing district will be. What we've done with our recent Amendment that was adopted yesterday is we allow the children to remain there until they age-out of this program at the eighth grade and that the cost shall be subject to the parties agreeing. And if the parties do not agree by August 1 on the cost, then the cost will be set by the Illinois State Board of Education.

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

So, this is... would apply specifically to this district, this co-op and no other, so it wouldn't affect any other laws throughout the state. This is something that will really help basically five to seven highly special need children. And I respectfully ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

Harris, G.: "Mr. Speaker, could the record reflect that Representative Soto is excused for the rest of today."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Sir. Mr. Pritchard."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Pritchard: "Representative, you gave us a lot of detail in committee about how the one school district that has these students that need special care withdrew from the special education cooperative. Now, are they willing to pay for the overhead and the operational costs of the special education schools to handle those children?"

Martwick: "So, yes. The question is, is what the district and...
the withdrawing district and the remaining districts can't
seem to decide on is what that cost should be. They are
willing to pay. There's been some dispute and it seemed as
though the Legislature was going to have to subject itself
into setting the cost. And I thought that that was
inappropriate for us. And so, what I did was I made ISBE the
final decider and I gave them... the district... the withdrawing
district and the remaining districts until August 1 to
negotiate a compromise with the idea that you might not like
what you got from ISBE so negotiate something you can live
with. I think it's a good motivation. It takes the Legislature

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

who's... we're really not equipped to set the cost for this. And so, I thought that was a good compromise. And there currently is... the only opposition of the Bill is ISBE, but they're only opposed because, well, they'd rather not decide this either. But they were not actively opposed to the Bill."

Pritchard: "So, is there a Regional Office of Education in this school district?"

Martwick: "A Regional Office of Education. I don't believe there is. This is Cook County. I think we got rid of those."

Pritchard: "So, is... would the... I mean, in Cook County you have three lookalikes, if you will, to Regional Offices of Education."

Martwick: "Right."

Pritchard: "Would they be logical mediators of this situation to get it out of a state agency and back into the local level that may understand the issues better?"

Martwick: "Potentially. And to be honest, Representative, this Amendment will now go back to the Senate on Concurrence, if we were to pass today. My hope is that we have encouraged these parties to continue. As I said, all of them believe that the best path forward is for these children to finish their education in this school where they're receiving their education. They just have been not willing enough to negotiate a settlement between the two parties. We're hoping that by the time this gets back to the Senate they will have entered into a intergovernmental agreement and there'll be no need for this. But we feel that it is important to keep the ball rolling and protect the children's rights to that education."

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

Pritchard: "Well, I appreciate your interest in the parties' interest in trying to provide the best education for these students. And I hope as you do that there will be some cooperation and a compromise reached. I would urge the Body's support this Gentleman's Motion."

Martwick: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Willis."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Willis: "So, I had a Bill similar to this a couple of years ago which was a debacle, but it actually helped you out because we were able to get west 40 to approve this school district from pulling out of the co-op, correct?"

Martwick: "I'm sorry. Could you repeat that question?"

Willis: "Yeah. Just say yes, it worked."

Martwick: "Yes."

Willis: "But here is my question for you. While we... I know that we only have a... at current, my understanding is, that there are only six students that we're looking at, that are extremely fragile students that there is no other place for them to be except for one of the schools in this co-op. Is that correct?"

Martwick: "And the number moves five to seven."

Willis: "Okay."

Martwick: "So, that six is about right, yes."

Willis: "Six is about right. And there is no problem with the coop taking them back in, but the issue and the problem seems to be at what price. Is that not correct?"

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

Martwick: "Yes. All of the members of the co-op that I've spoken to say they agree that these children should..."

Willis: "Said that they go back to education..."

Martwick: "...finish their eighth-grade education there. Yes, yes, absolutely."

Willis: "Correct. So, what I'm wondering, what happens if ISBE comes up with a bad rate? A rate that doesn't cover... it seems right now... and I just talked to one of the members of the special ed co-op board... and it sounds like they're about \$20 thousand apart as to what the cost is to actually educate these very fragile students. What happens if ISBE comes up at the low end of that \$20 thousand slide? Does this co-op just have to eat the cost and accept what comes through? Is there any appeal process for them or not?"

Martwick: "We... we did not build an appeal process into it. We... again, we wanted to make sort of a neutral arbitrator. And so, I chose the State Board of Education. Superintendent Smith has been involved in this process somewhat. And I just thought that... that that would be the best..."

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

Willis: "Okay, thank you. I guess my biggest concern is that, yes, I think... you know, I think this is something that we need to urge all school districts to be cautious. Before you state that you can take over the education of your very fragile students and you turn away from a special ed co-op, you need to have that plan in place. And I truly feel that this school district, which I won't name, but I don't think that they took that into consideration. And now, they're coming back crying for help. And it's very difficult for the

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

rest to foot the bill. So, I am very concerned about this and I'm not exactly sure what I'm going to be voting on this. So, thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Martwick to close."

Martwick: "Thank you. So, this Bill... without it, five to seven really extremely special needs kids may be ripped from a school at a very sensitive time in their education. This Bill will preserve their rights and... to go there and it will solve the dispute between the district and the co-op in a way that I think is the most neutral decider in the Illinois State Board of Education. It's a... it's not a great solution, but I think it's the best one we've come up with. And so, I respectfully ask the Body for an 'aye' vote."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 97 voting 'yes', 17 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2350, Mr. Carroll. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2387, Representative Mussman. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2387, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Mussman."

Mussman: "Thank you... thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 2387 is an initiative to address the concerns brought to life by the mass shooting at a Tennessee Waffle House in April of this year in which a father had

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

returned the weapon to this son who had had his FOID card revoked in the State of Illinois. It makes three changes to the law concerning firearm transfers. One, it requires notice of the firearm disposition record forms to be given to the local State's Attorney's Office where both the transferor and the transferee live to notify them that such a transfer has officially taken place. Two, it requires the recipient of any firearm transfer by way of a firearm disposition record to... form to file a sworn affidavit regarding the safekeeping of the weapon and file that affidavit with the State Police and with the State's Attorney in the county where they live, which must be updated with any name or address changes and proof for destruction or transfer of the firearms being held, so that we know that there is no misunderstanding that the person in possession of the weapon has any... has any lack of knowledge that it is not to be transferred back to a non... a person who doesn't own a FOID card in our state. And three, it codifies the penalty for non-federally licensed gun sellers who do not check the validity of a FOID with the Illinois State Police is a Class A misdemeanor to create consistency between the FOID Act and the Criminal Code which will aid in enforcement. This is already the penalty under the FOID Act, but because the language in the Criminal Code is different it has been inconsistently applied or not applied at all. Certainly, we know it is a frequent complaint that we do not properly enforce laws we already have on the books and we believe this clarifying language will assist with this problem. We do not want anyone to mistakenly transfer firearms to someone not legally able to attain them in our state."

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

Speaker Lang: "Representative Mussman."

Mussman: "Apparently, we need to pull it from the record to do a little clarifying."

Speaker Lang: "Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. Senate Bill 2544, Mr. Yingling. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2544, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Yingling."

"Thank you, Speaker. Senate Bill 2544 would put a binding question on the November ballot for voters in Lake County to decide whether they would like to convert the currently appointed Office of Chief County Assessment Officer into an elected office held accountable to the taxpayers. According to Forbes, Lake County is one of the highest property tax counties in the... in the country. Lake County has one of the highest EAVs in the state and also has a structure of government that is unique to the other collar counties. Unlike the other collar counties, Lake County does not have a popularly elected county board chairman or executive. This created a lack of transparency and especially accountability in the Office of Chief County Assessment Officer. Under Illinois statute, the Chief County Assessment Officer has substantial power including the ability to change the property tax assessments by our elected township assessors leaving taxpayers vulnerable to a system with no accountability. Taxpayers in my district in Lake County are fed up and they're demanding a level of accountability in the assessment process. Under the Illinois Constitution, there are only two ways this question can be placed on the ballot.

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

One is a legislative... one is legislatively. The second one is through petitions circulated by residents living in the county. The Bill before us today provides the property taxpayers and the voters of Lake County to decide for themselves if they want to be able to hold the Office of Chief County Assessment Officer accountable for its actions. I'm aware of no opponents. And I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote. Happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sauer."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sauer: "Representative Yingling, I wanted to ask you which other counties have a politically elected assessor currently and how is it working?"

Yingling: "I... I do not have a list of other counties that have an elected assessor."

Sauer: "Are there any that come to mind?"

Yingling: "I believe St. Clair County and Cook County does."

Sauer: "Okay. I have a message from Lake County. I know that they had not... I'm not sure if they have filed in support, or neutral or in opposition. It sounds like they have some major concerns over it. And I just want to read this into the record. So, to the Bill. It is with... it is well established, both within the Illinois State Constitution and corresponding case law, that it is unconstitutional for the Legislature to enact special legislation that arbitrarily discriminates without a legitimate state interest. In this case, the act of enabling the conversion of an appointed Chief Assessment Officer in one county without a state... within a state of 102

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

counties is arbitrary and has no legitimate state interest. If the Bill passes and is signed into law by the Governor, the action is unlikely to stand against a legal challenge. In the event that the Legislature is interested in modeling true government reduction, its time would be best consolidating offices within the county. The Chief Assessment Officer is responsible for administering the assessment of all real property in Lake County and in the accordance with and as mandated by the Illinois State Property Code. If the proposed Bill is intended to address the impact of assessments, which I believe it is... that's my own note ... so back to the county... on property taxes, the act of converting an appointed Chief Assessment Officer to an elected one does not address the root cause of the problem. If Illinois's Property Tax Code is broken, then the Code should be fixed rather than converting a Chief Assessment Officer position from appointed to elected. The Chief County Assessment Officer is an important role in a complex system of property tax administration in a highly technical and professional position. Within county government structure, the work of the Chief County Assessment Officer is one of the most..."

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

Sauer: "Thank you, Sir. As such, the role should remain an appointed one because of its technicality. Now, I will say this. Property taxes are the issue. I think that you want to bring that in and we need to have that conversation. I don't know that making an office more political, seeing things that we've seen in the county of Cook in recent times, I don't know that that's the right answer. And I think that there

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

should be some more time. We should talk a more about this. And I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Batinick."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Batinick: "Representative, we worked a lot on transparency stuff over the last couple years and I've usually been on the same side as you. I'm finding myself surprised that I'm kind of on a different side. You mentioned two counties that you know of that have this situation, Cook and St. Clair, correct?"

Yingling: "That is correct from what I am aware of."

Batinick: "So, Cook County has a elected... elected assessor. How's that working out for us?"

Yingling: "Well, as I recall, the voters in Cook County just fired their assessor because they have the power to do that. People in Lake County do not have the power to do that. And I think providing them a question to decide for themselves that that is a power they want is very reasonable and adds to transparency and accountability within the process."

Batinick: "Yeah. That... that's a... those are nice prepared... that's a nice prepared response to it to an obvious question, but politicizing it through money is... I'm going to go straight to the Bill. What we're doing is we're politicizing the assessor process. One of the problems with property taxes and that it's extremely vague. And we've seen what's happened when you politicize the Assessor's Office and money and influence in the valuation of property taxes. I... I don't support this Bill. And one of the main reasons I don't support this Bill is I haven't heard a situation where this solved the problem. Is

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

there another county that did this where they solved... solved the problem? The biggest thing we know about it is what happened in Cook County. We don't even know if we've solved that problem yet. I urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ives: "Just want to know, Representative Yingling, are your Township Assessors... are they elected in Lake County?"

Yingling: "I'm sorry. What is the question?"

Ives: "Are your Township Assessors elected in Lake County?"

Yingling: "Yes, they are."

Ives: "Okay. So, you do have elected representation when it comes
to assessment. Is that... then?"

Yingling: "Kind of, yes. The... the Township Assessors do the assessing, but the unelected Chief County Assessment Officer has the power to alter those assessments that the elected township officials have been elected to do."

I just don't think that you should push this through the General Assembly where there's 118 of us and the most of us don't really care one way or the other what Lake County does. I will say this. You have a huge property tax problem because you have the highest property taxes in the state. And actually, you're in the top one percent of property taxes in the entire nation is Lake County. The number one in the State of Illinois. You do definitely have a problem. It's not so much with assessments. It's just the cost of government more than anything. But I would prefer that you actually do the

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

work in your county, do the petition phase to put this on as a referendum. To me that is more... a more democratic way of putting this to the vote of your electors. So, thank you very much for your Bill, but I won't support it. I prefer you do a petition."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. McSweeney."

McSweeney: "Speaker, to the Bill. Now, Representative Ives is right. We do have some of the highest taxes in Lake County. That's why I support this Bill. This actually allows the voters to make a decision. That's the only thing that this Bill does. And to Representative Sauer, I received a call yesterday from the Lake County Chairman Aaron Lawlor who told me he's neutral on the Bill. So, unless something gets changed, he has not called me, he told me he was neutral on the Bill. And if that has changed, then that would be a new development. But most importantly, let's just give voters the chance to reform the system. It's a broken system up in Lake County with the assessors. I support this Bill and urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Olsen."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Olsen: "Representative, could you discuss the position of the Township Assessors on this legislation?"

Yingling: "Sure. This is... this is supported by the Lake County
Township Assessors. And it's also supported by the Township
Officials of Illinois."

Olsen: "So, this Bill is not opposed by those groups. Those groups are actually in support of the Bill?"

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

Yingling: "Correct. They are in support of this."

Olsen: "And could you describe... do you... do you have an understanding why they are in support of the Bill?"

Yingling: "I'm sorry. What was the question?"

Olsen: "Why... why are they in support of the Bill?"

Yingling: "They're in support of the Bill because they feel that as elected officials their decision should not be overturned by an unelected individual. They also believe that from a transparency and accountability standpoint that they can better serve their constituencies by having a more transparent system."

Olsen: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Carroll."

Carroll: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this Bill. You know, I live... I live near Lake County. I have a lot of ... I have some constituents in Lake County and friends in Lake County and frankly, what they're dealing with right now is a major, major taxing issue. And I hear all the time in this chamber we talk about responsibilities and things like that. So, this is one of these moments where the taxpayers of Lake County will have the opportunity to vote for the person who controls their taxes. So, I think it's important that that option's on the table for them. And Representative Yingling made a great point. The voters of Cook... the voters of Cook County got fed up with the guy that was assessing their taxes and voted in someone else and give that person an opportunity. So, let's offer the same thing to the people of Lake County. Let's let them make a decision 'cause it's all about that choice that they can make. So, Representative Yingling, I

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

applaud you for bringing this Bill forward. Thank you for recognizing the needs of those people in Lake County. And good work, my friend. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Yingling to close."

- Yingling: "Thank you. I just... well, I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote. Again, this is merely putting a question on the ballot. The voters will make the ultimate decision. And again, I will reiterate that there are no opponents to this Bill. I appreciate an 'aye' vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 77 voting 'yes', 35 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Harris is recognized."
- Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And would you kindly let the record reflect that unfortunately my switch was locked and was negotiating another Bill. On House Bill 337, it was my intention to vote 'yes' on that Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "The record will reflect your intention.

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

Speaker Lang: "Proceed."

Ives: "Just like to let the other Representatives know, that I did file today HB5908. HB5908 says that Senate Bill 337 would only go into effect for those licensed firearms dealers that had three or more firearms used in the commission of a

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

criminal offense that they sold within a five-year period and only then would 337 need to go in effect. I do this as a basis of actually punishing those firearm dealers who are not in compliance with the law. As you heard the Sponsor... the House Sponsor of 337 very clearly articulate at the end of her arguments that essentially that there are dealers that are doing the right thing and there are certainly are dealers that are not. So, I am more in favor of extracting some additional penalties against dealers that are not doing the right thing and not protecting... are not selling guns only to those who they should be. And so, that's why I filed HB5908.

If you want to join me on that House Bill, let me know."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

- Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I do apologize. I need to pay more attention to what I'm doing. I believe I stated that it was House Bill 337, it's Senate Bill 337. And I intended to vote 'yes'."
- Speaker Lang: "Thank you. The record will reflect that. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk Hollman: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 1032, offered by Representative Bellock and House Resolution 1148, offered by Representative Batinick."
- Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. And now, leaving perfunctory time for the Clerk, Leader Currie moves that the House stand adjourned 'til Wednesday, May 30 at the hour of 10 a.m. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'.

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

- The 'ayes' have it. And the House stands adjourned 'til Wednesday, May 30 at the hour of 10 a.m."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order.

 Member's statements offered by Representative Bennett
 concerning Senate Joint Resolution 8 and Senate Joint
 Resolution 9."
- Bennett: "Senate Joint Resolution #8 is about the family and also a gentleman by the name of Dana Schoolman. This is where it starts. It's highly fitting that the Illinois General Assembly pays honor and respect to individuals who gave their lives in service to their communities; and
 - WHEREAS, Dana Schoolman was a volunteer firefighter with the Ashkum Township Fire Protection District for six years; and
 - WHEREAS, Dana Schoolman also served as an emergency medical technician with the Ash-Clif Ambulance Service. I'm sorry. All right. We'll start again. Is that okay? Thank you. This is Senate Joint Resolution #8. It deals with Mr. Dana Schoolman and his family as well.
 - WHEREAS, It is highly fitting that the Illinois General Assembly pays honor and respect to individuals who gave their lives in service to their communities; and
 - WHEREAS, Dana Schoolman was a volunteer firefighter with the Ashkum Township Fire Protection District for six years; and
 - WHEREAS, Dana Schoolman also served as an emergency medical technician with the Ash-Clif Ambulance Service; and
 - WHEREAS, On November 6, 1988, Dana Schoolman was fatally injured in the line of duty; at approximately 8:00 a.m., he responded to a medical emergency call in his personal vehicle; whereby he lost control on the ice and snow covered roadway near the

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

- intersection of U.S. Route 45 and Iroquois County Road 2400 North and died from injuries sustained in the accident; and WHEREAS, Dana Schoolman was 31 years of age; he was survived by his wife and two children; and
- WHEREAS, Dana Schoolman was honored at the National Fallen Firefighters Memorial in Emmitsburg, Maryland in 1989 and at the Illinois Fallen Firefighters Memorial in Springfield; therefore, be it
- RESOLVED, BY THE SENATE OF THE ONE HUNDREDTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CONCURRING HEREIN, that we designate the section of U.S. Route 45, Iroquois County Road 2400 North on the South, to Illinois State Route 116 on the North as the "Firefighter Dana Schoolman Memorial Highway"; and be it further
- RESOLVED, That the Illinois Department of Transportation is requested to erect at suitable locations, consistent with State and federal regulations, appropriate plaques or signs giving notice of the name "Firefighter Dana Schoolman Memorial Highway". Thank you. Senate Joint Resolution #9 deals with a Mr. Phillip Pannier and his family.
- WHEREAS, It is highly fitting that the Illinois General Assembly pays honor and respect to the truly great individuals who have served our country and, in so doing, have gone above and beyond the call of duty in truly heroic acts; and
- WHEREAS, Specialist Phillip Pannier was born on December 5, 1987 in Peoria; his parents were Donald and Robyn Amigoni Pannier; and

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

- WHEREAS, SPC Phillip Pannier graduated in 2006 from Roanoke-Benson High School, where he was active in band, FFA, football, and soccer; and
- WHEREAS, SPC Phillip Pannier began his military career with basic training at Fort Benning, Georgia; he achieved his rank of private first class, serving his home post at Fort Campbell, Kentucky; and
- WHEREAS, SPC Phillip Pannier was killed in action on January 8, 2008, while serving in Operation Iraqi Freedom; he was posthumously promoted to the rank of specialist; and
- WHEREAS, SPC Phillip Pannier was a member of St. Paul Lutheran Church in Benson; and
- WHEREAS, SPC Phillip Pannier enjoyed being outdoors on the farm; he was also active with the Happy Hustlers 4-H Club and was an avid deer hunter; and
- WHEREAS, SPC Phillip Pannier was preceded in death by his paternal and maternal grandparents, and his brother, Dale Opie Pannier; and
- WHEREAS, SPC Phillip Pannier was survived by his parents; his brothers, Dan (Karin) Pannier and Benjamin Pannier; his sister-in-law, Tanya; his nieces and nephews, Kaitlyn, Karly, Kiefer, Jessica, Colton, and Dalana; and his fiancee, Jennifer Held; therefore, be it
- RESOLVED, BY THE SENATE OF THE ONE HUNDREDTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CONCURRING HEREIN, that we designate the portion of Illinois Route 116 from Roanoke to Metamora as the SPC Phillip J. Pannier Memorial Highway; and be it further

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

RESOLVED, That the Illinois Department of Transportation is requested to erect at suitable locations, consistent with State and federal regulations, appropriate plaques or signs giving notice of the name of the SPC Phillip J. Pannier Memorial Highway; and be it further

RESOLVED, That suitable copies of this resolution be delivered to the Secretary of the Illinois Department of Transportation, the Village of Metamora, the Village of Roanoke, and the family of Specialist Phillip Pannier. Thank you."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Long is recognized for a Member statement concerning unfunded mandates."

Long: "Thank you, Sir. Today I want to touch on something, a trend if you will, that needs to stop right here in the State of Illinois. Each... each year lawmakers are in the General Assembly look at many Bills that would enforce new unfunded mandates on our schools, cities, and villages. Figuring out a way to navigate through these burdensome measures has become quite the task for our municipalities school and administrators. What started out... what starts out as well intended ideas become a drain as each unfunded mandate accumulates. I'm going to show you something right here. Take a look at these right here. That's 2016 and 2017. What's starts as well-intent... intentioned ideas become a drain as unfunded mandates accumulate. Take a look at those. Mounds of unfunded mandates that are heaved upon folks with no relief in sight. This is 2016, 2017 unfunded mandates. This snowball effect has driven up our educational and municipal... municipal operating costs. During this spring Session, I introduced

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

HB4352, a Bill that would have helped our local schools to eliminate some of those heavy burdensome unfunded mandates that is heaved upon them, only to have it shot down in committee with the parliamentary trick that hasn't even been used in years called 'Motion to do not pass'. After the Bill was shot down, a Member from across the aisle came over and said this was not a bad Bill. All I had to say was, why didn't we work on it in committee? It's gotten... it's gotten to the point where we must acknowledge that the growing property taxes that plaque homeowners in this great State of Illinois must be contributed to these unfunded mandates. We failed to allocate funds to enforce them or implement these new policies. We depend upon our municipalities or our schools to foot the bill themselves. They, in turn, look to taxpayers to pay in the form of property taxes. Last year, we lost approximately 33,700 in population, nearly twice... twice the size of the population of my... of the largest city in my district. We can no longer sustain this kind of loss year after year without having detrimental effects upon our people and tax base. A blind man can see this. How can we expect our schools and communities to adhere to these new orders without giving them the means to do so? The state already fails to meet its funding obligation in many areas, yet, we cannot pile on new and expensive requirements. Can somebody please take the credit card away from Springfield? According to the Municipal League, there were approximately 132 municipal mandates proposed this year alone. Are we really expecting our taxpayers, who are already leaving in droves along with their businesses, to foot the bill in the form of their

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

property taxes, some of the highest in the nation already? On top of the issues just stated, these mandates, which are basically just more red tape and regulations, make Illinois that much more unattractive to both businesses and prospective citizens alike. As I've said before, many of these mandates, especially those enforced upon our schools, are well intended, many are quite noble, but the fact of the matter is we are making demands that our taxpayers cannot afford to follow. We need to get our finances in order first, get Illinois back into black, if you will, so we can pass fully funded mandates, make Illinois a better place to live and work without making our constituents break their bank. Thank you."

Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Harris, Greq, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-Human Services reports the following committee action taken on May 29, 2018: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 3115. Representative Hoffman, Chairperson from the Committee on Labor & Commerce reports the following committee action taken on May 29, 2018: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 200; recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 1595. Representative Martwick, Chairperson from the Committee on Personnel & Pensions reports the following committee action taken on May 29, 2018: recommends be adopted is Motion to Concur to Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 4412. Representative Zalewski, Chairperson from the Committee on Revenue & Finance reports the following committee action taken on May 29, recommends be adopted is a Motion to Concur with Senate

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

Amendment 2 to... and 3 to House Bill 1910, Floor Amendment 4 to Senate Bill 486, Floor Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 1979, Floor Amendment 2 Senate Bill 3527. Representative Burke, Daniel, Chairperson from the Committee on Executive reports the following committee action taken on May 29, 2018: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 643, Senate Bill 1737, Senate Bill 2367, Senate Bill 2444, Senate Bill 2921, Senate Bill 3102, Senate Bill 3531; do pass as amended Short Debate is Senate Bill 682, Senate Bill 3128; recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendments 2 and 3 to House Bill 4897, Floor Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 2641, Floor Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 3452. Representative Jones, Chairperson from the Committee on Community College Access & Affordability reports the following committee action taken on May 29, 2018: do pass as amended Short Debate is Senate Bill 3045. Representative Welch, Chairperson from the Committee on Higher Education reports the following committee action taken on May 29, 2018: do pass as amended Short Debate is Senate 2354. Representative Gabel, Chairperson from the Committee on Human Services reports the following committee action taken on May 29, 2018: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 4707, a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 5245, a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 5288, House Resolution 910, House Resolution 911, House Resolution 960, House Resolution 1050, Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2447, Senate Joint Resolution 70. Representative Evans, Chairperson from the Committee on Transportation: Regulation, Roads & Bridges reports the following committee action taken

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

on May 29, 2018: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 5057, Senate Joint Resolution 9, Senate Joint Resolution 25, Senate Joint Resolution 56, Senate Joint Resolution 58, Senate Joint Resolution 62, Senate Joint Resolution 65. Representative Tabares, Chairperson from the Committee on Elections & Campaign Finance reports the following committee action taken on May 29, 2018: do pass as amended Short Debate is Senate Bill 426; recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 4395. Representative Costello, Chairperson from the Committee on Agriculture & Conservation reports the following committee action taken on May 29, 2018: recommends be adopted is Senate Joint Resolution 73. Representative Rita, Chairperson from the Committee on Business & Occupational Licenses reports the following committee action taken on May 29, 2018: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 5502, Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2617. Representative Mayfield, Chairperson from the Committee on Elementary & Secondary Education: Licensing, Administration & Oversight reports the following committee action taken on May 29, 2018: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 2892; do pass as amended Short Debate is Senate Bill 2844; recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 2838. Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 1149, offered by Representative Welch and House Resolution 1150, offered by Representative Ford are referred to the Rules Committee. Committee Reports. Representative Willis, Chairperson from the Committee on Fire & Emergency Services reports the following committee action

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

taken on May 29, 2018: recommends be adopted, Motion to Concur [sic-4] to Senate Amendment 1 House Bill Representative Riley, Chairperson from the Committee on State Government Administration reports the following committee action taken on May 29, 2018: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 20, Senate Bill 2365; recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1023, Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 4751. Representative Thapedi, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary - Civil reports the following committee action taken on May 29, 2018: recommends be adopted, Motion to Concur is with Senate Amendment 1 to House... correction ... with Senate Amendment 1 and 3 to House Bill 2723, Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 4787, Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 4711. Representative D'Amico, Chairperson from the Committee on Transportation: Vehicles & Safety reports the following committee action taken on May 29, 2018: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2040, Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 5056, Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2562; recommends be not adopted is Floor Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 2562. Representative Turner, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary - Criminal reports the following committee action taken on May 29, 2018: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 4348, Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 5303, Floor Amendment 3 to Senate 2579, Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill Representative Tabares, Chairperson from the Committee on

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

Elections & Campaign Finance reports the following committee action taken on May 29, 2018: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2651. Representative Hoffman, Chairperson from the Committee on Labor & Commerce reports the following committee action taken on May 29, recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 2999. Second Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 20, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 200, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Senate Bill 426, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 643, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Senate Bill 682, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 1737, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 2354, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 2365, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Senate Bill 2367, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Senate Bill 2444, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 2844, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 2892, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 2921, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 3045, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Senate Bill 3102, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Senate Bill 3128, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Senate Bill 3531, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Second Reading of these Senate Bills. They'll be held on the Order of Second Reading. Introduction and First Reading of House Bills. House Bill 5907, a Bill for an Act... offered by Representative Ford, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 5908, offered by Representative Ives, a Bill for an Act concerning

140th Legislative Day

5/29/2018

firearms. House Bill 5909, offered by Representative Cassidy, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. House Bill 5910, offered by Representative Ives, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. First Reading of these House Bills. Introduction of Resolutions. Senate Joint Resolution 57, offered by Representative Sauer and Senate Joint Resolution 60, offered by Representative Soto are referred to the Rules Committee. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."