36th Legislative Day

- Speaker Davis: "The House will be in order, and Members will be in their chairs. We shall be led in prayer today by Wayne Padget, the assistant doorkeeper. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off all cell phones, and rise for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance."
- Padget: "Lets us pray. Lord, as we prepare for Session today, I ask freshness of your spirit to quicken our thinking that out of confused issues may come simplicity of plan, that out of fear may come confidence, that of hurry may come deliberation, and that out of frustration may come guidance. Let us get to work not head first but heart first, may we be able to disagree without being disagreeable, to differ without being difficult, to be honest without tension, and to be frank without offense in an atmosphere of team spirit. These things we ask in your son's name, Amen."
- Speaker Davis: "We will be led in the Pledge of Allegiance today by Representative Yednock."
- Yednock 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 Davis: "Roll Call for Attendance. Leader Harris is recognized for any excuse absences on the Democratic side."
- Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that there are no excused absences on the Democratic side of the aisle today."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Butler is recognized for any excused absences on the Republican side."

36th Legislative Day

- Butler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please the let the Journal reflect that Representative Bennet and Representative Frese are excused today."
- Speaker Davis: "Have all recorded themselves who wished? Clerk, please take the record, 115 Members answering the roll. We have a quorum and ready to do business. Mr. Clerk, Committee Reports."
- Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on April 03, 2019: recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is the Motion to Table Committee Amendment #1 to House Bill 180. Representative Gabel, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-Human Services reports the following committee action taken on April 03, 2019: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 526. Representative Welch, Chairperson from the Committee on Executive reports the following committee action taken on April 03, 2019: do pass as amended Short Debate is House Bill 196. Representative Evans, Chairperson from the Committee on Labor & Commerce reports the following committee action taken on April 03, 2019: recommends be adopted Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 2040. Representative Feigenholtz, Chairperson from the Committee on Adoption & Child Welfare reports the following committee action taken on April 03, recommends be adopted Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 1551 and Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 1551. Representative Costello, Chairperson from the Committee on Agriculture & Conservation reports the following committee action taken on April 03, 2019: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

Bill 2783. Representative Conyears-Ervin, to House Chairperson from the Committee on Child Care Accessibility & Early Childhood Education reports the following committee action taken on April 03, 2019: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 196. Representative Kifowit, Chairperson from the Committee on State Government Administration reports the following committee action taken on April 03, 2019: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 142, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 837, Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 2460, Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 3589. Representative Yingling, Chairperson from the Committee on Counties & Townships reports the following committee action taken on April 03, 2019: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 2583. Introduction to Resolutions: House Joint Resolutions 56, offered by Mason, is referred to the Rules Committee."

Speaker Davis: "On page 31 of the Calendar under Motions in Writing, appears Motions to Table: House Bill 48, House Committee Amendment #1 to House Bill 180, House Bill 186, House Bill 193, House Bill 422, House Bill 2101, House Bill 2184, House Bill 2186, House Bill 2187, House Bill 2321, House Bill 2457, House Bill 2554, House Bill 2560, House Bill 2616, House Bill 2733, House Bill 2819, House Bill 2848, House Bill 3064, House Bill 3300, House Bill 3499, House Bill 3500, House Bill 3502, House Bill 3657, and House Bill 3703. With leave of the Body, we will consider these Motions and one single Motion. Is there a leave? Leave is granted. The Sponsor... Sponsors have move to table the House Bills. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. In the

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the all Bills are tabled. Representative Butler, for what reason do you rise?"

- Butler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please let the Journal reflect that Representative Chesney is excuses for the rest of the day."
- Speaker Davis: "The record, will so reflect. Representative Sommer, for what reason do you rise?"
- Sommer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A Point of personal privilege." Speaker Davis: "State your point."
- Sommer: "Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen, I have two very special guests with me this morning serving as Pages. I want to introduce to you two friends of mine. First of all, we have Alex Tucker. Alex lives in Morton, his parents live in East Peoria, his mother is up in the gallery. And also here we have Seth Bauersfeld he is from McLean, lives in the area of Funks Grove. For those of you who drive I-55 see the signs Funks Grove that's the area he lives in. His mother, Jennifer, is here with him today as well as his sister, Hannah. So please welcome these two wonderful gentlemen who have a great interest in government to service our Pages today."
- Speaker Davis: "Supplemental Calendar #1, we have Senate Bills on Second Reading. Senate Bill 196, Representative Harris. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 196, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions were filed."

36th Legislative Day

- Speaker Davis: "Third Reading. On Supplemental Calendar #1, Senate Bills-Second Reading, we have Senate Bill 526, Representative Harris. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 526, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Second Reading of that Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions were filed."
- Speaker Davis: "Third Reading. On page 28 of the Calendar we have Senate Bills-Second Reading. We have Senate Bill 1474, Representative Yednock. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1474, a Bill for an Act concerning government. This Bill was read a second time a previous day.

 Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions were filed."
- Speaker Davis: "Third Reading. Senate Bills-Third Reading, we have Senate 1474, Representative Yednock. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1474, a Bill for Act concerning government. Third Reading for that Senate Bill."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Yednock."
- Yednock: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. Today, I'm presenting Senate Bill 1474. The legislation codifies that it is the right of the state to regulate union security agreements. By codifying SB1474 not only would the state preserve its exclusive role in... as decision maker permitted under National Labor Relations Act, it would preserve stability across an array of unionized industries. Men and women of labor have helped build our communities and they deserve to have the security and protections that thousands have fought for across our state. The Bill is also about

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

protecting worker... working men and women as they continue to do their jobs every day no matter what town they are in. Our local workers and contractors, those that continue to provide critical services and build the communities that we live in, deserve the stability they have earned for ... and the right to fight for it. Congress explicitly refused to political subdivisions within Section 14 of the National Labor Relations Act. In doing so, Congress decided to avoid the confusion that having seven thousand units of local government in Illinois with thousands of different laws would create. The court referred to this situation as an impossible position and a nightmare. Instead of asking whether employee is subject to an agency agreement one day when his job takes him to a nearby... to nearby Chicago and not the next day when he happens to be working on sites in say a neighboring village or city that has the opposite law. It must clarify and set the law as the state level contemplated by the National Labor Relations Act. Today I'm presenting legislation that will not only codify what our courts have ruled but legislation that will protect the rights of working men and women across our great state. I would appreciate your vote."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Wheeler, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Davis: "He indicates he will."

Wheeler: "Thank you. Representative, you and I had a sidebar conversation over near my desk here a week or two about some of the different... the ways that the language is structured in

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

here regarding private sector union security agreements. Do you recall that conversation?"

Yednock: "Yes, I do, Sir."

Wheeler: "And can you help me clarify what we discussed and how we were going to address that on the floor here today."

Yednock: "Yes. You asked me if this was, and correct me if I'm wrong, Representative, you had asked me if this makes... makes it so a non-union contractor or an employee that does not have... an agreement makes them now have to have one. And I told you, no, that is not the intent of this legislation."

Wheeler: "Okay. So the just to put it on the record for everybody to be clear for the legis... purposes of legislative intent that this does not affect those who don't already have a union security agreement, correct?"

Yednock: "That is correct."

Wheeler: "Perfect. Thank you. And just some other clarifying questions, the way we discussed this in committee if I recall, this is... the way the Bill is now as amended codifies what the federal regulations already are. Correct?"

Yednock: "That's correct, Sir."

Wheeler: "So, we're not doing anything new. And all the language that was in the original Bill that had to do with penalties on local officials, that's all been removed from the Bill? We're not voting on that today at all?"

Yednock: "That's correct."

Wheeler: "So, we're really just... for everybody's clarity. We're going to codify what the federal version of things is. And we're not doing anything that would be expanding that at all today?"

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

Yednock: "Yes."

Wheeler: "Correct. Thank you very much. I appreciate your answers to my questions."

Yednock: "Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Wehrli, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Davis: "Indicates he will."

Wehrli: "Thank you. Sorry. I've been distracted over here. I just want to make sure that this Bill as amended removes the Class A Misdemeanor component of this?"

Yednock: "Yes, it does."

Wehrli: "And that what we're really doing here is just codifying Federal Law at the local level?"

Yednock: "Yes, that's correct."

Wehrli: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Moylan, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Davis: "He indicates he will."

Moylan: "I have a question. The question is for the purpose of legislative intent. Representative Yednock, you have a private right of action in this legislation. What is the primary purpose of that language in your Bill?"

Yednock: "Thanks for your question, Representative. The primary purpose for including the language in the Bill is to allow an injunction to cease any local ordinance restricting collective bargaining that has passed."

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

Moylan: "Can the Illinois General Assembly still pass collective bargaining restrictions under your Bill?"

Yednock: "That's correct. Yes, they can."

Moylan: "Thank you."

Speaker Davis: "Leader Durkin, for what reason do you rise?"

Durkin: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Davis: "He indicates he will."

Durkin: "Representative, this issue of local right-to-work became very contentious over the last few years. Mainly from what happened in the Village of Lincolnshire, correct?"

Yednock: "You're correct, Sir."

Durkin: "So, could you educate this... this Body about the litigation in the Federal Court from the District Court all the way up to the Appellate Court of where the Lincolnshire ordinance stands today?"

Yednock: "I just wanted to clarify the... the court has ruled, I think the 7th Circuit has ruled that... that particular ordinance is... is void. It's no..."

Durkin: "Okay."

Yednock: "...not law."

Durkin: "All right. But I... the District Court ruled that the... a municipality by ordinance could not enact local right-to-work zones because of the reading of the Labor Relations Act. It doesn't... the State of Illinois would have to authorize a local right-to-work, they just cannot do it unilaterally, correct?"

Yednock: "That's correct."

Durkin: "And the 7th Circuit Court of Appeals has upheld that District Court finding, correct?"

Yednock: "Yes."

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

Durkin: "All right. Could you ask your counsel if he knows whether or not the Village of Lincolnshire is going to take that up to the Supreme Court? All right."

Yednock: "We would have to talk to the village about that,

Leader."

Durkin: "Well, they've got... maybe Representative Didech can provide some... All right. Here's... here's another question and this is not, I'm not doing this to jam you up. But the thing is, there's another Appellate District in the United States, the 6th District which is just south of us, has ruled that local right-to-work zones are permitted under the Labor Relations Act. So, and I... my understanding is that is gone... that's being taken up to the U.S. Supreme Court and they're... they're doing to deal with it. So the question I have for you, and maybe you can ask your counsel over here, that if the U.S. Supreme Court takes up the 6th Appellate Circuit's decision and they rule that the Labor Relations Act does not allow these types of ordinances, what would happen to the law if we pass this today in Illinois?"

Yednock: "I would assume, and I'm not a lawyer, but we would have revisit that... this question."

Durkin: "Would it be null and void?"

Yednock: "I... I couldn't tell you that."

Durkin: "I think it would be. But I... look this is not about a... again, I'm not trying to test you. You're not a lawyer. But I just wanted the Body to understand that my impression is that if this other district goes up the Supreme Court and they somehow rule that something similar to Lincolnshire is allowed, this ban would be stricken and I think it would no

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

longer be constitutional and enforceable on the books of Illinois. That's just my only... that's my statement. So in any event, I think we've... we've visited this issue, and we've talked about it a lot over the past few years. I am going to side with the 7th Circuit on this. And if the Supreme Court comes back and says something otherwise, sobeit, but today I'll be supporting this legislation."

Yednock: "Thank you."

Speaker Davis: "Seeing no further discussion, Representative Yednock to close."

Yednock: "I thank you for the discussion. And I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Davis: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1474 pass?'
All in favor vote 'yes'; all opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Davidsmeyer. Mazzochi. Meier. Morrison. Parkhurst. Unes. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, 101 voting 'yes', 8 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, receiving a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Spain, for what reason do you rise?"

Spain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. A point of Personal Privilege."

Speaker Davis: "Please proceed."

Spain: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it gives me great pleasure to introduce a special guest that I have with me here with me today from my district, Laney Lester is an eighth grader from Henry, Illinois. She's here to serve as a Page for the day. She's a straight A student, an MVP for basketball

36th Legislative Day

- and track. She was the state runner up in shotput, which is very impressive, plays clarinet in the school band and is involved and really a great role model in our community. Please give a very warm Springfield welcome to my Page for the day, Laney Lester."
- Speaker Davis: "On page two of the Calendar, we have House Bills-Second Reading. House Bill 120, Representative Costello. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 120, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Kifowit, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Kifowit on the Amendment."

 Representative Costello on the Amendment."
- Costello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment creates the Veterans Service Related Ailment Task Force, and it's designed to address service related ailments that are not recognized by the Federal Government."
- Speaker Davis: "Seeing no further debate, questions on the Amendment. Third Reading. Representative Costello, excuse me, moves for the adoption of the Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 120. All those in favor say 'yes'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Davis: "Third Reading. Continuing on page 2 of the Calendar, House Bill 124, Representative Arroyo. Out of the record. On page 3 of the Calendar, House Bill 188, Representative D'Amico. Out of the record. On page 4 of the

36th Legislative Day

- Calendar, we have House Bill 331, Representative Jones. Out of the record. Page 3 of the Calendar House Bill 348, Representative McSweeney. Out of the record. House Bill 424, Representative Hernandez. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 424, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Davis: "Third Reading. House Bill 825, Representative DeLuca. Out of the record. House Bill 854, Representative Evans. Representative Evans. Out of the record. House Bill 895, Representative Morgan. Out of the record. House Bill 1456, Representative Rita. Out of the record. On page 6 of the Calendar, House Bill 1561, Representative Crespo. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1561, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment 1 was adopted. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Davis: "Third Reading. On page 7 of the Calendar, we have House Bill 1653, Representative Villanueva. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1653, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Davis: "Third Reading. Page 7 of the Calendar, House Bill 2046, Representative Evans. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2046, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee

36th Legislative Day

- Amendments. No Floor Amendments. A correctional note has been requested but not filed at this time."
- Speaker Davis: "Mr. Clerk, leave this Bill on the Order of Second Reading. On page 8 of the Calendar, House Bill 2170, Representative Hernandez. Excuse me, Representative Barbara Hernandez. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2170, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Davis: "Third Reading. House Bill 2188, Representative...

 Leader Manley. Out of the record. House Bill 2211,

 Representative Yingling. Out of the record. House Bill 2258,

 Representative Welter. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2258, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Davis: "Third Reading. House Bill 2267, Representative Martwick. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2267, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment 2 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Davis: "Third Reading. On page 9 of the Calendar, House Bill 2304, Representative Slaughter. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2304, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

36th Legislative Day

- Speaker Davis: "Third Reading. House Bill 2425, Representative Chesney. Out of the record. House Bill 2451, Representative Martwick. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2451, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Davis: "Third Reading. House Bill 2461, Representative Meyers-Martin. Out the record. Page 10 of the Calendar, House Bill 2491, Representative Walsh. Out of the record. House Bill 2519, Representative Slaughter. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
 - Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2519, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Davis: "Third Reading. House Bill 2541, Representative Harper. Out of the record. House Bill 2572, Representative Feigenholtz. Out of the record. House Bill 2576, Representative Zalewski. Out of the record. House Bill 2604, Representative Crespo. Out of the record. House Bill 2605, Representative Crespo. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2605, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Davis: "Third Reading. House Bill 2624, Representative Arroyo. Out of the record. On page 12 of the Calendar, we have House Bill 2691, Representative Hernandez. Elizabeth Hernandez. Out of the record. House Bill 2698, Representative

36th Legislative Day

- Harris. Out of the record. On page 13 of the Calendar, House Bill 2831, Representative Mussman. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2831, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Davis: "Third Reading. On page 14 of the Calendar, we have House Bill 3018, Representative Mason. Is Representative Mason on the floor? Out of the record. House Bill 3035 Representative Unes. Out of the record. On page 15 of the calendar, we have House Bill 3082, Representative Martwick. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3082, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Second Reading of this House Bill.

 Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Davis: "Third Reading. House Bill 3113, Representative Cassidy. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3113, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Davis: "Third Reading. On page 16 of the Calendar appears House Bill 3237, Representative Barbara Hernandez. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
 - Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3237, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

36th Legislative Day

- Speaker Davis: "Third Reading. On page 16 of the Calendar, we have House Bill 3301, Representative Manley. Representative Manley. Out of the record. House Bill 3302, Leader Crespo. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3202, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Davis: "Third Reading. On page 17 of the Calendar appears House Bill 3349, Representative Slaughter. Out of the record. House Bill 3427, Representative Conroy. Out of the record. On page 18 on the Calendar, we have House Bill 3469, Representative Bristow. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3469, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Davis: "Third Reading. House Bill 3477, Representative Edly-Allen. Out of the record. Page 18 of the Calendar, House Bill 3580, Representative Slaughter. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3580, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment 2 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Davis: "Third Reading. House Bill 3586, Leader Crespo. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3586, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment 1 was

36th Legislative Day

- adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Davis: "Third Reading. House Bill 3596, Representative Yingling. Representative Yingling on House Bill 3596. Out of the record. On page 19 of the Calendar, House Bill 3658, Representative Gabel. Out of the record. House Bill 3671, Representative Thapedi. Out of the record. House Bill 3687, Representative Harper. Representative Harper. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
 - Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3687, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Davis: "Third Reading. Going back to page 3 of the Calendar, we have House Bill 188, Representative D'Amico. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 188, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Davis: "Third Reading. On page 12 of the Calendar, we have House Bill 2698, Leader Harris. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2698, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Davis: "Third Reading. Going back to page 5 of the Calendar, we have House Bill 854, Representative Evans. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

36th Legislative Day

- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 854, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Davis: "Third Reading. On the Order of Third Readings, we are working from the priority list. We have House Bill 3663, Representative Ammons. Is Representative Ammons on the floor? Out of the record. House Bill 3628, Representative Bristow. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3628, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Bristow."
- Bristow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm finding my notes. This amends the School Code and Community College Act by moving provisions from the School Code to the Community College Act. Also provides a new definition of adult education, increases instructional fees from \$3 to \$6 for students taking adult education courses and proposes a generation rate for adult education instruction. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Kalish, for what reason do you rise?

 Seeking no further discussion, Representative Bristow to close."
- Bristow: "I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Davis: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3628 pass?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Kalish, for what reason do you rise?"

Kalish: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Point of personal privilege."
Speaker Davis: "State your point."

Kalish: "Members of the House, I like to welcome Agudath Israel of Illinois, who's in the gallery today, a group from my hometown from Chicago and Skokie. And they're going to be walking around the Capitol today giving blessings and kosher food. So please stop by 402A later and give them a warm Springfield welcome. Thank you."

Speaker Davis: "Thank you. And welcome to the Capitol. Continuing on Third Readings, we have House Bill 2470, Representative Burke. Out of the record. House Bill 2408, Representative Bourne. Out of the record. House Bill 2786, Representative Cabello. Out of the record. House Bill 3148, Representative HalbroOkay. Out of the record. House Bill 2123, Representative Carroll. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2123, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Carroll."

Carroll: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. This is a Bill we've been discussing food allergies a lot in this chamber lately. I wanted to thank everyone last week for their support on EpiPens. I have a daughter with severe food allergies in a variety of areas. One area that's been ignored in the area of sesame allergies. So I present this Bill to make sure prepackage foods in Illinois are labeled for sesame. And I want to thank the retail merchants for working with me on the

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

language to have them go neutral on the Bill. And I'd ask for
a 'yes' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Davis: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2123 pass?' Clerk, shall call the roll. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Davidsmeyer. Sosnowski. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2444, Representative Cassidy. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2444, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Cassidy."

Cassidy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 2444 provides an opportunity for a parent to present a family-impact statement at sentencing, creates some standards by which a judge can determine the impact on... of the sentence on a parent-child separation. Also adds the opportunity to contemplate the impact on a caregiver of an ill or elderly family member. And I ask for your support."

Speaker Davis: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2444 pass?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 82 voting 'yes', 28 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3101, Representative Costa-Howard. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3101, a Bill for an Act concerning human trafficking recognition. Third Reading of this House Bill."

 Speaker Davis: "Representative Costa-Howard."
- Costa-Howard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3101 requires human trafficking training to be completed in our hotel and motel industry. I have been working hard with the Hotel and Motel Lodging Association to work together to protect individuals. This is an issue that is impacting us at many, many levels. And this is a very good Bill, this is a bipartisan Bill. And I ask for your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Davis: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3101 pass?' All in favor vote 'yes'; all opposed vote 'no'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2243, Representative Marron. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2243, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Marron."

Marron: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm presenting House Bill 2243 which simply updates qualifications to stand for appointment or election for the position of county supervisor of assessments or multi-township assessors or township assessors as a means to reflect current status of assessment designations. I know no of opposition. And I request an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

Speaker Davis: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2243 pass?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Severin. Welch. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 113 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3263, Representative Mazzochi. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3263, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Mazzochi."

Mazzochi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise on House Bill 3263 this is a simple transparency and oversight Bill. We have many people throughout the state who depend on the Illinois Municipal Retirement Fund in ensuring that our local units of government are making their promised payments. Both they and the taxpayers have a right to some basic information about their status of with the fund at their fingertips. So this transparency Bill simply requires IMRF participants to post three things on their public website in a manner consistent that the Freedom of Information Act. First, the actual agreement setting the terms of participation. Second, the annual projective future contributions to the fund. And the third, information about the amount of the municipalities past required contributions to the fund for each year of participation. The Bill does not affect any pension payouts. It has been negotiated with IMRF. And I'd be happy to take any questions. I'll ask for an 'aye' vote."

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

Speaker Davis: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2363 pass?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 2 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1482, Representative McCombie. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1482, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative McCombie."

McCombie: "Thank you, Speaker. House Bill 1482 is a rewrite of HB4147 from Brian Stewart and my House Bill 4586 from last Session, which is a public safety Bill that closes a loophole that was discovered when Pam Knight, the DCFS worker, was brutally beating and eventually died. If I could just for a minute get everybody's attention, unfortunately Pam's family was not able to be here and did ask me to give a short statement on his behalf. 'I was married to my wife, Pam Knight, for 32 years. She was assaulted while performing a welfare check on September 29 of 2017 while trying to make sure that a two year old was safe from harm. As a result, she was brutally assaulted and she died on February 8 of 2018. Existing law in Illinois protects many first responders, attacking a social worker that is ensuring a child's safety should have the same protections. Please send a message to child welfare workers that their safety matters and their lives matter. Thank you, Don Knight.' Closing this loophole

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

would put DCFS workers as well as adult protective service workers in the same category as police, fire, teachers, and other first responders. This Bill has been a long time coming and I appreciate Chairman... Representative Slaughter and the Judicial-Criminal Committee for letting this be heard today and on the floor. And to all of you who have... there's over 70 sponsors on this Bill, so please consider joining the Bill. And I urge an 'aye' vote for Pam Knight and her family. Thank you."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Williams, for what reason do you rise?"

Williams: "Just a comment to the Bill."

Speaker Davis: "To the Bill."

Williams: "Representative, I just want to note and thank and acknowledge your hard work on this Bill. You've been working on this for a least a couple of years, but since you've been working on it we been subject to information about happenings within the Department that have been devastating to children. And some of us have sat through of hours of hearings about some of those cases. So I think this ties in very well with the work that others are doing on improving the lives of children through Illinois that are in the most unimaginable circumstances. So thank you to your work on this side of this very difficult challenge that we have."

Speaker Davis: "Representative McCombie to close."

McCombie: "I urge an 'aye' vote, please."

Speaker Davis: "Seeing no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 1482 pass?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Ammons. Mayfield. Mr. Clerk, take the record, 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3617, Representative Costello, out of the record. House Bill 925, Representative Didech. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 925, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Didech."

Didech: "Thank you. This Bill allows County Treasurers to reduce the penalty for delinquent local service tax payments to 50 percent of the original tax imposed under the Mobile Home Local Services Tax Act. I will be happy to take any questions."

Speaker Davis: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 925 pass?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Sosnowski. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 113 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3652, Representative Edly-Allen. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3652, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Edly-Allen."

Edly-Allen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today I'm presenting House Bill 3652, which asks that school counselors provide

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

discussing and information to students on all post-secondary options including a four-year college and universities, community colleges, and vocational schools. And I would ask for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Davis: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3652 pass?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Brady. Parkhurst. Skillicorn. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2237, Representative Gabel. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2237, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Gabel."

Gabel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2237 creates the Illinois Higher Education Savings Program, which automatically deposits \$50 into a college savings account for every child born or adopted in Illinois on or after January 21, 2021. If implemented this program will have the power to start Illinois families saving and changing the trajectory of young lives making them more likely to attend and graduate from post-secondary education. I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Batinick, for what reason do you rise?"

Batinick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Davis: "She indicates she will."

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

Batinick: "Representative, a couple of quick questions. What's the genesis of this Bill?"

Gabel: "This Bill is sponsored by the Treasurer's Office."

Batinick: "Okay."

Gabel: "Also came from Heartland Alliance."

Batinick: "Has this happened... are there states that are doing this now?"

Gabel: "Yes. There are 34 states that are doing a program like this."

Batinick: "We often hear on the floor they say a program like this.

Can you describe a couple of them that are very similar?

Sometimes I hear the response on Bills like this, they say state is doing something like this, and I look up and its pretty big differences."

Gabel: "Sure. Well, 52 percent of the programs use 529 accounts as a vehicle for savings which is what..."

Batinick: "We already have that, correct?

Gabel:" ...we're proposing to do. Yes, we already have that, but we don't already start one for every child born or adopted in the state. So it's easy for us to use that program that we already have. Pennsylvania is the largest state to provide a universal CSA program. And there are approximately 140,000 children born or adopted in Pennsylvania every year. Nevada, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Vermont, and Maine all have statewide CSA programs. Maine's is completely privately funded while the other existing state programs use a mix of state and private funds, which is what we would like to do."

Batinick: "Okay. So you mentioned a mix of state and private funds.

What's the vehicle for the private funds?"

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

Gabel: "The private funds can either come from community foundations throughout the state or it could from individuals. The Office of the Treasurer is going to be looking at that for this year. This is a planning year to try to setup a program like that. We also are looking at other states, possibly some other state funds but no general revenue."

Batinick: "What is the cost of the program?"

Gabel: "The cost of providing this \$50 for each child and for administrative costs is about \$9 million a year. After 10 years we expect this program to begin to become more... the price will go down."

Batinick: "So, Pennsylvania is state about the size of Illinois, correct?"

Gabel: "Yes."

Batinick: "There... you said 40 thousand people were born or adopted."

Gabel: "One hundred forty thousand."

Batinick: "I'm sorry? Oh, 140 thousand?"

Gabel: "Correct."

Batinick: "One hundred forty thousand. So that's about \$6 million that would be going into our accounts based on that. So you're telling me that \$3 million of this is cost, that about a third?"

Gabel: "No. In Illinois its 165 thousand children."

Batinick: "Okay. So break out the 9 million. So how much is going to overhead and how much is it going to cost?"

Gabel: "Eight million is going to the children and one million is going to administrative costs."

36th Legislative Day

- Batinick: "So it's a million dollar cost that seems kind of hefty.

 Has that been figured into the Governor's budget?"
- Gabel: "No."
- Batinick: "It has not been figured into the Governor... so that change the rates that..."
- Gabel: "It wouldn't start this year. It would not start until next year so there is no cost in this fiscal year budget."
- Batinick: "Okay, but eventually there is a cost. Have you spoken to the Governor about this particular?"
- Gabel: "And it would be in the Treasurer Office budget."
- Batinick: "Right, but it at I understand that it's a Treasurer's initiative, but the Governor is the one that has to pay for the program. So you have a 9 million dollar cost has that cost..."
- Gabel: "It can be paid through other state funds that are not GRF.

 It could also be paid for by some private money. I know in

 Evanston, we're doing a pilot program like this with all

 private funds through the Evanston Community Foundation."
- Batinick: "Right. But this isn't... you're guaranteeing \$50 per newborn?"
- Gabel: "It's subject to appropriation."
- Batinick: "Okay. Its subject to appropriation, which is the question have you talked to the Governor's Office about it? Because they're the ones... the Governor's Office and us are the ones that are going to be appropriating it and we keep talking about..."
- Gabel: "Okay."
- Batinick: "...we keep talking about spending more and more money with a lot of these Bills. And I haven't heard... I haven't

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

seen in any of my analysis, in fact and I could be wrong, but not once have I seen the Governor's Office as a proponent of some of these new spending Bills. Have you spoken with the Governor's Office about it?"

Gabel: "I have not. I just spoken with the Treasurer's Office."

Batinick: "Just spoken with the Treasurer's Office, Okay."

Gabel: "It would be in their budget."

Batinick: "You may have heard this before, but I'm going to sit back and listen to the rest of the debate and we'll see where this goes. Thank you, Representative."

Gabel: "Yeah, the importance of this Bill is that it is... research has shown that any amount that is saved for a child for higher education, they will be three times more likely to attend college and four times more likely to graduate from college."

Batinick: "Thank you for your answers."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Skillicorn, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Davis: "She indicates she will."

Skillicorn: "Good afternoon, Representative. Quick question, I hear there is a shortage of welders will this money go to welding training?"

Gabel: "Pardon?"

Skillicorn: "I hear there is a shortage of welders, will this go to job training to for welding?"

Gabel: "Yes. It can also be used for any post-secondary education."

Skillicorn: "So any post-secondary education... What about blue collar workers that just enter the workforce without college?"

36th Legislative Day

- Gabel: "As long as they have a high school degree, it's for any post-secondary education."
- Skillicorn: "But if someone is a blue collar worker doesn't go to any sort of college, just goes right into workforce, do they get a check from the Treasurer's Office?"
- Gabel: "No, they do not. Well they... if they don't spend it for higher education by the time they're 26, they would not have access to this \$50 that hopefully would grow to be a little more."
- Skillicorn: "Okay, thank you very much. To the Bill. This is just another tier of stratification with the working class versus the white collar workers. This favors families that can send their kids to college. It doesn't do anything for blue collar workers, it does not do anything for impoverished communities. This is more welfare for the rich. Vote 'no'."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Wehrli, for what reason do you rise?"
- Wehrli: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Davis: "She indicates she will."
- Wehrli: "Thank you. So this is going to be a continuing appropriation for about \$10 million. Is that correct?"
- Gabel: "Nine."
- Wehrli: "Nine million dollars."
- Gabel: "And it's not a continuing appropriation. It's subject to appropriation. So each year they would have to decide how much there could be appropriated."
- Wehrli: "And it's my understanding that the Treasurer can decide that maybe \$50 isn't enough and he can mathematically increase that to a 100, 200 thousand, 5 thousand. Is there any cap to

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

how much that the Treasurer can allocate as an appropriate amount?"

Gabel: "They will need to go through rules too, so... through JCAR."

Wehrli: "So... JCAR? It would have to go through JCAR?"

Gabel: "Yes, it would have to go through JCAR."

Wehrli: "Okay. And earlier you stated there's about a \$1 million in operational costs to the Treasurer. Is that correct?"

Gabel: "Yes, correct. That's what they're proposing."

Wehrli: "So that's over 10 percent in operational costs. So if you're an investor in a mutual fund, if you have a 10 percent load, you're being ripped off."

Gabel: "Well, I don't... a load? I mean any program I know of have has at a least a 10 percent administrative cost."

Wehrli: "Well, there's part of the problem with the State of Illinois is we're extremely inefficient. So this is... to the Bill."

Speaker Davis: "To the Bill."

Wehrli: "Actually, I'm going to... I have an additional question. Do we have other savings vehicles in the State of Illinois to save for college? That are state run?"

Gabel: "We have the 529 College Fund now. What this will do is encourage more people to save, it'll encourage more working class people to save. As I said, the research shows that there are three times more likely to go to college if they have even \$50 in a savings account for them and four times more likely to graduate. As I said this program..."

Wehrli: "Allow me to rephrase my question."

Gabel: "Thirty-four states are doing this program."

36th Legislative Day

- Wehrli: "Does the state run any other investment vehicles for residents to save for college?"
- Gabel: "There is a completely... not out of the... there is a completely different program where they do run another program for college funds."
- Wehrli: "What's the fiscal health of that program?"
- Gabel: "It's not good, but it's not the Treasurer's program."
- Wehrli: "Not good. So it's state... a state run savings program for college that is quote, not good. Can you define what is not good?"
- Gabel: "The Treasurer's 529 program is very healthy."
- Wehrli: "That's not... that was not my question."
- Gabel: "That's the program that we're looking at."
- Wehrli: "That was not my question. State-run programs, you said, is not good."
- Gabel: "I don't know the answer to any other program, yeah I don't
 know the answer to the other program."
- Wehrli: "So are we in the midst of trying to redo that program, to salvage that one?"
- Gabel: "That's not the purpose of this Bill. The purpose of this Bill..."
- Wehrli: "It's a 'yes' or 'no' question."
- Gabel: "...the purpose of this Bill is to work with the Treasurer's Office, which has a successful 529 program."
- Wehrli: "So, to the Bill. The state has serious financial mismanagement problems, it's pandemic around this state as far as how we invest our dollars and how we exercise our fiduciary responsibility. This is yet another opportunity for the State of Illinois to mismanage funds. Right now it starts

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

as \$50, we heard by rule it could... there's no cap to that. It's a million dollars on a nine million dollar investment which is a heavy load for oversight of a program that quite honestly whether it's the Treasurer's Office, the Governor's Office, or any office in the State of Illinois we do a terrible job at managing our money. It is better for the individual to take this \$50 of their own and invest it on their own in the market were they can grow this. Anytime I hear that it's a 10 percent load to oversee money by the state, that's a problem. So this is well-intentioned Bill that will lead to nothing but disaster, more financial ruin for the State of Illinois. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Hammond, for what reason do you rise?"

Hammond: "Question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Davis: "She indicates she'll yield?"

Hammond: "Thank you. Representative Gabel, you had a similar Bill last year to this Bill at that time there was significant bipartisan support. This Bill takes that same legislation that you presented last year and absolutely takes it off the cliff in our opinion. So the cap that was mentioned, has there been any discussion on how high that could possibly go, how that increase... how high that increase may go?"

Gabel: "The intention is to have it be \$50. As we said, the department would have to go to JCAR to get that amount increased. The amount... as I've said, the research shows that it doesn't matter how much is in the account but simply that there is an account for that child. I mean you were a Sponsor of this Bill and I'm surprised that you pulled yourself off.

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

I mean this Bill is pretty similar to the one that was there last year."

Hammond: "There are significant differences to the Bill from last year, Representative. In your legislation, does the money from those accounts have to be used for an Illinois school or an Illinois university or trade school?"

Gabel: "No, it does not. It's a 529 savings account, it does not."

Hammond: "And perhaps that would have been with all of the changes you made that could have been a significant change as we struggle to keep our Illinois students here in Illinois to further their education and to get into our workforce. As far the fees for... so this \$50 that sits there from birth to an age 26..."

Gabel: "And earns interest, its invested by a professional."

Hammond: "...and earns interest. So at age 26 is that interest reflected in the 529..."

Gabel: "Yes."

Hammond: "...or where does that interest go?"

Gabel: "The interest, it follows that \$50, and if by age 26 they do not use those funds, they go back to the Treasurer's Office and can be reinvested."

Hammond: "And would they be reinvested in this same program or would they go somewhere else?"

Gabel: "They'd be reinvested in the same program."

Hammond: "So in other words, other individuals that are a part of this program they could see an even higher rate?"

Gabel: "No. It would go to new infant... new babies being born."

Hammond: "So, at some point in time do you anticipate that this
would be self-funded?"

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

Gabel: "You know that's an interesting question because certainly the cost to the state will go down every year after 10 years. But you want the program to be successful so you want them to use that money so you don't necessarily want the money to come back to the fund. So it's hard to say, I mean... they'll... we'll be doing analysis to see how many families are actually using this funds and how many are not. So that's a difficult question to answer."

Hammond: "And is your legislation specific that is in fact the case regarding the fees?"

Gabel: "The fees?"

Hammond: "Is your legislation specific? Does it state specifically that these funds would continue?"

Gabel: "Go back into the fund, yes."

Hammond: "Okay. And finally, there has been significant opposition from the banking community because, they too provide these services to people in Illinois. And certainly in other states but more and more we see particular this Treasurer getting deeper and deeper in to what are the traditional banking industry and I have serious concerns about that. And I would urge a 'no' vote."

Gabel: "Sure. Yes... no, the... you know the department... the Office of the Treasurer is going to be working with the banking industry. What this Bill does is it also encourages families to get their own 529 account. And we think that this will actually encourage people to save and to use banks. In other states the banks have been great partners with this. So we will continue to talk to the banks and work with them on this

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

issue this should be in full support of this as it will increase their funds as well."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Demmer, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Davis: "She indicates she will."

Demmer: "Representative Gabel, we had some good conversation about very aspects of this Bill. I have to ask though about one characteristic here that strikes me is peculiar, and that's, why is the question of the dollar amount that the Treasurer would establish these accounts, why that is referred to JCAR? Why is that set by administrative rule and not by legislation?"

Gabel: "The \$50 is in the legislation but to change it would need to through JCAR."

Demmer: "Why wouldn't we come back to..."

Gabel: "That's to put some checks...

Demmer: "...why wouldn't we come back to legislation?"

Gabel: "...checks and balances on it that I would think that your side of the aisle would be happy about."

Demmer: "Well, the... the ultimate check that we have is legislative actions."

Gabel: "Not to do it."

Demmer: "The check and balance of delegating to JCAR, a question of what financial resources are available is very strange. It's not normally the purview of JCAR. So I think the question would be, looking at JCAR which traditionally ensures that administrative rule that are enacted are consistent with a legislation as it passed this chamber. On what criteria would

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

JCAR evaluate a future change that the Treasurer suggested for this? What would the criteria be that JCAR would weigh in on?"

Gabel: "So the department... the Office of the Treasurer is not wed to that line and the piece in the Bill. They'd be happy to change it in the Senate if you feel that would... that's inappropriate. But I think the intent of this Bill is to have the \$50 and continue with the \$50. As I've said before the amount doesn't matter as much as the fact as there is a savings account for that child."

Demmer: "Thank you. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I think we're pointing out there's a lot of unanswered questions with this. We have a very strange procedure set up that seems to delegate outside of this Legislature the authority to make changes that will have a fiscal impact that will come back to this Legislature to ask us to appropriate money for. And we could be set up with a situation in which the Treasurer offers instead of \$50 its \$5,000 next year. We come back to the Legislature then and it's going to be our responsibility to come up with an appropriation to meet that need. We can't delegate appropriation authority to an outside group, even if it's a JCAR that's created by Members of the Legislature. That's not what JCAR is for. JCAR is not there to make decisions about whether an appropriation is sufficient or not. The power of appropriating money is one of the core functions of the General Assembly. We should be very wary of any measure that takes that power away from the House of Representatives. This Bill is one example of that and has a

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

- lot of unintended consequences. As a result of that, I encourage a 'no' vote."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Keicher, for what reason do you rise?"
- Keicher: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Davis: "She indicates she will."
- Keicher: "All right. Thank you. Representative, approximately how
 many students a year are we talking that will be enrolled in
 this program?"
- Gabel: "We are talking about newborn babies, 165 thousand a year."
- Keicher: "Okay. I had spoken extensively in the committee on this and then after with the Treasurer's staff. Can you help share with me the notification letters that will go out to each Household and whether those will have the Treasurer's name on those letters?"
- Gabel: "The State Treasurer's Office adheres to the state ethics guidelines in the marketing of the programs and services. The State Officials and Employee Ethics Act governs program promotional materials for the Treasurer just as it does for all Members of the General Assembly."
- Keicher: "I love that you had that ready, thank you. Can you help me understand... we in this state have had trouble with public officials putting their name all over programs that taxpayers have funded? A Governor dubbed that one time and we've got a number of other elected officials. So what I hear you telling me is that each and every newborn in the State of Illinois will get a letter to their household plus annual statement that will have the Speaker's name on the letter each and every year... Treasurer, sorry, Treasurer's name?"

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

Gabel: "Will adhere to the States Ethics guidelines."

Keicher: "So I hear you saying yes, but I like to hear you say
yes. Each and every..."

Gabel: "I don't know, I don't know."

Keicher: "...of these 166 thousand children will receive a letter initially and once a year at the renewal of the account that will have the Treasurer's name? So we will have virtually every child in every household receiving a letter from the Treasurer specifically and directly each and every year?"

Gabel: "I would have to look at the guidelines to see if that... what's allowed by the state ethics."

Keicher: "This seems like a very elaborate marketing plan."

Gabel: "It will abide by the ethics guidelines."

Keicher: "And especially since you're asking that the taxpayers to foot the Bill. So the funding for this is coming from the taxpayer, correct?"

Gabel: "It can come from some other states funds."

Keicher: "If approved."

Gabel: "Not... no, it's not going to come from GRF. There's going to be some private funds and some other state funds that are not necessarily taxpayer dollars."

Keicher: "It's still coming from the taxpayer."

Gabel: "Not as a tax."

Keicher: "Not as a tax. So money the taxpayers are giving us is not a tax don't count and shouldn't be treated with the same level of care, respect, and diligence? So here's what we have, we have the taxpayers of Illinois funding a marketing program for the Treasurer's Office of Illinois that regardless of who the occupants of the Treasurer's Office will be at the time

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

will continue to receive mail and marketing materials on free money that is being footed by the taxpayer of the State of Illinois. I think this is a horrible, horrible idea on behalf of the taxpayer because it suggests that the Treasurer is supplying these funds. Additionally, are there any caps to the \$50 per child limit?"

Gabel: "We previously discussed this. At this at this time \$50 is what in this legislation."

Keicher: "At this time is there any cap?"

Gabel: "It would require approval from JCAR which is comprise of Legislators."

Keicher: "And is this \$50 a onetime deposit?"

Gabel: "Yes."

Keicher: "What we would expect that \$50 to grow to by the time they're 18 years old?"

Gabel: "Around \$110."

Keicher: "Are there any means testing to any of the qualifications for any of the participants for any other the families?"

Gabel: "No. No. No. This is a universal program to encourage all children to go to college."

Keicher: "And where will this money be invested?"

Gabel: "With the states 529 program, which has... is privately managed by Union Bank and Trust."

Keicher: "And what about the families that currently do not trust the Illinois 529 plan and choose to invest in alternative state's 529 plan. What happens with the \$50 then?"

Gabel: "They're still able to use it."

Keicher: "To the Bill. I urge my colleagues to reject this as a
 marketing plan. It doesn't really fulfill the mission because

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

the taxpayers are being left out of receiving credit for helping the students get through college. Thank you."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Mazzochi, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Davis: "She indicates she will."

Mazzochi: "All right. As I'm going through this, so it starts on and around page 11, it says that there's going to be a quote/unquote '\$50 deposit to an omnibus account that the Treasurer owns.' So, am I correct that then a child can't actually or the child's parents can't actually pull that \$50 out, enroll it into their own 529 plan? If for example the parents..."

Gabel: "No, they cannot. But they are encouraged to start their own 529 plan and they will be linked."

Mazzochi: "But why... if our goal is to make sure there is individual college plans that are funded, why wouldn't you allow them to simple put the \$50 into their own account? If we established that parents have established a 529, why don't we let the parents put the money in there and then it's there?"

Gabel: "Well, it is still there. And the reason that the Treasurer's Office wants to continue to control that \$50 is because if it's not used then they can recycle it for other children."

Mazzochi: "Well see this is one of the concerns though ... "

Gabel: "But the funds are available for them."

Mazzochi: "...no but see it's not."

Gabel: "No, they are."

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

Mazzochi: "Because if this is a onetime only deposit. And you're basically saying that you can't claim, as I read the Bill, you can't claim the \$50 until the child has reached the age of 10 years, that's how it's written in the Bill."

Gabel: "You have to positively say that you want to do this program. Because the purpose of this program is to teach financial education to families as well to encourage to start their own 529 account."

Mazzochi: "But the problem..."

Gabel: "And the child... and the child... as I said..."

Mazzochi: "...but if you want to do that, why aren't you letting the parents take the money right away. Why are you saying they have to wait until child is 10 years... 10 years old?"

Gabel: "It's to make the program fiscally responsible."

Mazzochi: "Well, but if our goal is to say that students from the age of birth on, if that's consistent with the data that you've had, that making sure that the fund exists and the parent knows about it, why want we let them actually take it out now? Let just appropriate say everybody gets a \$50 tax credit you know if they have signed up for the tax credit then maybe you put this in. But if you don't let..."

Gabel: "So let me explain the research again. The research shows that if a child knows that there is a savings account for them then they are three times more likely to go to college and four times more likely to graduate. The point of having...

Mazzochi: "That why I'm asking. Why are you saying I want..."

Gabel: "...can you let me finish?"

Mazzochi: "...to make \$50..."

Gabel: "Can you let me finish?"

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

- Mazzochi: "...available but I won't let the parents actually have it until age 10. Then if it turns out that the parents move, the child moves... you know, the child doesn't live at that same address anymore, the parents are going to know to where their 529 plan is. The Treasurer may not know where the student is and likewise you've got the provision in here that if they don't claim it by age 10 then its forfeit. Whereas if you at least say, we're going to require... we're going to fund it at the time of the child is born then that money is actually still there until the child reaches the age of 18, and it's not going to be forfeit."
- Gabel: "So as I've said we're trying to make this program more fiscally responsible. As I've said, the parents can claim it at any time up through as 10 but the child has to know that money is there. The parents have to acknowledge that the money is there. And we think this is best way to do that."
- Mazzochi: "Right. Well, why... what's stopping us from simply giving banks some type of tax incentive or other regulatory incentive to say, if you create these types of plans or if you deposit \$50 into this account then, you know, then great. We'll reward you for that. And then again the banks have for the personal relationship that gets around the concerns that Representative Keicher raised that this is being used inappropriately by the Treasurer as a marketing campaign. And then we don't have all those administrative costs at the state."

Gabel: "Yes. Well, there are some people..."

Mazzochi: "And then the banks can do that year after year after year. So instead of having \$50, which by my math is going to

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

turn into about \$110 by age 18 then you might actually be able to accumulate several thousand dollars."

Gabel: "That's another possibility that would be... we could amend the Bill and add that on in the future."

Mazzochi: "Okay. Well, I mean... can you pull, I mean can you commit to making that type of Amendment so that we don't have to..."

Gabel: "No. I'd like this program to begin and to start this year.

As we know, we need a whole year of planning. That's as... what
we mainly do in this Legislature is amend Bills, amend laws.

So as we see how this Bill folds out we can add that in
later."

Mazzochi: "Well, I..."

Gabel:" I appreciate your comments."

Mazzochi: "...well maybe the way in which we should go at it is we should ask the Treasurer's department to actually do the planning and then when the planning is actually final then we can know exactly what it is we're voting for. Because as things currently stand you're basically saying that we're going to promise parents money but we don't you don't actually own that money, maybe you can roll it into a 529 plan by the age of 10 and if not you forfeit it. You know, I think that you're making some promises to parents that the State of Illinois may not actually be able to keep. And that's very concerning to me and particularly if it's going to come out on the imprimatur of the Treasurer's Office. Thank you."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Davidsmeyer, for what reason do you rise?"

Davidsmeyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Question to the Sponsor." Speaker Davis: "She indicates she'll yield."

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

- Davidsmeyer: "So are you making argument that \$110 at the age of 18 is going to encourage somebody to go to college?"
- Gabel: "I am making this statement that the research shows that if a child's knows that there is any amount of money in a savings account for them to go to college that they are more of likely to go, yes."
- Davidsmeyer: "A hundred and ten dollars?"
- Gabel: "Yes. What it does is it has a mindset for them that they are going to go to college. And they can figure out, first of all their parents can set up a separate 529 account, and they also can work to go college and figure out other ways to fund it."
- Davidsmeyer: "So there... I assume that there will be some kind of reporting requirements..."

Gabel: "Yes."

Davidsmeyer: "...to send out to the parents of the individuals who have these accounts? So will there be like annual mailing or something like that to let them know a statement of some sort?"

Gabel: "Yes."

Davidsmeyer: "So, just let's... let's say that printing the letters, envelopes, mailing everything let say it cost a buck per person every year you're talking about almost \$3 million over their lifetime. So that's just one year of people for 18 years sending out those statements once a year. So that's an additional \$3 million. So... and that will grow every year. So it's \$3 million this year to send out the mailer, and it will grow as we have more and more kids. I mean it's not going to be an initial \$3 million cost but when we have a full 18 years

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

- of programs, just the mailing will be \$3 million every year, just the mailing of statements."
- Gabel: "The administrative costs are about a million a year."
- Davidsmeyer: "But mailing, mailing itself is more than a million dollars a year."
- Gabel: "I mean, we'll see how..."
- Davidsmeyer: "When you have a full 18 years' worth of people. We'll see, and we'll just wait to see what it costs."
- Gabel: "We don't have to use mailings, we can also use other forms of communication."
- Davidsmeyer: "So now that the kids... the prior speaker said something about the kids if they don't claim it... if the parents don't claim it if the parents don't claim it by the time there 10, the account goes away?"

Gabel: "Correct."

- Davidsmeyer: "Why don't we... didn't we Treasurer have a Bill recently that required life insurance companies to track down family members? Why don't we require that of the Treasurer to track down the individual to make sure that money follows the individual?"
- Gabel: "The program is designed so that it recycles these funds and is financially responsible."
- Davidsmeyer: "So, he's for private companies having to track people down, but he's not for himself to track people down to claim their money?"
- Gabel: "It's the state's money; it's not their money yet."
- Davidsmeyer: "Whoa. I thought you said this was their account?"
- Gabel: "They can claim it when they're 18."

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

- Davidsmeyer: "But if they don't claim it by 10, it defaults and goes away?"
- Gabel: "Correct. This program is also there to teach families financial education."
- Davidsmeyer: "But it's not their account?"
- Gabel: "The funds are available for the child when they're 18...
 between the ages of 18 and 26 to go to higher education."
- Davidsmeyer: "This just seems kind of like, hey, why you don't and I go buy a car. We'll just keep it at my house, but it'll be ours. Right? I mean I think that... I think that this small incentive, this \$110 is not going to encourage anybody to go. And there are tons of people in the State of Illinois..."
- Gabel: "Well, the research show the opposite."
- Davidsmeyer: "There are tons of people in the State of Illinois that don't need the extra \$50. So there's no means testing to say, we're going to give people who need it \$50, and the people that don't need it, we're going to go and give them \$50, too?"
- Gabel: "No, there is not means testing. No. This is a program to encourage all of our children to go to college."
- Davidsmeyer: "I just think... To the Bill. I think that this is an interesting idea, I just don't think it's ready to go. I think it's, you know, a way for the Treasurer to get his name out, no matter who the Treasurer is. I spoke about it on a different Bill. I think were running all these Bills for the Treasurer so he can get his name out, and I don't thinks it's right. I urge a 'no' vote."

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

Speakers Davis: "Members, we still have four Members seeking recognition. Representative Wheeler, for what reason do you rise?"

Wheeler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, for those of you that are not familiar with a Joint Committee on Administrative Rules, I am. I'm a Member of it. I'm actually the Co-chair from the House side. And I want you to understand that the way this Bill is structured, when you give this authority to any agency in this case it's the Treasurer's Office, once a rule is promulgated it takes 8 of the 12 Members of JCAR to prohibit that rule. So what we're creating in this is a backdoor approach to unrestricted funding at the purview of the agency. This is a terrible precedent to set. There is a place for rules and there is a place for legislation, don't use JCAR and the rule process to create unlimited process for an agency to do this. This is a bad precedent. On this account alone, I will be voting 'no'. Thank you."

Speaker Davis: Representative Stava-Murray, for what reason do you rise?"

Stave Murray: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Davis: "She indicates she will."

Stava-Murray: "To the Bill. So as I think the person in the chamber who given birth most recently, I'm simply a little bit jealous that this doesn't go into effect for my children. And I want to thank you for bringing this forward as it's tough even being a parent with three kids to remember to start the 529 plan for each of the children. So my son has a 529 plan, but we've forgotten to start one for our second two. So I think

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

this is a great reminder for families of all means and a good incentive for people to get involved in saving for their child's education at the time where it can make most difference. Sure, that \$50 may end up being recycled, but if it and if the parents don't claim it but it could inspire many people to be opening up their own accounts and getting a lot of the advantages at the... in terms of investing early and getting compounded interest on their accounts before their child turns 18. So I think it's a very good program, and I actually like the fact that it has a marketing for 529 aspect to it, because parents do need to be reminded. It's an incredibly large transition point in life. And so with the sleepless nights you can sometimes forget about those things you should be doing. So I just wanted to say to thank you. And I encourage an 'aye' vote on this."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Guzzardi, for what reason do you rise?"

Guzzardi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Questions to the Sponsor."

Speaker Davis: "She indicates she'll yield."

Guzzardi: "Representative Gabel, can you talk a little bit more about the providence of this idea? Was there a commission that worked on this idea some time ago?"

Gabel: "Ten years ago there was a commission that worked on this."

Guzzardi: "Was it just a Democrat only commission?"

Gabel: "Yes... it was a bipartisan."

Guzzardi: "I didn't think we would just do a Democrat only commission. It was a bipartisan commission, right? And the commission issued a report, isn't that right?"

Gabel: "Yes."

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

Guzzardi: "And one of the recommendations of that report was to do precisely what your Bill proposes, right?"

Gabel: "It was."

Guzzardi: "And it wasn't a divided report, it was a unanimous recommendation of this bipartisan commission?"

Gabel: "It was."

Guzzardi: "And you've worked on legislation awfully similar to this Bill very recently, haven't you?"

Gabel: "Yes."

Guzzardi: "And that rep... that legislation had bipartisan support, too?"

Gabel: "Yes."

Guzzardi: "Okay. Thank you. To the Bill."

Speaker Davis: "To the Bill."

Guzzardi: "I find myself confused by the debate that we've heard here today. On the one hand this program is a vast new marketing program for the Treasurer's Office and on the other hand they're not doing enough to track down people. On the one hand that spends way too much money, on the other hand it's not nearly enough incentive for people to want to go college. One of my colleagues even suggested that this should just be a cash grant to every family that has a newborn that we should just give money to every family that has a child. That's an issue I would love to talk about with my colleague, but that's not what this Bill proposes. This is a very simple proposal that is grounded in research that says that we can create better outcomes for our children with a very small upfront investment from our state. We're telling the children in this state that we believe in their future with a small

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

investment of state resources we're going to give them that belief, give their families that belief and encourage better outcomes for them. To everyone on the other side of the aisle who talks about lack of job opportunities and students needing to achieve higher education in order to compete in the global market place, you know that this Bill is the right thing to do. Your folks have been recommending this idea for a decade. So join us today in voting for this good Bill. I urge an 'aye' vote thank you."

- Speaker Davis: "Seeing no further discussion, Representative Gabel to close."
- Gabel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And thank you all for the discussion about this Bill. As I've stated, this is a Bill that will provide funds for every child born or adopted in Illinois after January 1, 2021. It's a program that will have the power to start Illinois families saving and changing the trajectory of young lives. It is based on research. The research it is very positive, as I said. It shows that any child who knows they have a savings account three times more likely to go to college and four times more likely to graduate. Thirty-four states already do programs similar to this. I would encourage an 'aye' vote. And thank you."
- Speaker Davis: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2237 pass?' All in favor vote 'yes'; all opposed vote 'no'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Batinick. Carroll. DeLuca. Harper. Jones. Kifowit. Villa. Walker. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 66 voting 'yes', 42 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority,

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2264, Representative Meier. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2264, a Bill for an Act concerning agriculture. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Meier."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2264, a Bill for an Act concerning agriculture. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Meier."

Meier: "This legislation is a joint effort of University of Illinois extension... extension partners a grass roots organization in support of University of Illinois extension and its programming: 4-H master gardener, nutrition, education, economic development, agriculture, and much more. This Bill makes no appropriation. House Bill 2264 brings the county cooperative extension law update with the Civil Administration Code by changing the 'may' to 'shall' to mirror the Civil Administration Code. There is no additional expenditure of money. And I'd appreciate a 'yay' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Davis: "Seeing no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2264 pass?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Burke. Didech. West. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Bryant, for what reason do you rise?"

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

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

Speaker Davis: "Please state your point."

Bryant: "Just like to recognize in the gallery today, I have Mayor John Lewis and Ms. Mary Ellen Bechtel who is the city manager for Mount Vernon. So Mayor John Lewis of Mount Vernon and Mary Ellen Bechtel, welcome to the Capitol."

Speaker Davis: "Thank you for visiting today. House Bill 2838, Representative Gong-Gershowitz. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2838, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Gong-Gershowitz."

Gong-Gershowitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of this House. I rise to present House Bill 2838 that provides for primary contractor responsibility for wage and benefit theft in the construction industry. Simply put, wage theft is a failure to pay workers the full wages that they're legally entitled to. It's a widespread and deeply rooted problem that not only harms the workers and families who directly suffer the exploitation, it also damages law abiding business owners. Employers who commit wage theft have artificially lower labor costs and can under bid competitors who follow the law. A recent study of the 10 most populous states found that construction workers in Illinois lose 22.9 percent of their income to wage theft. Aside from just being wrong, there is also a public cost. When workers aren't paid, there is straight forward loss in payroll and income tax revenue. And when workers comp isn't paid and a worker is injured on the job, it's the taxpayer that picks up the tab at the emergency

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

room. The good news is that this is a solvable problem. This Bill gives primary contracts the tools necessary to ensure the sub-contractors that they hire and choose to do business with are paying their workers. General contractors are given the authority, not a mandate, to collect contract bid as well payroll records for wages and benefits from subs of any tier. The idea is to incentivize contractors to solve problems before they become acute and actually prevent wage theft from happening in the first place. A worker does not have a direct claim against a general contractor in this Bill. Only the Department of Labor or a joint labor management committee compose equally of management and labor Representatives can bring us to the lawsuit to collect unpaid wages. This protects contractors against frivolous and harassing lawsuits and ensures that meritorious claims get the attention that they deserve. In short, this Bill is about leveling the playing field and ensuring that contractors who are doing the right thing by paying their workers can stay in business. And I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Davis: "Ladies and Gentlemen, we have six people seeking recognition. Representative Wheeler, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Davis: "She indicates she will."

Wheeler: "Representative, you and I discussed this Bill for a little bit in committee when it was coming through there. There, I can see you now. Thank you. There's some real concerns about how this would function in the real world. Are you aware of that?"

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

- Gong-Gershowitz: "I had conversations with Members about how the Bill will function, yes."
- Wheeler: "And with Members... what about contractors?"
- Gong-Gershowitz: "Yes, we've been in conversations and we're, you know... do you have... yes, we have been having conversations."
- Wheeler: "Have you worked to address any of those concerns? I don't... I don't see any Amendments on this Bill yet, and I know we've talked about a lot of issues that came up in committee. Are you intending to amend this Bill at all or you're going to run this as is?"
- Gong-Gershowitz: "I filed this Bill in February, and it wasn't until after this Bill passed committee that anyone approached me to have conversation. So we're continuing to have those conversations. And as a matter of fact the Department of Labor may have some suggestions about the implementation. We're continuing to have those conversations. And it will have an opportunity to continue those conversations as the Bill moves through the committee process in the Senate."
- Wheeler: "Well, once we vote on this today it leaves our hands, unless the Senate amends it and it can come back for concurrence at which point we have no control of the Amendments of that process either. So I guess I'm asking you... I know I've been reached out to by a number of our listed opponents as well as other actual contractors, people who hire people in my district and around my district, to say that this... I think they use the general word that I can say on the House Floor anyway is unworkable. This is not something we can do to actually make a difference for the contractors that are following the right process, doing the right thing

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

we're putting them in a terrible trouble amount of liability with this process. So, would you consider pulling it from the record today and working on an Amendment? With the... with the people who've you actually been talking with?"

Gong-Gershowitz: "Representative, this Bill was extensively negotiated and passed in California. And the reason why workers do not have a direct cause of action against a contractor and the reason why in this particular legislation if there were workers who had not been paid, a claim would have to be filed at the Department of Labor. And the Department of Labor would have to decide that that claim was meritorious before any liability attached is part of a recognition that we need to make sure the contractors voices are heard in this process."

Wheeler: "My question was just, are we consider working on it some more? It was just a 'yes' or 'no' question."

Gong-Gershowitz: "In the House, I'm asking for an 'aye' vote."

Wheeler: "Okay. Well, I'm going to point out a couple of things to you then. Thankfully Illinois does not rubber stamp everything that California does. We'd be further off the cliff than we already are right now. So telling me that California has already done this and that's why we should is not enough. I believe I also requested from the gentleman who testified in committee something to back up the number you just gave on the floor of some 22 percent of wages being lost. Now that's incredulous from my experience in the trades, both as a worker and a contractor, because you can't function. Nobody can function under that scenario. The most important thing you have is a contractor is access to good people who work hard.

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

And believe me those of us who are union contractors we got to go through the process of paying people a great wage, they got great benefits, and we paid them. And you know they did a great job for us and gave a great life to us. So the idea that someone shorting anybody those contractors don't last you don't use them in projects going forward. You can't because the project responsibilities are on you, the general contractor, to make sure that actually happens. So those are things you're looking at in adding this Bill you're saying well the general contractor is the prime contractor is going to be responsible for everybody else in the system. If there is a wage dispute between a subcontractor and some employees or worse yet a subcontractor of a subcontractor and their employees, I have no control over that as a general contractor. But I need to build in a cost now to pay for that so we're going to raise the cost of doing business in Illinois, we're going to raise the cost of every project in the state. That's the effect of this Bill. Is that really your intent?"

Gong-Gershowitz: "It is not my intent. And this Bill has some experience in California and that's not what's happened. Bond rates have not increased, this has not stopped a construction. In fact, the construction industry is booming in California. And I would like to point out, Representative, that a contractor that is doing all of the things that you said and ensuring that workers are paid and they're hiring subs that they know to be reputable and are paying their workers, has no reason to be concerned about this Bill."

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

Wheeler: "I wish that was true. I wish that that was true. Because the way I understand these things that it can happen. A dispute can come up at for any reason and you have to prepare for that which means you have to assume you have some additional legal fees, you have additional overhead costs of administration just to prepare for these concepts. And the fact that your accountant is going sit down and say you need to set aside x amount of dollars just in case someone files the claim. All... you're talking about insurance costs... you mentioned bonding before, again, I can't speak to the California example I just know my experience. And it's a real experience. And the contractors I used to work with that have reached out to me that do all the right things that pay their people, that have had people working for 20 and 30 years offering them a great careers are ... they don't like this Bill for a number of reasons. In fact, I won't even say on the cause I can't on the House Floor for decorum reasons what they told me. This Bill will devastate a lot of companies not because they are thinking that they do the wrong thing, they're going to get in trouble from this Bill. One more thing, this is just one more reason why they should retire and move to another state. I hear this every single day. I'm sure you hear some of it, too. But this is another reason we are to run people out of here. Representative Halbrook was talking here... it came up here, is there any... what are the protections for the contractor in this Bill?"

Gong-Gershowitz: "The protection is that no one can file a lawsuit unless a worker has had... has been cheated out of their wages

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

and the Department of Labor feels that the claim is meritorious."

Wheeler: "So it goes to late... the Department of Labor first?" Gong-Gershowitz: "That is correct."

Wheeler: "How far behind is the Department of Labor right now on their investigations on these kinds of wages thefts?"

Gong-Gershowitz: "I don't have that information."

Wheeler: "Well, I'll tell you what, they testified last year in committee that they are so far behind that we've talk about adding the Attorney General, their office in to how we should investigate these kinds of situations. So the process is they would linger on forever. Which means you have a potential liability on your books that's going to last multiple years, that's just a fact right now. We don't..."

Gong-Gershowitz: "The statute of limitations in this Bill is one year, they have one year. That's it."

Wheeler: "They file a claim in one year. That's what you're saying. Then it's going to sit in the Department of Labor and their investigation process for a number of months, years, we don't know the answer cause they are so far behind. And now we're adding another reason for people to file claims. Thank you, Representative. I appreciate the answer to your questions, my questions... your answers to my questions. I'm going to go to the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, I understand the intention of the Sponsor and her work toward protecting workers. This Bill is going to have some real unintended consequences, like many things we do here cutting and pasting from other state to this state doesn't always work the way we want it to, because our administration here and our processes are not the same.

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

One of the things that I see coming from this is for a general contractor to say, you know what it's going to be easier for me going forward to not have subcontractors, I'll just do it all in the house. I will do it myself, I'll go vertical all the way to the bottom. And I won't hire subcontractors because now I have total control. That is a bad thing for small business. It's a bad thing for small business because the guy who wants to start on his own and create an opportunity to take his talents and his ideas and his way of doing things and bring it to market. That's probably not going to happen because he want as many opportunities because it's just going to go all in house. The biggest guys are going to get bigger and the small guys are going to shut out. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Davis: "Members, we now have 9 Members seeking recognition.

The Chair is going to move to a 5 minute timer. On that

The Chair is going to move to a 5 minute timer. On that Representative Mazzochi, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Davis: "She indicates she will."

Mazzochi: "All right. Representative Gong-Gershowitz, have you ever actually run a construction project?"

Gong-Gershowitz: "No, I've run a non-profit agency."

Mazzochi: "Okay. Have you ever actually worked on a construction project? Either being responsible for hiring subs, getting to completion, getting the bank loans, or doing anything relates to construction?"

Gong-Gershowitz: "I'm not a general contractor, no."

Mazzochi: "Okay. And you are not a sub-contractor?"

Gong-Gershowitz: "No."

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

Mazzochi: "You've never done construction work yourself, I take it?"

Gong-Gershowitz: "What's your point?"

Mazzochi: "My point is, is that you actually know nothing about this industry, you've never worked in this industry. So you have people on our side of the aisle... and we did talk to you about this in committee, people who have worked with as contractors, who finance construction projects, understand how this... how this industry works. And we pointed out to you specific things that were wrong with this Bill and specific things that need to be fixed with this Bill, including if you really did want to protect the workers. And also pointed out to you some of the protections you're proposing won't actually protect the workers, because the big thing that the union was focusing on is having all the people do these certified payment contract... payroll things. If your subcontractor is lying to you that he's paid his workers, if your subcontractor has lied to you on his mechanic's lien statement, and then why do you think that the subcontractor is going to not somehow lie to the general contractor. And what you're doing is you're saying that if workers get screwed over by a subcontractor then the general contractor who paid the sub gets to get screwed over twice. He's not only going to mechanic's lien on his property, he is going have union lawsuits, he is going to have pension lawsuits, he going to have an Illinois Department of Labor lawsuits. And if you don't think that's going to make it harder for your general contractor to actually sell the property that's an issue, you're completely wrong because the titling company is never

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

going to release the sale. So you're creating all these adverse consequences and you have no clue how they actually go through the system. We asked you if you would be amendable to making changes, and I wanted to be very clear that none of our feedback has been taken into account when it comes this language. There's all kinds of better ways that you could protect the workers if that's really what your intent is without punishing the general contractors. You're not even limiting the scope of this to amounts that were unpaid or reserve amounts. You're basically saying..."

Gong-Gershowitz: "Now that is just blatantly misrepresenting the Bill. The Bill very specifically says that you can only go after unpaid wages, does not allow for trouble damages or double damages."

Mazzochi: "No. Unpaid wages could be a huge dollar amount. So if I paid a subcontractor \$20 thousand and the subcontractor incurred \$15 thousand worth of wages and I only retain 10 percent and he didn't pay the \$15 thousand. You're now saying, I, general contractor, am paying twice. I paid my subcontractor the 20 less the 10 percent now I have to go pay another \$15 thousand, not my fault. I'm not... the contractor is not the one who screwed over the workers. So what you're doing, and frankly you also want to know where this is going to have the biggest consequences as well, the people who get hurt by this kind of stuff the most are the small contractors, the small businesses. And you know who also gets hurt by this, the minority contractors because these are exactly the kind of things that they don't have the capital reserves to be able to do, they don't have the ability pay for people twice.

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

You are hurting people with this Bill. And the fact you say, well, I think works in California. That's not what's going to work for contractors in Illinois. And the fact that you know ... when you don't know anything about this industry, and you won't talk to the people who actually do this kind of work about ways to try to actually fix this so it's not going to harmful is extraordinary problematic. To the Bill. Again, this is one of those Bills where I really hate to say it but this again is going to have all sort of unintended consequences. It's going to tie up sales, it's going to make it harder for people to be in general contractors, it's going to raise construction pricing because what you as a general contractor now have to do is assume that every single price that you're subcontracting out you may have to actually pay double or even more if your subcontractor miss bid. The general contractors don't get to go back and tell the laborers, hey' I didn't make money on this job give me my money back. You're now basically saying that labor, and labor by the way does have all sorts of tools, they have union representation, they have mechanic's liens that they can file. You're basically saying, I'm not going to obligate them to take advantage of any of those tools we already have in law, I'm just going to screw over the general contractor because of that this is just a bad Bill. I vote 'no'."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Stava-Murray, for what reason do you rise?"

Stava-Murray: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Davis: "She indicates she will."

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

- Stava-Murray: "So, I have a question. So, when a construction project is going on, what is the general contractor, what is their purpose of being there?"
- Gong-Gershowitz: "The general contractor manages the contract, manages the project. General contractors responsible for ensuring that construction codes are followed, building codes ae followed, fire codes are followed. I actually was curious I am not a general contractor; however, this Bill was actually supported the carpenters union who have a fair amount of experience in construction. And this was brought to me by a concerned constituent, who is a contractor, and said that he is having trouble competing with those who aren't playing by the rules and aren't playing fair. And so this would allow a contractor to do is to simply ask the subcontractors to show that they had paid their workers, and if workers are paid, there is no liability here."
- Stava-Murray: "So what happens if... what happens right now when the subcontractors, who are not paying their workers, give bids verses those who are good actors who are paying their people? What are those... is there a difference in those bids? Like in the cost of them or is there one that seems more attractive maybe to a general contractor currently? For those who aren't paying their contractors are they able to offer lower prices?"
- Gong-Gershowitz: "That's exactly right. And it's making a difficult for contractors who are doing the right thing to compete."
- Stava-Murray: "So, it sounds like the unintended consequences... to the Bill. It sounds like the unintended consequences are of

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

the market reality now. So saying that we... that those contractors don't last is obviously not the case when we have such a large percentage of wage theft going on. To say that a general contractor can't be responsible for another aspect of project management, seems to me disingenuous, that somehow we require the cost of unpaid labor to be borne by those who are doing the actual labor. Seems to me the unsustainable or to use the word of the opposition, the unworkable solution is what's going on currently. So to think that somehow this is just another reason for people to file claims, I think misses the bigger point that right now people don't have a way to file a claim for those wages that have been stolen. And so thinking about those who have had the stolen wages above those who can afford to be a general contractor, I urge my colleagues to have a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Weber, for what reason do you rise?" Weber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Does the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Davis: "She indicates she will."

Weber: "Sounds to me, there's a couple of different issues. There's obviously some Members that have no idea how a construction project works and what a general contractor is. So you're not running around making sure people get paid, you're working for the owner of the property in which case you're making sure that the project gets done. We're not standing their looking over the codes, that's the building inspector job, all you're doing is managing the project. So for instance if there a bank that owns a property, a realtor that's managing that property would be considered under your Bill a general contractor are you aware of that?"

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

- Gong-Gershowitz: "I don't see that... the analogy, no."
- Weber: "So, the general contractor as described in the Bill says, anyone who has a contractual obligation to the property owner, which if a bank owns a piece of property and a realtor is managing that property then they could be liable if they hire a roofing company and the roofing company doesn't pay his employees. Is that correct?"
- Gong-Gershowitz: "No. This provides for direct contractor responsibility and defines that pretty narrowly on this Bill."
- Weber: "So no, if you actually look at your bill and you say what is a... so for those that don't know there is no license or certification in the State of Illinois for general contractor. This is a status people call themselves, you probably hear neighbors saying I'm generally my own job. There is no status to say I'm in the State of Illinois as a general contractor. There is no such thing. So anyone that manages a project under this Bill for money: a realtor, a condo association, or anything else would be the person to have a direct financial contract with the owner of the property. Those people, realtors also would be liable for paying wages the way I read it."
- Gong-Gershowitz: "That is not the intent of the Bill and that is not how the Bill is written."
- Weber: "Well, that's exactly how the Bill is written, because it says anyone with a financial contractual obligation to the owner of the property. If a bank owns a house and they hire a realtor to manage that property and a realtor hires a roofer and that roofer does not pay the wages then that realtor would

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

- be liable to pay those back wages. And by the way, this is not just back wages, its back wages and benefits."
- Gong-Gershowitz: "In Section (a)(1), it specifies that it is talking about a direct contractor who is making or taking a contract in the state for the erection, construction, alteration, or repair of a build structure or other private work."
- Weber: "So I'm glad you agree with me because direct contractor as described is someone with a contractual obligation to the owner of the property because there is no such thing as general contractor. Also under the same instance, a condo association management company that would hire a repair when you get paid is a contractor like myself if I do a roof my check would come for that management company. Under your Bill that management company also would be liable if I don't pay my employees to come up the wages and benefits."
- Gong-Gershowitz: "I don't believe that's the case. I think the Department of Labor and the Joint Labor Management Committee under the contractors union understand what a direct contractor is and would not file a claim in that case."
- Weber: "So in the State of Illinois, not 'Illifornia' by the way, there's many foreclosures across the state, many banks have taken ownership of the property. And realtors are managing these properties. Are they aware that your Bill would affect them?"
- Gong-Gershowitz: "I have not heard from them, no."
- Weber: "Well, I just contacted them yesterday to ask if they had any input, so. But the way your Bill reads is anyone with a contractual obligation to the owner of the property. So that

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

would include every realtor that's managing a project across the State of Illinois. And by the way, every contractor is not wealthy, minority contractors, small contractors like myself with three employees oftentimes higher subcontractors that's are ten times the size of us. We may just be there managing it for a small job and have to hire out plumbers that are more expensive, roofing contractors that are more expensive, electricians that are much bigger companies. So one of those companies that's bigger could be sticking to little minority companies or small companies like myself, and there wouldn't be anything we'd able to do or afford to take them to court. So I think there a lot of consequences for this Bill that have not been..."

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

Weber: "So just for the unknown consequences, for the realtors, for anyone that says they want to manage these projects on their own please vote 'no' because you may be liable."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Davidsmeyer, for what reason do you rise?"

Davidsmeyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Question the Sponsor."

Speaker Davis: "She indicates she yield."

Davidsmeyer: "So if there's been a little bit of discussion but I want you to understand that new contractors will not have a chance, new subcontractors will not have a chance to get it into the marketplace because the large general contractors will not take a chance that they will have to cover these individuals. So you're talking about small... new small businesses as was discussed earlier, you're talking about a minority— and woman—owned businesses. You're talking about a

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

number of issues and we're trying to allow these small businesses to get into the market and most of the time they can't get in as a prime contractor or as a general contractor and I think... I think this has unintended consequences that we're really not looking at. We want to encourage small businesses and people who never being in business to have an opportunity to grow and get involve in these marketplaces and this discourages that. As a contractor this would require me to go to the individual's bank and say, hey I need a letter of credit I need to know for a fact that these people can cover their wages. Is that a concern?"

- Gong-Gershowitz: "I guess I don't understand why it would be an issue as long as you have the tools that you need to ensure that workers are being paid. So for example, on a public contract where you have to certify... the general contractor has to certify under penalty of perjury that wages have been paid by their subs. It took me all of five minutes to pull off a certified transcript of payroll where you just put the name of the worker, the days that they worked, the wages and ensure that somebody has been paid. You show this to a general contractor and they don't need to worry that their workers aren't being paid. And you don't have a claim if the worker hasn't... if the worker has been paid, there is no claim here."
- Davidsmeyer: "Where do you think the certified payroll from the subs come from?"
- Gong-Gershowitz: "This does not require a certified payroll I'm
 just making the point..."
- Davidsmeyer: "No, but I'm saying you're talking about certified payroll over there, that's what you pulled up. I mean I filled

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

out those documents, I've signed my name on the line. So where do you think the certification... the certified payroll from the subcontractors come from? Where does that come from? Do you think I make it up? If I'm the prime contractor, if I'm the general contractor, do you think I make those numbers up? Or do you think the subcontractor gives them to me?"

- Gong-Gershowitz: "The subcontractor would have to give those to you."
- Davidsmeyer: "And they would have to lie, right? They would have to lie and tell me that they paid their wages."
- Gong-Gershowitz: "I don't know if I understand the question?"
- Davidsmeyer: "For me to be subject to doing that they would have to lie. Why I would be subject to paying their wages when they told me that they were paying them all along. They told not only me, but let's say they working for the State of Illinois. They told the State of Illinois by signing those sheets that they paid their employees. So should the State of Illinois be subject to it as well because they were duped? Let me ask an easier question."
- Gong-Gershowitz: "If there is fraud going on we have a whole different issue. And you may have a claim against the subcontractor for fraud, but that is not what we're getting at here. We're getting at a general contractor being the best position to ensure that workers on their job people that hire to work on their project are paying their workers. Workers aren't entitled to be paid twice. If they have been paid, they don't have a claim. And it's the Department of Labor that would have the responsibility to weed out frivolous lawsuits. No claim is being made."

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

Davidsmeyer: "But you're putting responsibility on it business that did not hire those employees. So let me put it this way, let's say you want to redo your bathroom in your house. So you hire a contractor to come in, he does all the work you pay him for it. He does not pay his employees, should I be able to come back to you and say... as his employee, should I be able come to you and say, well my employer didn't pay my wages, but I think you should."

Gong-Gershowitz: "Homeowners are not liable under this Bill."

Davidsmeyer: "No... but it's the same idea. It's the same exact idea, because at that point on your property you're managing your own... your own job basically you hired that individual to come in and do the job. So the same premise of this Bill could be applied to... and I know it doesn't cover them, so I'm making the argument that it does, but the same ideas that you should have to pay the wages for that contractor because you hired that contractor. That's exactly what you're saying in this Bill. We need to figure out a better way to ensure that these individuals are paid and it shouldn't be responsibility of a contractor..."

Speaker Davis: "Representative, can you bring your remarks to a close?"

Davidsmeyer: "Yes, thank you. It should not be the responsibility of the responsible contractor who's doing the right thing and paying the wages, it shouldn't be that person's responsibility. You are taking away opportunity from small businesses to break through that glass ceiling or whatever to go to the next level because they're not even going to get a chance to take the first step. So I... there's a number of

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

reasons, but this Bill takes a way opportunity for a number of groups: small contractors, minority contractors, female contractors. So I encourage a 'no' vote."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Batinick, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Davis: "She indicates she will."

Batinick: "Representative, I'm going to take a little bit of a different angle here. I have some empathy for what you trying to do. And I'm curious, what is... in wage steps situations what is the current statute? What's the penalty?"

Gong-Gershowitz: "Currently, I think the Department of Labor does have a processor filing wage theft and it is to recoup lost wages."

Batinick: "Right. What is... what is the penalty to the subcontractor?"

Gong-Gershowitz: "I'm not sure."

Batinick: "Okay. I guess and that's where... that's where I think maybe I'm going to beg you to take this Bill out of the record, maybe amend it because I agree with you wage theft is bad. I'd be... if this really is a big problem, I'd be all in for increasing fines on subcontractors who are bad actors, that's an efficient way to do this. That doesn't drive up costs for construction projects that would be an efficient way to do this. So that many of the other speakers have mentioned that you have a lot of small startup subcontractors that are women-owned businesses, minority-owned businesses, people that don't have the large payroll that aren't the big boys of the world. I'm worried that a Bill like this would

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

inadvertently stop them from taking that first step. And I would love to work with you on legislation that would increase the penalty for the bad actors instead of going this route."

Gong-Gershowitz: "The problem right now is that workers are the one on the hook when they're being cheated. And once that happens it is very difficult, it is a huge and a steep climb to ever see that money back. And so this incentivizes the general contractor who's holding themselves out of as the management of a project to ensure that their working with people who simple pay their workers. Because honestly once wage theft happens..."

Batinick: "I'll move for you."

- Gong-Gershowitz: "...I'll keep backing up, no matter how stiff the penalties the reality is that workers are being left on the hook and they're not being paid and..."
- Batinick: "Well I just... because I'm on the clock, I'm going to interrupt you. You said no matter how steep the penalties you didn't know if the penalties were. I have a problem with you saying that no matter how steep the penalties are, it's not happening. We... you don't have that information."
- Gong-Gershowitz: "I've done my due diligence. I've read paper after paper from the economic policy institute, from University of Massachusetts, and this is a well-documented problem that isn't being solved. This asks simply that you do business with people who pay their workers and if workers are being paid, the Department of Labor isn't going to have a reason to file suit against anyone."
- Batinick: "Okay. I'm going to go to the Bill. I offered my peace offering there. Here is what going to happen, because I've

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

talked to a lot of general contractors on this, minimally it's going to increase of bookkeeping. It's going to increase the cost of liability insurance, you can't increase anybody's liability without increasing the cost of liability insurance. Over time my guess is that this will increase the cost to bonding. When you do that, you increase the cost construction. And I talk at ad nauseam on this floor about how we do things inefficiently, how we spend a lot of money on things but somehow get less of a result then other states. And its things like this that add up to this. So a couple of things are going to happen. One, general contractors are going to have to charge more. So they're going to have to charge more to build a school, to build a university, to build a social services center. The increase for somebody to get their home built, all those things are going to go up. The cost of those things are going to go up. That's bad, that's bad for everybody. The other thing that's going to happen is that I talked to general contractors about this Bill last night that does work around the United States they said, we're just not ... we're going to stop bidding in Illinois. You have less people bid that also drives up the costs. This is bad for taxpayers. There's other ways of solving this problem. And this vote were to meet the 60 requirement, I certainly ask for a verification. Thank you."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Ammons, for what reason do you rise?"

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

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

Speaker Davis: "Members, a verification has been requested by Representative Batinick. Representative Ammons, for what reason do you rise?"

Ammons: "Thank you. Would the Sponsor yield for a quick question?" Speaker Davis: "She indicates she will."

Ammons: "Thank you. Representative, there's been quite a bit of debate on this subject. I just want to circle back to the purpose of this Bill. Can you clarify why you filed this Bill in the first place?"

Gong-Gershowitz: "Because it's important to ensure that people are getting paid for the work that they do."

Ammons: "And have you seen through your research, I know you referenced a few research institutions, have you seen this being a problem of significant proportion in Illinois?"

Gong-Gershowitz: "It is."

Ammons: "And would your Bill require those who did not pay the wages or may be subject to this Bill, does it require them to make any kind of changes in relationship to payroll or their workers at all?"

Gong-Gershowitz: "It does not mandate anything."

Ammons: "And so the overall goal of the Bill then you will say it's to really deal with those actors?"

Gong-Gershowitz: "That's right."

Ammons: "All right. To the Bill."

Speaker Davis: "To the Bill."

Ammons: "This is not a new story and unfortunately, this is a very difficult one, because the research has shown on national level as in Illinois, when I work on the temporary worker Bill, this was part of that Bill. Wage theft was an issue

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

then, it's an issue now. And paying workers what they deserve and what they've earned is the actually based problem that this Bill is trying to address. Wage theft affects millions of workers each and every single year. If this were not a problem, I nor my colleague would have worked on this issue last year and certainly this year for House Bill 2883 that's in front of us or 38 that's in front of us today. I believe that workers who are low income as we work with the Department of Labor around the temporary worker Bill, they testified that it was extremely difficult for them to get support on this issue because they don't have money, in many cases they are temporary workers, and they can be fired without recourse. This Bill would just give protections to workers that have experienced wage theft and I'm sure that it is not a lot of workers according to my colleagues here on the right. We want to catch those bad subcontractors as well as prime contractors that are engaging in this felonious behavior. And so I do urge an 'aye' vote for my colleagues here in the House to support this step forward to end this practice of wage theft and to really require accountability on the part of the of the contractors, sub and prime, when it comes to perpetuating a practice of wage theft that has driven us to this point in Illinois. And I do urge an 'aye ' vote."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Pappas, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Davis: "She indicates she will."

Pappas: "Thank you. Representative Gong-Gershowitz, you and I have discussed this Bill before and do you recall that I spoke

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

with you about the Standard AIA documents that I use as underline bases for most construction projects?"

Gong-Gershowitz: "I do."

Pappas: "Okay. And do you recall that I mentioned that in those documents, those standard documents the contractors are responsible for all acts and omissions of employees both of their own employees and their own subcontractors?"

Gong-Gershowitz: "Yeah, you mentioned that."

Pappas: "Okay. And do you recall that I also mentioned that where it's other... unless it's otherwise provided in the documentation the contractor, who contracts to perform all of the work for the owner, is actually responsible for the payment of all labor performed under that contract?"

Gong-Gershowitz: "That's correct."

Pappas: "So really in most contracts where the general contract...

the general contractor undertakes construction work they
already take on the responsibility to pay for all of the labor
perform under the contract, is that correct?"

Gong-Gershowitz: "That's right."

Pappas: "Okay. So... and is there also an indemnity provision in this standard documentation that requires the general contractor to then notify the owner if there are any claims for... with respect to performance of that contract?"

Gong-Gershowitz: "That's right."

Pappas: "And is there also a provision that requires a general contractor to comply with all applicable laws with respect to the law... with the respect to the work performed under the contract?"

Gong-Gershowitz: "Yes."

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

Pappas: "And in fact aren't we talking about the violation of Illinois labor laws in this Bill?"

Gong-Gershowitz: "That's exactly right."

Pappas: "So the general contractor in their standard documentation is already committing to the owner that they will ensure that the subcontractors that they hire will comply with all applicable labor laws in Illinois, is that correct?"

Gong-Gershowitz: "That's right, that's the law."

Pappas: "Then it seems that we're not really changing anything by doing this Bill except providing the laborers who are doing the work on the project with an ability to recover the wages that they're not getting from the subcontractor. I also have... hold on one moment. Let me look at my notes. I understand that there is a lot of concern or there seems to be a lot of concern on the other side of aisle about the problems that this Bill will cause the general contractor. Isn't it true that under the current regulations when there is a claim filed by an employee, the only person who knows about that claim is the subcontractor?"

Gong-Gershowitz: "That's right."

Pappas: "So there is no information being passed on to the general contractor or the owner about the fact that the subcontractor did not do their job, did not follow the law, and did not pay their workers for the work performed?"

Gong-Gershowitz: "That's right."

Pappas: "So the general contractor has... under current regulations has no way of knowing which of the subs are bad subs, unscrupulous sub, subs that violate the law and which are good subs that actually follow Illinois laws?"

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

Gong-Gershowitz: "That's right."

Pappas: "So isn't it the fact that this regulation will help the Illinois construction industry because it will help identify those contracts who actually are trying to comply with Illinois laws?"

Gong-Gershowitz: "That's the intent of the Bill."

Pappas: "And isn't the case that if we do this and we help identify the good contractors those contractors who now have to compete for jobs with unscrupulous contractors who underpay their employees and possibly underbid on contract projects that those contractors who do comply with the law will actually be able to compete on a fair basis?"

Gong-Gershowitz: "That's the whole idea, to level the playing field and ensure those who are following wage and labor laws in our state are the ones that can thrive in and do business in our state."

Pappas: "So in that the case that this bill actually protect those small businesses."

Gong-Gershowitz: "That's right."

Pappas: "Okay. To the Bill. I believe that we are creating issues here and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle in their effort to protect the general contractor are forgetting about the subcontractors are forgetting about the employees that are... who's wages are being stolen. We worry about small businesses leaving Illinois of course, but we also have a shortage of employees in the trades. And why are we not worrying about those people leaving the State of Illinois because there wages are being stolen by unscrupulous business owners who are allowed to do business in Illinois who are not

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

keeping in check. And also to the point that was made earlier regarding realtors and management companies. Realtors and management companies do not actually contract to perform this work unlike a general contractor. When a general contractor in a construction industry enters into a contract they undertake to perform all the work under the contract and they are then allowed to subcontract some of the work. That is not nature of the contract that you enter into with a realtor. No realtor has ever entered into a contract with an owner in order to put on a new roof. They enter into be the agent of the owner to hire somebody to put on the new roof. So there is a difference there and I think it has not been flagged up. I believe this will help employees, I believe that this will help small businesses indus... in Illinois. And I urge my colleagues."

Speaker Davis: "Representative, are you done? Representative Tarver, for what reason do you rise?"

Tarver: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Davis: "She indicates she will."

Tarver: "You know, Jennifer, I don't like to talk very much but what ends up happening is that someone from the right always says, have you represented from the minority contractor? Are you minority contractor? The interesting thing is five days ago nobody want minority woman on boards but today... today is our lucky day. They care about black and brown people as contractors. So I've actually represented a GC for the last 13 years, one of the largest minority owned contractors in the state. And I talked to him about this Bill, he's okay with it. He's okay with it. He's not going to go out of

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

business at all, right? And he's GC of Marino's, he's GC of Walmart's, he's GC Whole Foods as well. You know I would like to respond to every single point, am I right? But most of them just make no sense. The notion that nobody's licensed as a general contractor is frankly stupid. I took 25 seconds and pulled up on Google, the City of Chicago actually licenses... the Great City of Chicago by the way, licenses general contractors, would you believe it."

Gong-Gershowitz: "I'm glad to hear that."

Tarver: "Exactly. So here is the reality of it. Not only do I represent minority contractors, I've actually built out a couple places you know because I own a small business, too. happens. Black people own business, women businesses. We deserve to be on corporate boards as well. The bottom line to all of this every single thing that's been put out there about this so bad for business is untrue. It's not. It's simply about holding the people accountable. And I find it offensive when everything coming from this side of the aisle is we've got to be accountable, we've got to be accountable. You know as a Legislator, this, that, and the other. And now we say general contractors should be accountable and it becomes a huge issue. So I'm in support of the Bill. I will encourage everybody even if you, Jennifer, are not minority-owned contractor, who they want to save and help today, even if you are not a woman-owned contractor, who they want to help and save today, I encourage you to keep pushing forward Bills like this. I'll always be here to support those and any time somebody is looking for somebody, who I don't know who is a lawyer, owns a business, is unafraid

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

to speak to issues just call on me. I got your back Jennifer, vote 'yes'."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Mason, for what reason do you rise?"

Mason: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Davis: "She indicates she will."

Mason: "Thank you. I'm trying to make this simple and easy because quite honestly I don't understand why this is so difficult. So Representative, when a consumer hires a general contractor do they... say to remodel their house, do they get choose who the plumber is that the general contractor hires?"

Gong-Gershowitz: "My understanding that your general contractor is the one who handles that."

Mason: "Right. And the same with the flooring, the roofing, the electrician, correct?"

Gong-Gershowitz: "I believe so."

Mason: "So they're are putting that responsibility for the project on the general contractor? They are trusting the general contractor to do that?"

Gong-Gershowitz: "That's right."

Mason: "And if there's a problem down the road, do they call that sub-contractor to complain or do they call the general contractor?"

Gong-Gershowitz: "I think typically you'd go to your general contractor."

Mason: "Yeah, because often times people don't even know who their subcontractors is, correct?"

Gong-Gershowitz: "Correct."

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

Mason: "So if the general contractor who is by the way charging a markup right because they're not paying the plumber their actual rates, right? They're doing all of that is willing to take responsibility for putting their name on this project, shouldn't they also be willing to take the responsibility to make sure that the people doing the work on that project are paid?"

Gong-Gershowitz: "That's exactly the intent of the Bill."

Mason: "Okay. So I do not have a history as a contractor, I've hired many but I've worked in the corporate world. If we in a business hire an independent contractor, say to come in and do audit or work on a project. And that independent contractor behaves badly in the office or does something incorrect, that corporation... that company is responsible for that behavior. Because the independent contractor is acting as agent of that company and that's how that works. So how difficult is it for a general contractor to say to the sub-contractor when you submit your invoice to me I would like a print out of your payroll showing that the people who have worked on this job have been paid?"

Gong-Gershowitz: "This Bill actually gives the contractor the authority to do exactly that."

Mason: "Okay. So they don't have to pay the subcontractor before they get that proof, correct?"

Gong-Gershowitz: "Correct."

Mason: "And as one of the folks on the other side of the aisle complained about, there's no letter of credit requested to make sure in advance that that subcontractor is good for the payroll is there?"

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

Gong-Gershowitz: "No."

Mason: "No. So there's no preliminary questioning, no ooh... you might be shady I'm not going to hire you. It's just I'm not going to pay you until you've shown me proof that you've paid people?"

Gong-Gershowitz: "A contractor could do that if they wanted to,
 yes."

Mason: "Okay. So this seems very simple to me. It seems like a great protection for workers. As someone who has spent years overseeing payroll, I know it takes minutes to print out that record of payroll, not hours, not weeks, not anything that will increase costs for a general contractor. That's ridiculous. This is a ridiculous argument. And I fully support this Bill. I encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Parkhurst, for what reason do you rise?"

Parkhurst: "To the Bill."

Speaker Davis: "To the Bill."

Parkhurst: "Thank you. This Bill is redundant and repetitive and actually unnecessary. We have the Illinois Department of Labor which is a department of the state and it covers unpaid wage claims for employees and for contractors. It has a hearing system, it has penalties, and it has a chance for mediation. And so we already have this covered we should let our Illinois Department of Labor cover this issue. You can go right online, file an online claims form for any unpaid wages. And so there's no reason to carve out an exception and to punish other areas... other contractors in this area by holding them by for a punishment double pay when there's already a

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

remedy and a whole department in Illinois to cover this area. So I would urge a 'no' vote. And I think that the Bill really just seeks to punish the good actors and doesn't help the bad actors. Thank you."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Jones, for what reason do you rise?"

Jones: "Will the sponsor yield?"

Speaker Davis: "She indicates she will."

Jones: "How you doing, Representative?"

Gong-Gershowitz: "I'm well. Thank you."

Jones: "Great. Great. So Representative, you're not from California, are you?"

Jones: "Because someone on the other side said that this Bill is for California. It's not for California?"

Gong-Gershowitz: "This is to protect Illinois workers from wage
 theft."

Jones: "Never talked to anybody in California about this Bill, correct?"

Gong-Gershowitz: "No. I've talked to the carpenters union here in Illinois."

Jones: "So Representative, there were claims made on the other side that this Bill is going to stop minority women and vendors from actually participating in it. Is that the intent of this Bill?"

Gong-Gershowitz: "Absolutely not. And I think it's insulting to suggest that I... minority contractors would be any more prone to wage theft claims than anyone else."

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

- Jones: "So Representative, can you walk through like when someone files a claim with the Department of Labor, are you familiar with that process?"
- Gong-Gershowitz: "Generally."
- Jones: "So generally, what's the process when someone has a wage claim? Do you know how many wage theft claims have been filed in Illinois?"
- Gong-Gershowitz: "I actually printed out the flow chart. It basically... you file a claim and they actually as of last year approved the process so that you can file a claim online. And then it starts with the Illinois Department of Labor informing the employer that a claim has been filed. There's a response of process and it's a basically an administrative review and hearing process."
- Jones: "Okay. So there were also claims that this Bill would slow down the process, it would add an undue burden to the Department of Labor. Are you aware of that happening? Or would this Bill do that to the Department of Labor?"
- Gong-Gershowitz: "The Department of Labor has not expressed that concern."
- Jones: "Okay. So looking at the opponents of this Bill. Have you had any contact... has the Department of Labor reached out to you and said this Bill... that they're against this Bill, supporting this Bill?"
- Gong-Gershowitz: "No. In fact, we're continuing conversations with this Department of Labor, they may want to make some suggestion on the Senate side to put some more information in the Bill about process, but I've not heard any concerns about... with the respect to enforcement."

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

- Jones: "Has any one of the opponents came to you and offered any language saying we want this language on this Bill, this will make this a better Bill?"
- Gong-Gershowitz: "No."
- Jones: "And have you reached out to any of those opponents that are listed in our Bill of analysis?"
- Gong-Gershowitz: "Over the last week I talk to representatives of the opponents and we're continuing to have those conversations. I'm happy to continue to have those conversations as the Bill moves through the Senate and comes back on concurrence."
- Jones: "So you're giving your word that in the Senate some of the items that the other side mentioned will be addressed, I think this is a great Bill, but are you giving that commitment to do that, Representative?"
- Gong-Gershowitz: "I'm committing to continuing the conversation and I think that would be up to the Senate Sponsor to make any further commitments with the respect to amending it."
- Jones: "So why did you chose to model this after the California statute that you listed?"
- Gong-Gershowitz: "This was an initiative by the United Brotherhood of Carpenters, who worked on a model Bill. It was extensively negotiated in California which was the first state to pass the Bill. And in fact, that's why the Bill has a Department of Labor or the Joint Labor Management Commission as the only bodies who have standing to sue. And that would was out of concern that we not have frivolous or harassing lawsuits."

Jones: "So does this Bill pre-empt Home Rule, do you know?" Gong-Gershowitz: "I am not... I don't believe so."

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

Jones: "So the other side had the opportunity to file any fiscal notes? They claim that this Bill not only would be bad for contractors, minority woman, but they had the opportunity to file a note on this Bill. To your knowledge are there any notes been filed on this Bill?"

Gong-Gershowitz: "Not that I am aware of."

Jones: "Representative, to the Bill. I'm stand in strong support of this Bill. This Bill not only looks at the issue wage theft, but we know that this is a serious issue. It doesn't prevent any minority contractors, this Bill helps and this is a great Bill that the Representative has brought forward. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Willis, for reason do you rise?"

Willis: "Will the Sponsor yield, please?"

Speaker Davis: "She indicates she will."

Willis: "Representative, I think we've heard from quite a few proponents and quite a few opponents on this Bill. Is your intent to harm general contractors with this Bill?"

Gong-Gershowitz: "Of course not. It's to make sure that general contractors who follow the law can thrive and stay in business in the State of Illinois."

Willis: "And isn't in fact if a general contractor hires a subcontractor and for some reason the subcontractor fails to fulfill their obligation especially when it comes to paying wages to their workers, who is that going to reflect poorly on at the end of day?"

Gong-Gershowitz: "Well, it's the general contractors who name is generally associated with the project."

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

- Willis: "And so that's where we're really looking at when we go and we do this it really to... nobody knows how many unless you are directly in the industry and doing the work who all of the workers are. You see the big trucks out there that have the general contractors name on it. Oftentimes in the bidding process, it's the general contractors that get the credit for the work done, but is often... but in the end of it's the subcontractor that general contractor hires to do this that sometimes fails to come through. Is that not correct?"
- Gong-Gershowitz: "That's right. It the... in this case it's the general contractor who'd be in the best position to ensure that workers are paid."
- Willis: "And so what I'm seeing is that, I'm hearing from many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that this going to hurt minority businesses or minority subcontractors that they're... they're the ones that are going to be hurt by this or even our minority general contractors. Don't you find it odd when it's convenient for them, then they worry about our minority contractors or our minority people in this State of Illinois? I'll leave that one just to hang out but you don't have to respond to that. So what I'm seeing and what I'm hearing and you've made it very clear that this Bill was brought to you by the carpenter association. And so the carpenter's association have found that there are a number of subcontractors that are failing to fulfill their obligation and is that why they brought this Bill to you?"

Gong-Gershowitz: "Yes."

Willis: "Okay. And so, what we're hoping is we're saying look you're the big guy, you're the general, you're supposed to

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

make sure and part of your obligation to the project is to make sure that you direct hire out the subcontractors that's not going to do wage fraud or do subpar work or have other issues. And if you go and you hire somebody that's not working to the best of their ability or doing wage fraud to their employees, you're going to have to pony up to get it correct. Is that not right?"

Gong-Gershowitz: "That's right."

- Willis: "Right. So what this in a essence going to do is going to make that our general contractors are much more diligent in who they hire underneath them to represent them and to do some of the subcontract work. Is that not the intent of the Bill?"
- Gong-Gershowitz: "The intent of the Bill is to, you know, ensure that general contractors are more choosy... choose subcontractors that they know are going to pay their workers and if workers are paid there is no problem and no liability under this Bill."
- Willis: "Thank you very much. To the Bill. This is exactly what we need in the state right now. To say that we already have this redundancy in there, well you know what then vote 'yes' on the Bill if you think this is being redundant. It's going to cause no harm on voting 'yes' on the Bill, making sure that we have our general contractors held to a standard that they make sure when they sub out the work that they make sure it goes to the best subs that are not fraudulent on their claims of paying the workers, that they treat their workers with dignity, pay them for the hard work that they've done during the day. This is a Bill that we need to have in there.

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

Obviously the carpenters feel that it's not being redundant. Obviously the AFL-CIO doesn't feel that it's redundant. Who else do we have? We have the Chicago Regional Council of Carpenters, the Southern Illinois Carpenters, Carpenters Local 174, and the Blue and Green Alliance along with the AFL-CIO of Illinois. All of these strong labor unions feel that this is not a redundant Bill that is necessary. And I think it is within our best interests to support these friends in labor to make sure that we have the best Bills possible out there and..."

Speaker Davis: "Representative, can you bring your remarks to a close?"

Willis: "Of course, I can. And I urge an 'aye' vote on this Bill.

Thank you."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Welch, for what reason do you rise?" Welch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Davis: "She indicates she will."

Welch: "I just have a couple of questions for the Representative. But first of all, I want to thank her for bringing House Bill 2838 to the floor. Wage theft is an issue, Representative, that I've worked on in the past. But one of the... some things have been said on the other side of the aisle that just concern me. And it seems like on many instances here people want to diminish and talk down about the credentials that many of us have here. And it is my understanding that you never run a construction company before, correct?"

Gong-Gershowitz: "That's true."

Welch: "You have run a not-for-profit agency though, correct?" Gong-Gershowitz: "That's right."

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

- Welch: "And you are a lawyer by profession, is that right? Gong-Gershowitz: "Twenty years."
- Welch: "Twenty years. And prior to running a not-for-profit... you mind sharing with this Body the law firm you worked with when you were in private practice?"
- Gong-Gershowitz: "I was with Winston & Strawn."
- Welch: "One of the top tier law firms that law students compete for each and every year. Is that correct?"
- Gong-Gershowitz: "I'd like to think they had fairly good reputation, yes."
- Welch: "Can you tell us, counselor, what... when you think of wage theft what that means to you? What is wage theft?"
- Gong-Gershowitz: "In basic terms, it is a violation of the law.

 It's a failure to pay workers the wages that they're legally obligated to be paid."
- Welch: "So someone has actually already done the work. Is that what you're saying?"
- Gong-Gershowitz: "That's correct."
- Welch: "And this money is owed to them. Is that what you're saying?"
- Gong-Gershowitz: "That's right. And wage theft can take many forms. It can take a form of a minimum wage violation where they're being paid less than the legal minimum wage. They can be subject to overtime violations under the Fair Labor Standards Act, which means that the worker was not paid time and half for hours worked in excess of 40 hours of week. There are off the clock violations where employees are asked to work off the clock before or after their shifts, there are meal break violations, pay stubs and illegal deductions, and employee

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

misclassification violations all which violate the Fair Labor Standards Act, which is a Federal law enacted to protect workers."

- "To the Bill. Thank you, Representative. Members, I think first and foremost when we bring Bills to the House whether we're Democrat or Republican, we shouldn't stand up and try to degrade one of our colleagues in their experience. We should address the merits of a Bill. To try to say someone hasn't run a construction company or someone shouldn't run a Bill because they're a man and not a woman and things of that nature is not fair to any of us. Let's talk about the merits of a Bill. And when you look at this Bill, this Representative who has spent her life speaking up for the voiceless is doing that right here. She's speaking up for those who have earned wages that are being stolen from them. This is an issue that should be easy to support, we've been debating this for over an hour. This should have been a simple Bill here today. We want to protect those who can't protect themselves. And that's what this Bill does here today. And I would ask for everyone to vote for House Bill 2838. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Davis: "Members, Representative Batinick has requested a verification. All Members will be in their chairs and vote their own switches. Seeing no further discussion, the Chair recognizes Representative Gong-Gershowitz to close."
- Gong-Gershowitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

 And thank you for the thoughtful questions and the discussion we've had here today. The bottom line is that no business should be able to gain a competitive advantage by cheating its workers. If a business cannot succeed without breaking

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

the law, it should not exist. If a general contractor fails to do their due diligence and pays a subcontractor in full who stole from their workers and the Labor Commissioner decides to sue then they can be liable, but that only happens if you hire subs that steal from workers and you don't check and put a stop to it. The general contractor is in the best position to prevent wage theft from happening in the first place. Once a worker is cheated recovery is a steep climb for those who are often our most vulnerable and are getting stolen from in cheated in the first place. If a business is following best practices and doing there due diligence to ensure that workers get paid, a worker isn't going to have a claim. No one is paying twice. A general contractor can hold back enough to ensure that a sub can make payroll. And if a sub has employees working for them that they need to pay, they must have some process for keeping track of the workers, the hours they work, the wages they're owed. And they can certainly ensure that they can give the general contractor the information that they need to verify that the workers on their jobs have been paid. The bottom line is the best way to protect against wage claim is to do business with reputable subs that pay workers. I did extensive research in connection with this Bill and the key findings from the economic policy institute found that the employers steal billions from workers' paychecks each year and that wage theft is a significant problem in the United States. Wage theft being the practice of employers failing to pay workers the full wages to which they are legally entitled is a widespread and deep-rooted problem that directly harms millions of U.S.

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

workers each year. Employers refusing to pay promised wages, paying less than legally mandated minimums, failing to pay for all hours worked or not paying overtime premiums deprives working people of billions of dollars annually. It also leaves hundreds of thousands of affected workers and their families in poverty. Wage theft does not just harm the workers and families who directly suffer exploitation, it also weakens the bargaining power of workers more broadly by putting downward pressure on hourly wages in affected industries and occupations. For many low income families who suffer wage theft the resulting loss of income forces them to rely on more heavily on public assistance programs, unduly straining safety net programs and hamstringing efforts to reduce poverty. In short, this Bill is about bringing self-policing back to the construction industry, ensuring the contractors who are thriving in our state are the ones that are following best practices and paying their workers. And I urge an 'aye; vote."

Speaker Davis: "Again, Members, Representative Batinick has requested a verification. All Members will be in their chairs and vote their own switches. And the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2838 pass?' All in favor vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? On this question, there are 70 Members voting 'yes', 41 voting 'nay', and 1 voting 'present'. Mr. Clerk, please read the names of those voting in the affirmative. Representative Batinick."

Batinick: "Since everybody had time to get lunch I call off the verification."

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

- Speaker Davis: "The verification being withdrawn. On this question, there are again 70 voting 'yes', 41 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 29 of the Calendar under the Order of Agreed Resolutions, we have House Resolutions, sorry. Again, on page 29 of the Calendar under the Order of Agreed Resolutions, we have House Resolutions 230, offered by Leader Hoffman. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Resolution 230, offered by Representative Hoffman. be it
- RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ONE HUNDRED FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS that we congratulate the Belleville West High School Boys Basketball Team on winning the 2019 Class 4A State Basketball Championship, and we wish them many more successful seasons."

 Speaker Davis: "Leader Hoffman on the Resolution."
- Hoffman: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

 I'll be brief. I just wanted to introduce and acknowledge the Belleville West Basketball team. As indicated by the Clerk, they are for the second year in a row, they are the 4A Basketball Champions here in Illinois. I'd like to welcome their Coach Joe Muniz as well as Doctor Jeff Dozier who is a superintendent of schools and Mr. Basketball in Illinois, Mr. Eric Liddell for the second time in two years. The Belleville West High School State Champions."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Bailey, do you wish to speak on this Resolution? We'll get back to you. Leader Hoffman moves for the adoption of Resolution... House Resolution 230. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. And

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. On page 29 of the Calendar under the Order of Agreed Resolutions, we have House Resolution 231, offered by Representative Greenwood. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Resolution 231, offered by Representative Greenwood. be it

RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ONE HUNDRED FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS that we congratulate the East St. Louis Senior High School Boys Basketball Team, the Flyers, on winning the 2019 Class 3A State Basketball Championship, and we wish them many more successful seasons."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Greenwood on the Resolution."

Greenwood: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I am very excited to welcome to their State Capitol the Class 3A Boys basketball team, East St. Louis Senior High School. They are in our gallery at the top if we would all wave and acknowledge them today. We have Coach Mark Chambers as well as Superintendent Arthur Culver here today. And I want to just take a moment to recognize and acknowledge the players on the team. Brian Calhoun, Jashawn Anderson, Richard Robinson, Elijah Rice, Traeveion Jones, Cornelious Leflore, Kendez Basquine, Carlton King, Andre Gillespie, Jabril Olivaria, Armond Williams, Kentrell Cox, Terrance Hargrove Jr., and Jaylon Jones. Thank you for coming here to Springfield, you guys did amazing job. This the first state champion boys basketball 3A championship for the school in their history, and I'm very proud of you. Again, thank you and welcome to your Capitol."

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

- Speaker Davis: "Representative Greenwood moves for the adoption of House Resolution 231. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. Representative Bailey, for what reason do you rise?"
- Bailey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I apologize but on the Bill 2838

 I'd like the record to reflect a 'no' vote please. Thank you."
- Speaker Davis: "The record will so reflect. Thank you. Continuing on Third Readings we have House Bill 3249, Representative Harris. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3249, a Bill for an Act to revise the law by combining multiple enactments and making technical corrections. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Harris."
- Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is the first 2019 General Revisory. This Bill goes back through the complied statues, updates changes, reformats and corrects errors for legislation dating from the 94th to 100th General Assembly. I'd be happy to answer any of your questions about any one of the 2,149 pages it contains."
- Speaker Davis: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3249 pass?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 113 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3659, Representative Kalish. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3659, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Kalish: "Representative Kalish."

Kalish: "Thank you, Mr. Chair. This is a Bill that in a year after its effective date, a Charter School Board of Directors or other governing body must have a parent or guardian member; so therefore, the schools board has to have a parent or guardian member involved in the decision making. Additionally all voting board members must receive training to ensure members understand their roles and responsibilities. This is an initiative of the Illinois coalition of nonpublic schools. We really do not have serious opposition, and I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Davis: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3659 pass?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Skillicorn. Sosnowski. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 595, Representative Kifowit. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 595, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Third Reading of House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Kifowit."

Kifowit: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is an initiative of a resident, what it does is add GAMT testing to the Newborn Metabolic Screening Act administered by the Department of Health."

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

Speaker Davis: "Representative Batinick."

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

Speaker Batinick: "She indicates she will."

- Batinick: "Representative, at first flesh here looks like not a huge Bill, but there is a 10-5 committee vote. Am I missing something? What was that objection in committee?"
- Kifowit: "I've no idea. There was no debate, the vote just happened. So I have no idea. The cost of this is about 30 cents to the total cost of the test. So it's not a large cost either, I have no idea."
- Bailey: "So this adds what to the testing? I passed a Bill like this last year. What testing does this add to the newborn training?"
- Kifowit: "It's GAMT and I'm not really sure on the pronunciation of the medical term for that. So guanidinoacetate methyltransferase. It's a... what it's a disease that if not caught in infancy then the child will need special needs the rest of its life. And so I have a resident whose child was not diagnosed with this until they were six. And he needs profound special needs assistance the rest of his life. They had a second child, it was diagnosed as a newborn and the child is a vibrant 10 year old. So the early the diagnosis of this in the newborn... in the infancy is so vital to the direction of the child's life."
- Bailey: "I appreciate the answers clarifying that. I see it was a shell Bill. Thank you."
- Speaker Davis: "Seeing no further debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 595 pass?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those vote 'no'... all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open.

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Keicher. Wheeler. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 113 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1444, Representative Mussman. I'm sorry, House Bill 1442 Representative Mussman. Out of the record. House Bill 3198, Representative Pappas. Representative Pappas. Out of the record. Would you like to call your Bill, Representative? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3198, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Pappas. No need to run, we'll wait. Pappas: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is a Bill that allows non-Home Rule municipalities in DuPage County to use up to 25 percent of the monies collected under the sales tax for economic development and capital improvement projects from... until... for four years until January of 2023. And I ask for your 'aye' votes and open to any questions."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Batinick."

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

Speaker Davis: "She indicates she will."

Batinick: "Representative, I'm reading the analysis of your Bill here. It allows the non-Home Rule municipalities in DuPage County to utilize 25 percent of the proceeds of the hotel operator's tax for economic development or capital infrastructure. So what you not doing here instituting a new tax, what you are doing is you're describing the ways in which an existing tax can be used, is that correct?"

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

Pappas: "That is correct."

Batinick: "Okay. What was the genesis of the Bill?"

Pappas: "It was a sponsor initiative."

Batinick: "Okay. The sponsor being..."

Pappas: "Municipal... non-Home Rule municipalities in DuPage County."

Batinick: "And why was it only for DuPage County and not statewide?"

Pappas: "Again, it's the non-Home Rule municipalities in DuPage County that requested the Bill."

Batinick: "Okay. Is this your first Bill, Representative?"

Pappas: "Yes, it is."

Batinick: "It is your first Bill. Okay. Well, I think I'll sit back to the rest of the debate and see where it goes. Thank you."

Pappas: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Mazzochi, for what reason do you rise?"

Mazzochi: "Just to the Bill."

Speaker Davis: "To the Bill."

Mazzochi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. HB3198 it is very DuPage centric, but I will also like to note that there are differences of opinion within DuPage County as to how this language is drafted and who is actually permitted to live by these rules. This is not necessarily something that has agreement within DuPage County. And frankly, until we are at a point where all of the municipalities as well as the local economic boards and the local chambers are actually... and the hotels are all on the same page I still think that this is

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

premature to actually bring the floor for a Bill. And for that reason I'm not sure I can support it today. Thank you." Speaker Davis: "Representative Wehrli, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Davis: "She indicates that she will."

Wehrli: "So, there is some of descent in this Bill with some actual Home Rule communities that are a little concerned that this is just going to broaden the scope of what we can spend dollars on. Is there anything excluded from what these dollars can be spent on or is this just any capital improvement?"

Pappas: "It includes all capital improvement projects."

Wehrli: "So it could be something that has nothing to do with a hotel/motel industry or tourism or anything to promote business? It could be... if they need a new bridge they can take this money and spend it on that?"

Pappas: "That is correct. Although I would argue that a new bridge in town would in fact help the tourism industry, because it would help people get to the hotels."

Wehrli: "Well, okay. So that's a little bit of a legislative stretch, but I'll let that go. This is also your first Bill, is not?"

Pappas: "Yes, it is."

Wehrli: "So you said that's its 25 non-Home Rule municipalities in DuPage County that this is applicable to, can you name them?"

Pappas: "I can name some of them. I don't know that I can name all 25."

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

Wehrli: "Well, I think it's imperative on your first Bill that you have some depth of knowledge to what this Bill is applicable to and who is not applicable to."

Pappas: "Right. So I certainly name the non-Home Rule communities in my district, which are Itasca, Wood Dale, and Roselle. And in your district I believe its Warrenville, Lisle, Lombard."

Wehrli: "You know what, that's pretty good I'll let that go. Thank you. So to the Bill. There is some concern about this Bill from the Home Rule that it does open up a broad spectrum of spending of these dollars on pretty much anything instead of having a narrowly focused use of these dollars. So there is some concern with this Bill. And I appreciate you bringing this Bill forward, but I'm not sure I can support at this point in time."

Pappas: "Thank you."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Willis, for what reason do you rise? Willis "Will the Sponsor yield, please?"

Speaker Davis: "She indicates she will."

Willis: "Thank you. This Bill is not preventing Home Rule communities they already have that flexibility, is that not correct?"

Pappas: "That is correct."

Willis: "So what you're doing and you're not mandating that they take 25 percent of that tax and put into capital, you're just giving them that flexibility, is that not correct?"

Pappas: "That is correct. There's no mandate. It's up to 25 percent."

Willis: "Right."

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

- Pappas: "There's no mandate that any of it be used for any other purposes."
- Willis: "And that actually from my understanding talking to you previously about this Bill, it comes from one of your towns, and I believe it's Itasca that has quite a number of hotels in that community. And has not... because of it they had to almost waste some of this tax money on something that many people would might say is frivolous, but certainly being in a neighboring town I support it. They have one of the best fireworks displays in the whole DuPage County. But in..."
- Pappas: "In the Chicagoland area the number one... the biggest fireworks display in the Chicagoland area."
- Willis: "It is, and I actually can see it from the roof of my house. So I appreciate that. But one of the things that does give a town like Itasca, it gives them some flexibility so they can upgrade their roads if they need to. They could put in some additional infrastructure that might be necessary as we have all these tourists that are coming to the hotels to be able to do it. I think this is a good Bill. This is a Bill that I often hear my colleagues from the other side of the aisle holler for, more flexibility. We want to be able to have more flexibility on what to do with these funds and this money. I commend you for having this not only as your first Bill, but I think it's a darn good first Bill. And I wholeheartedly support it. And urge the rest of this Body to vote 'aye' on it. Thank you."

Pappas: "Thank you so much."

Speaker Davis: "Representative McCombie, for what reason do your rise?"

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

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

Speaker Davis: "She indicates she will."

McCombie: "Thank you. As a firm believer in how hotel/motel dollars are taxed to put heads in beds or how it's spent. So does this automatically, it says permit the non-Home Rule municipality. So will they have to go before there county boards to actually pass an ordinance to go ahead or is this just automatically going to happen?"

Pappas: "I believe it's... it's automatic."

McCombie: "So have you heard anything from your chambers or your CDB's on how they feel about this? Because... the reason I ask that is because over the years the funds have been decreased to help market municipalities and functions like fireworks, different things that bring visitors to communities. Those dollars have been cut substantially by the state, and I believe and I may be wrong, around \$60 million was cut again in proposed budget that we're seeing possibly from the Governor. So how do they feel about their funds being yet decreased again by another 25 percent?"

Pappas: "So I'm not aware of... that there's any opposition to this Bill. I have not heard from anyone who's opposing this Bill. I have spoken... the DuPage County Mayors are actually in behind the Bill. And I have spoken with the DuPage Tourism Bureau and they are neutral, so..."

McCombie: "Okay. That just surprises me a little bit. So I thank you, appreciate it."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Stava-Murray, for what reason do you rise?"

Stava-Murray: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

Speaker Davis: "She indicates she will."

- Stava-Murray: "So, to the Bill. I just wanted to thank Representative Pappas for bringing this forward. As a fellow Representative of the Lisle area, I know that it was a big deal to have this Bill brought forward and for anyone else. As you've said so clearly this was an initiative, a bipartisan initiative in the area that's well supported by those who have interest in it. So I encourage those both across and on our aisle to vote 'yay'."
- Speaker Davis: "Seeing no further discussion, Representative Pappas to close."
- Pappas: "Thank you. This Bill gives flexibility to the non-Home Rule communities in DuPage County to do some economic development and perform some capitol infrastructure projects without having to raise property taxes. I believe... again there are no opponents to this Bill and I would encourage everyone for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Davis: "And the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3198 pass?'

 All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'.

 The vote is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Bailey. Bradley. Butler.

 Hammond. Parkhurst. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 95 voting 'yes', 15 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'.

 And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2830, Representative Stava-Murray. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2830, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Stava-Murray."

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

Stava-Murray: "So HB2830 is a Bill that helps parents and particularly working parents, and specifically even further, working parents who might have a child with special needs or additional need to meet with the school. So currently in Illinois State Law we only allow parents a total of 8 hours with a job protective leave for school conferences or something similar. So this simply states that a person cannot be fired due to... if there absence is due to the employees' attendance of a school conference or behavioral meeting or academic meeting. And that language we made very specific through the use of an Amendment to make sure that this isn't broadly applicable to volleyball games or soccer or anything like that. This is simply about parents having the ability to be present, and it's not mandated in any way that this would be paid leave of any kind, simply that they can't be fired for doing their job as a parent."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Carroll, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Davis: "She indicates she will."

Carroll: "Great. Just a couple questions for you, why did you bring this Bill forward?"

Stava-Murray: "So this was actually an initiative... I was looking at Bills pertaining to parents and I happened to come across this. And I realized how stringent the current Illinois law was. And as you think about sort of the typical child versus the non-typical child and what the needs of the non-typical child are. Wanting to make sure that those who are in an area

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

where they have the most need in terms of parental support can have that."

Carroll: "Right. To the Bill. Fantastic piece of legislation. As a formal special education teacher I can telling you getting parents to attend meetings was one of the difficult challenges that we had because meetings are generally offered during the school day. And when you have lower income families that are working and can't get away from work for these meetings, they're essential. So I applaud the Representative for bringing this Bill forward. And I encourage an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Stava-Murray to close."

Stava-Murray: "I encourage everyone to have an 'aye' vote. And I make sure that it was very specific so hopefully those across the aisle can join us in this 'aye' vote."

Speaker Davis: "Seeing no further discussion, the question is,
 'Shall House Bill 2830 pass?' All those in favor vote 'yes';
 all those opposed vote 'no'. The vote is open. Have all voted
 who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
 Davidsmeyer. DeLuca. Mah. Morrison. Sommer. Wehrli. Mr.
 Clerk, take the record. With 105 voting 'yes', 5 voting 'no',
 and 0 voting 'present', and this Bill, having received the
 Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House
 Bill 3509, Representative Stuart. Mr. Clerk, please read the
 Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3509, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Stuart."

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

Stuart: "Thank you. House Bill 3509 simply requires health insurance... health insurers to provide coverage for pasteurized human breast milk and milk fortifiers in instances of medical necessity. The American Academy of Pediatrics recommends breast milk is the sole source of food for all newborns up to six months of age. But for a range of reason not all mothers can provide the milk that's necessary. And this Bill would help those families and not make cost a prohibitive factor."

Speaker Davis: "Seeing no discussion... Representative Hammond, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Davis: "She indicates she will."

Hammond: "Representative Stuart, thank you very much for bringing this Bill forward. And I know there was discussion in committee and you had indicated that you were going to make some changes when the Bill went to the Senate. Is that still correct?"

Stuart: "Yes, that is correct. I do have agreed language that helps narrowly define the Bill that the insurance industry is happy with and that also preserves the intent of the Bill. And that will be added in the Senate and brought back here."

Hammond: "And thank you very much for making that accommodation.

Thanks."

Stuart: "Thank you for helping me making it a better Bill."

Hammond: "You bet."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Stuart to close."

Stuart: "I encourage an 'aye' vote."

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

Speaker Davis: "Seeing no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3509 pass?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3405, Representative Villa. Out the record. House Bill 71, Representative West. Representative West on House Bill 71. Do you wish to call it? Out of the record. Representative 36... excuse me, House Bill 3663, Representative Ammons. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3663, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Ammons."

Ammons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 3663 is the Cooperative Extension Workers Bill. This Bill would simply extend current State Law that covers worker co-ops and provide for access to resources, provide for recognition as a business similar to an LLC and allow workers to get greater connectivity in their communities joining worker co-ops and providing for its own economic stability and self-sufficiency. And this Bill moved unanimously out of committee. And we ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Davis: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3663 pass?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The vote is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk,

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

take the record. On this question, 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2334, Representative Sosnowski. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2334, a Bill for an Act concerning courts.

Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Sosnowski."

Sosnowski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today on House Bill 2334, which seeks to undue something that the Legislature did many decades ago, an overreaction to a terrible situation that happen in which a couple left young children at home on their own for well over a week awhile they traveled out of the country. But as we've studied this Bill and looked at over the last couple of years, we're the only state in the nation that sets a home alone or babysitting age at 14 and over. Again, we're the only state. So this would seek to bring us more in line with what other states allow in regards to a child being left home alone, again at the parent's discretion. This would simply bring us in line with many other states. Many states have ages less than what's proposed in this change to legislation. But this will set the age at 12 years of age and then this also seeks to clarify a couple other things within the legislation as far what it means to be neglectful. I'm certainly available for any questions. Thank you for your time."

Speaker Davis: "On that question, Representative Villa." Villa: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Davis: "He indicates he will."

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

Villa: "So... how long will a parent be allowed to leave their child home alone under this Bill?"

Sosnowski: "Well as you probably know there's a lot of conditions within statute in regards to what neglect means: condition of the home, length of time, whose there, how many children are left. So there's many other things within statute offer protections for local police, local state's attorneys to enforce other areas of neglect, including danger in the household, those types of things. So this is really left at the discretion of the parents for after this age, but again there's a multitude other things that if there are dangers or other things associated with issues in the household that if there were truly a problem that rises to an issue where there's is a report by a neighbor or law enforcement. There are other ways that local state's attorneys could charge a person with neglect. But again, this empowers parents and really it allows parents not to be caught in a situation in which their child maybe left school is home by themselves for 45 minutes before mom and dad gets home from work. And they could potentially under current State Law be charged if your child is 13 years of age. And we need the kind of ... I think the best thing we can do is eliminate that danger for parents, give some practical assurance to working families and allow them to make that decision whether or not their child is mature enough to be on their own."

Villa: "So I absolutely agree with you that we need to protect the working families from even over the summer right. Like if a family is working and their 13 year old has the ability to stay home for a few amount of hours while the parent is

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

working, I think that that's reasonable. But what about the parents who'd be gone for entire an weekend or for... you know, to go to spring break for a week and they leave home a 13 year old child? Where... what do you think about that?"

- Sosnowski: "Yeah and again, that's what I kind of alluded to in my opening comments. You know many decades ago there was a case of St. Charles family where they were gone for a week and it was a 10 year old and a 4 year old. Obviously that's... wouldn't even be within the change here, but you know again there's other statutes that allow for practical enforcement. You know if two 12 year olds or two 13 year olds are left for a week on their own, no food... there's other areas within statutes that allow for neglect or charges to be brought about by police and local state's attorneys."
- Villa: "I do understand where you're going with this Bill. I think that we have to be very careful about voting 'yes' on this. I worked in a middle school for many years, and leaving home 13 year olds for an extended period of time, I don't think necessarily think is very good idea. They're not developmentally ready for that kind of responsibility. This is... I'm wondering where the NESW stands on this?"
- Sosnowski: "I don't know of any opposition at this time that has been brought to me. We've worked on this legislation for two years. There were some modifications made from last year's version, but at this time nobody has summited in any opposition. This passed out of committee unanimously with no opposition and no testimony against the Bill. And as I mentioned, every other state in the nation is 12 years or less, some are 10. Some actually set it as low as 6 or 8, I'm

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

not advocating for that in any way. Some don't set an age at all. And the reason they don't is because like us they have other items in statute that define conditions of neglect in which local law enforcement can step in. So we're really just taking out that age factor, we're not changing anything else. So we're offering protections for families for 12 and 13 year olds but they're still a multitude of other protections for children left alone for periods of time or in dangerous situations."

- Villa: "It's just that... that it's kind of like open in terms of how long they can leave the child home for. That's the thing that's the most concerning to me. I do agree with you that we should be protecting families especially if they're just going to leave the child home like latchkey kids. I was left alone over the summer as well. You know I do think that we do need to make sure to protect those families, I just think that... I'm really concern about the extended period of time or even 13 year olds who have developmental disability or anything else. I do think that the Bill does speak to that if the child is capable of... is capable of making those more mature, I think the Bill does speak to that, but it's just the extended length of time that would be my only concern. But thank you."
- Sosnowski: "I absolutely agree. And I believe we're covered in current statute even with this change."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Scherer, for what reason do you rise?"
 - Scherer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a couple questions. I like the content of this Bill but just..."

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

Speaker Davis: "He indicates he will yield."

Scherer: "Okay. If you will help me understand some parts. What if a child is under 12 years old? Is... from the way our analysis reads, are they... if they're mature then it's okay? Or do they have to be 12 no matter what?"

Sosnowski: "As with current State Law right now, technically, if a 13... a 12 or 13 year old is left, the age alone could be a trigger for arrest or possible prosecution. So this changes it and gives little more safeguard to families. But there could still be issues with under 12 and that's why I said you know some states that don't have any age all because they use our other conditions within statute to protect students in neglectful or... children in neglectful situations, but we were careful we don't want to go too far. We we're making a change that's been in law for many decades. So we wanted to move it a little bit, we wanted to kind of be in the middle of what other states are doing. And so that's why we recommended 12 years of age rather than 14 to kind of bring us in line with what other states has set forth in statute."

Scherer: "Okay. So even if the child is very mature and so forth, the mom runs to the store, the child's 11, the mom could be held for neglect in that case?"

Sosnowski: "There is a potential for that. And as we probably have all seen, depending how municipalities and maybe overzealous law enforcements, there's been issues that just recently in the press where a child was walking a dog at 8 years of age around the block and the parents were cited. Now the state's attorney ended up not prosecuting charges in that regard. You know, so what we're really doing is setting forth a better

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

standard, protecting parents with law enforcement and trying to be more practical on how we do that. Now in that particular case if an individual parent, you know, and I'm not advocating for that, but in that particular case of an 11 year old it's going to be obviously we can't enforce everything, it's at the parents discretion. But you know there could be danger if law enforcement or a neighbor made a complaint, there could be an issue there."

Scherer: "So what is the punishment then?"

Sosnowski: "So a report could be made to DCFS. There could be... they'd have to go to Juvenile Court potentially if charges are brought forward. I'm being told that it could be as much as a Class A misdemeanor."

Scherer: "Okay. Well thank you for moving in the right direction, appreciate it."

Sosnowski: "Thank you for your support."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Kifowit, for what reason do you rise?"

Kifowit: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Davis: "He indicates he will."

Kifowit: "Representative, I appreciate you bringing this Bill. I have a quick question with regards to just the implementation of this Bill, because we lived on the Eastside of Aurora for a long time. And it's a walkable community which means the elementary schools don't qualify for buses. So there's a lot of elementary school children walking home from school and as I read the Bill if they're under 12 are they supposed be supervised? Because these are third graders, fourth graders,

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

children that are under 12. So current law would then that be an infringement?"

Sosnowski: "Actually we clarify that in this particular legislation to exempt exactly that because that was not clarified previously in legislation."

Kifowit: "But is it clarified for those 12 and only... and over can only walk home from school and it still allows for an infringement if there under 12? That's what I'm trying to clarify because a lot of kids walk, my kids walked home from school, and I'm just trying to clarify the Bill."

Sosnowski: "Yes and I apologize, I slightly misstated. So, it clarifies neglect so that for all cases of any age walking to and from school cannot be considered neglect."

Kifowit: "Okay. Thank you for clarifying."

Sosnowski: "Sure."

Speaker Davis: Representative Sosnowski to close."

Sosnowski: "I ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Davis: "And the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2334 pass?'
All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'.
And the vote is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Buckner. Ramirez. Tarver.
Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 111 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 26, Representative Thapedi. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 26, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Thapedi."

Thapedi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 26 is a follow-up on to something that I've been working on for a couple of years. This is the top 10 percent Bill. The aim of the Bill is to further diversify our universities and to retain our best and our brightest students here in the State of Illinois. I'm available to answer any and all questions."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Wehrli, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Davis: "He indicates he will.

Wehrli: "Thank you. Is there any fiscal impact to any of these universities..."

Thapedi: "No."

Wehrli: "...deferred costs or anything like that?"

Thapedi: "No."

Wehrli: "So this is just if you're in the top 10 percent you get admitted?"

Thapedi: "Yes, Sir."

Wehrli: "I appreciate that. Thank you."

Speaker Davis: "I'm sorry, Representative, did you finish your statement? Thank you. Representative Keicher."

Keicher: "Representative, thank you for bringing this idea to the floor. I apologize that I walked in a little bit late. Were you able to recap some of the discussion we had after the

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

initial committee presentation about how we refine this Bill?"

Thapedi: "I don't think I understand your question?"

Keicher: "Where we were looking more at the directional universities and starting this as a pilot?"

Thapedi: "Yes. Well, really didn't have much of an option. The Bill was actually designed to further diversify all of our universities, but upon a very brutal debate last year, it's pretty clear that the University of Illinois at Champaign has no desire to further diversify its student body. The Bill was actually prompted by the stats which show that University of Illinois at Champaign only has 5 percent African-Americans. And they were aggressively opposed to this Bill and any efforts to further diversify the university. So for that reason, we took those universities that were interested in retaining our best and our brightest students, and they in fact will be participating in the pilot program. And so all of you of folks that are fans of the U of I they will not be involved in the program."

Keicher: "I just want to thank you, Representative, for modifying the Bill and putting it so we can give it a test float and see what its helps with our other public universities. Thank you."

Wehrli: "Thank you."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Hammond, for what reason do you rise?"

Hammond: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I want to thank the Sponsor of this Bill. He has worked long and hard for a number of years on this initiative and also has compromised I believe to the

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

upmost on what we have here as a final product. So I think it's a good Bill. And I thank the Sponsor for bringing it forward."

- Speaker Davis: "Representative Mazzochi, for what reason do you rise?"
- Mazzochi: "To the Bill. Thank you. I also want to thank the Sponsor for bringing this Bill forward because in our district we also have students who wind up being discriminated against because they wind up being on the higher end of the ACT score. And I firmly believe that having this approach of the top 10 percent of all high schools gaining admission to our schools is going to make sure that we are in fact holding on to the best and the brightest, that they do have an opportunity to use our public universities. And I am also quite saddened that U of I chose not to participate in this program. I encourage an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Davis: "Seeing no further discussion, Representative Thapedi to close."
- Thapedi: "I ask for an 'aye' vote. And as you've heard... and I do want to thank the Sponsors that have joined me on this initiative, that while I would have like to seeing the University of Illinois actually participating, because in light of the Supreme Court decision for Fisher v. the University of Texas, which is the 2013 and 2016 decision, it was clear to me that this Bill was specifically designed to address the rights that need to be made at the University of Illinois at Champaign. But I urge an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Davis: "And the question is, 'Shall House Bill 26 pass?'
 All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'.

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

The vote is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Ford. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Demmer, for what reason do you rise?"

Demmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege." Speaker Davis: "Please state your point."

Demmer: "Members, might notice today in the rotunda the Illinois Hospital Association has a number of posters from hospitals across the state talking about various quality initiatives that hospitals have led to improve patient outcomes and improve the health and lifestyle for people across of Illinois. Today I'd just like to welcome a couple of folks from my district from Katherine Shaw Bethea Hospital, Linda Clemen and Hilary Thomas are here. They were very involved in doing this patient quality work and we just want to give them a warm welcome to Springfield. Thank you."

Speaker Davis: "Continuing on the priority list, we have House Bill 2408, Representative Bourne. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill." Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2408, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Bourne."

Bourne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today I rise on House Bill 2408. It was a constituent request, currently in law it is illegal to post private compromising or sexually explicit images but there is no part of law that allows for the removal of those. This Bill simply allows for a court order to have those images

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

taken down prior to the full court proceeding. I'd be happy to take any questions, and I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Davis: "Seeing debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2408 pass?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The vote is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2087, Representative Carroll. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2087, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Carroll."

Carroll: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the Chamber. This is a Bill that helps create virtual drivers education classes for distance learning for some of the smaller districts that don't have the resources this offers them that opportunity. And I ask for a 'yay' vote."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Wehrli, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Davis: "Indicates he will."

Wehrli: "So if this person is a third-party contractor, do they have to meet the requirements as we passed in a previous Bill?"

Carroll: "Well, if it gets to the Senate and it gets to the Governor's desk and he signs it then the answer would be, yes."

Wehrli: "So do you know where the Governor is on this Bill?"

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

Carroll: "I do not."

Wehrli: "Do you know where the Secretary of State is on this Bill?"

Carroll: "On this particular Bill or the one from yesterday?"

Wehrli: "No, this Bill."

Carroll: "I don't see any opposition."

Wehrli: "Okay. Our analysis says you're going to hold this on Second and work with the opposition. Did you clarify that up, are we clear?"

Carroll: "I think we did that all ready. I think we amended the Bill for it."

Wehrli: "You think we did that or did amend it to address it?"

Carroll: "We did amend it to address it."

Wehrli: "Thank you."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Carroll to close."

Carroll: "I ask for 'yay' vote."

Speaker Davis: "Seeing no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2087 pass?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; all opposed vote 'no'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Conner. Flowers. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 113 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2729, Representative Didech. Out of the record. House Bill 3105, Representative Edly-Allen. Out of the record. House Bill 2287, Representative Gabel. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2287, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Gabel."

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

Gabel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill came out of committee with bi-partisan support. What it is does is it... updates the Civil Code. So in the 1999 General... in the 99th General Assembly, we updated the Criminal Code to extend criminal statute of limitations for certain kinds of crimes, but we didn't update the Civil Code. And I had a constituent who wanted to file a civil suit but couldn't. So this Bill will extend the civil statute of limitations three years beyond the criminal statute of limitations so that civil actions can be pursued after or in case of a criminal case doesn't work. I appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Davis: "Representative McDermed, for what reason do you rise?"

McDermed: "Thank you. I have a question if the Sponsor will yield?" Speaker Davis: "The Sponsor says she will."

McDermed: "So I just want to clarify for everybody in the room that what we're doing here is changing the Code of Civil Procedure to catch up with some changes we previously made in a the Code of Criminal Procedure?"

Gabel: "Correct."

McDermed: "And this is an agreed Bill that came out of Jud Civil, correct?"

Gabel: "Correct."

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

Gabel: "Thank you."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Gabel to close."

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

Speaker Davis: "Seeing no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2287 pass?' All those in favor vote 'yes';

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

all those opposed vote 'no'. The vote is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Walker. Mr. Clerk, take the record. 113 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2618, Representative Kifowit. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2618, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Kifowit."

Kifowit: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a simple Bill that recognizes our National Guard Members, who may have served in the National Guard in a different state, and this allows them if they relocate to Illinois to get a National Guard license plate. It's an initiative of the Secretary of State."

Speaker Davis: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2618 pass?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Hammond. Barbara Hernandez. Keicher. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 113 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1438, Representative Mussman. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1438, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Mussman."

Mussman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I'm here on House Bill 1438, which amends the Pawnbrokers Regulation

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

Act by adding clarifying language in the section of the existing statute, which states that in a situation where an item can be proved to be stolen and rightful owner identified the item in question will be returned at no cost to the victim of the theft. This language simply affirms the intent of original statute first passed back in the 84th General Assembly. Many of you will know that we have worked on this language over the course of the last couple of years now in an attempt to find agreed language and find a balance between what law enforcement considers the original intent of the statute, which is to protect the victim of the crime, and also serve as deterrent to pawnbrokers for making risky purchases from sellers and pawnbrokers becoming the victim of crimes also. Pawnbrokers have brought up some concerns that they feel exposed to buyers and sellers who maybe working in concert to defraud a pawnbroker. One acts as the victim and the other has the property return at no cost then chooses not press charges or provide enough evidence can't be raised to prove the case, the seller then walks off with the money. The pawnbrokers believe that they have paid in good faith, law enforcement believes the existing the law already offers them protection, the so called victim now becomes the offender who can be arrested for disorderly conduct for filing a false police report. And the seller can be arrested for theft, because they use the deception in obtaining the money from the pawnbrokers. The pawnbrokers also have civil remedies to go after such people. Again the goal of the Bill is to simply clarify not change the original intent of the statute. And I am happy to answer any questions."

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

- Speaker Davis: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 1438 pass?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Barbara Hernandez. Representative Rita. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 113 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3148, Representative Halbrook. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1438, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading for this House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Halbrook."

- Halbrook: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3148 creates the Local Appointed Official Removal Act to provide any person that's been appointed to and appointed board of a local union government may be removed for misconduct, official misconduct, or neglect of office. This adds to what we did to the 911 boards a few years ago and the water district just as of last year. I know of no opposition and urge a 'yes' vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Davis: "Seeing no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3148 pass?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Hoffman. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2078,

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

Representative Stuart. Out of the record. House Bill 3653, Representative Tarver. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3653, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading for this House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Tarver."

Tarver: "Mr. Speaker, this Bill is relatively straight forward. It requires the Department of corrections 45 days before a committed person leaves prison to notify them about their right to vote upon completion of their sentence. It also requires that they're provided voter registration information as well. I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Davis: "Seeing no discussion, and the question is, Shall House Bill 3653 pass?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Batinick. Davidsmeyer. Mazzochi. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 111 voting 'yes', O voting 'no', O voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Unes, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Davis: "Please state your point."

Unes: "Ladies and Gentlemen and Mr. Speaker, behind me and above we have a group of students visiting from Pekin High School, with Colleen Kahl. But also with Colleen Kahl and the students are two foreign exchange teachers visiting the State of Illinois and teaching in the United States through a foreign exchange teacher program. And they just arrived last week and

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

are here in the State Capitol for the first time and I'd like to ask the Body to give them warm Springfield welcome."

Speaker Davis: "Thank you for visiting. House Bill 3608,
Representative Sosnowski. Out of the record. On page 29 of
the Calendar under Resolutions, we have House Resolution 237,
Representative Evans. Representative Evans on the
Resolution."

Evans: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If I can get the Body's attention for a moment. We've suffered a lot losses with regards to our public servants. I just want to take a moment to honor and send a message back to my district, back to the community of Hegewisch, Eastside community on the southeast side. To let them know and let the family of John P. Rivera know, a Chicago Police Officer was 23 years old and was enjoying his time off, and you know as police officers rarely get time off. They work very hard in Chicago on those busy streets. And the 6th District Police Department one of the busiest districts, a training district. He was a young man who went to academy and was destined for greatness. And unfortunately someone else decided to take action and take his life. And I believe in God, but its moments like this that really test your faith because this young man was destined for greatness. A young police officer, a young man that was representing our community properly, a leader and his life was taken. It wasn't taken in vain. I would express to his family that not only am I praying for them that my colleagues are thinking about him and we're going to file this Resolution to send a message to him and to all that his memory will live on, and he'll inspire other young people to be police officers and to

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

protect and serve our community. So to the Chicago Police Office and the former and current police officers, the Illinois General Assembly, my community, my family we're praying for you on these busy streets. And we want nothing but the best for you. We appreciate you and that's reflected in this Resolution. So I would ask for you to support this Resolution. And I want to do roll call and to send a message that we praying for you and we're with the family of John P. Rivera. So thank you."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Evans moves for adoption of House Resolution 237 and has requested a roll call vote. Mr. Clerk. All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. In the… and the vote is open. Have all those voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. The Resolution, there are 113 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And the Resolution is adopted. Representative Butler, for what reason do you rise?"

Butler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege." Speaker Davis: "Please state your point."

Butler: "I just would like to rise as a reminder for all our colleagues to hopefully participate in next Tuesday's Diabetes Caucus Bowling event at Strick N Spare West. You've heard about it several times now from Representative Davis and myself and Leader Durkin. This is a great annual event that raises great money for children with Diabetes and I would urge you to participate. I have forms here on my desk, I know Representative Davis does as well. I have forms in office at E-1 Stratton if you'd like to stop by there. So please

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

participate, get your team together and if you have any questions talk to myself or Representative Davis. We're happy to help and we'll see you next Tuesday."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Caulkins, for what reason do you rise?"

Caulkins: "A point of personal privilege, please."

Speaker Davis: "Please state your point."

Caulkins: "Ladies and Gentlemen, in keeping with seed day, thank you very much Representative Pappas. Today we're going to honor the corn growers of Illinois... they're here on campus. And so, the seed for today is of course the corn seed. And I'd like to point out a few quick facts about corn in Illinois. We plant 12... over and 12 and a half million acres corn are planted it in Illinois each year. That's equivalent to 2 billion bushels of corn. And I want to tell you one bushel of corn weighs about 56 pounds. So that's a hundred and twelve billion pounds of corn produced in Illinois every year. Corn farms in Illinois comprise... there are about 38,300 corn farms or farms that plant corn and 95 percent of the farms in America... corn farms in America are family owned. There over 4 thousand uses for corn ranging from livestock feed, and ethanol, obviously corn bread, soda, latex paint and even in diapers. Forty three percent of the corn crop was consumed by livestock, primarily beef cattle, poultry and hogs. And we always promote Illinois Beef. If you look at an ear of corn there are about 8 hundred kernels of corn on one ear, there are 72,800 kernels of corn in a bushel and about 162 bushels per acre is the average production in Illinois.

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

So today I rise to speak about the seed of the day. Again, thank you Representative Pappas. The Corn Seed."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Halbrook, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Davis: "Please state your point."

Halbrook: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if I can have your attention please. We have quite a celebrity in the House today. Behind me to my left is Grace Khachaturian. She's a 21 year old from Champaign, the daughter of Steve and Janet Khachaturian. She was selected as Miss Illinois in 2018... Miss Illinois 2018 on June the 9th at the Cultural & Civic Center in Marion, Illinois. She represented the Illinois of the 2019 of the Miss America Competition in Atlantic City which was televised on ABC. Grace is earning a Bachelor's Degree in Journalism and Communication at the University of Illinois. And after completing her year of service as Miss Illinois, she looks forward to finishing her degree and one day aspires to be a writer. She has special interest in writing material for adolescence who may feel alienated from their peers, family, and society. She travels the state discussing her personal platform of 'You Matter', promoting positive mental health in youth and serving as a goodwill ambassador for Children's Miracle Network Hospital, the official platform of the Miss America organization. Please let's give her warm Springfield welcome, again to Miss Illinois."

Speaker Davis: "On page 29 of the Calendar under the Order of Agreed Resolutions, we have House Resolution 200, offered by

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

Speaker Madigan. Representative Hoffman on the Resolution. I'm sorry. Mr. Clerk, please read the Resolution."

Clerk Hollman: "House Resolution 200, offered by Speaker Madigan and Representative Hoffman. be it

RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ONE HUNDRED FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that we congratulate Ronald E. Powell on his retirement as President of Local 881 UFCW, and we wish him all the best in all his future endeavors."

Speaker Davis: "Leader Hoffman on the Resolution."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Ronald E. Powell retired from United Food Commercial Workers on December 1, 2018 after fifty-seven and a half years of dedicated service to the working men and women here in Illinois. Mr. Powell, he served in the United States Army and his first job out of school was with the Jewel Tea Company in DeKalb, where he led the first recognition strike against the company. Way back in 1983, he was elevated to the Office of President of the United Food Commercial Workers 881. Since that time he became Vice President of the Illinois AFL-CIO Executive Board, he did that in 1986, served as a leading voice in its governance under five Illinois AFL-CIO Presidents. In addition, he spent his life fighting for the rights of union members and workers throughout Illinois and Northwest Indiana. Under his steadfast leadership, he has helped countless workers find their voice on the job and beyond. He is been succeeded in the office at 881 by his son, Steve, who's has big shoes to fill. Ron Powell is not only a great father, he is a great friend, a great labor leader, a

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

compassionate caring person, but most of all he is great man. Congratulation Ron Powell on your retirement."

Speaker Davis: "Leader Hoffman moves for adoption of House Resolution 200. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. Attention Members, the filing deadline for Floor Amendments to House Bills will be Tuesday, April 9, 2019. Amendments filed after the close of business next Tuesday, 30 minutes after House Session ends will not be processed. Again, the filing deadline for Floor Amendments to House Bills will be Tuesday, April 9, 2019. Amendments filed after the close of business next Tuesday which is 30 minutes after Session will not, will not be processed. Representative Lisa Hernandez, for what reason do you rise?"

Hernandez, L.: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Davis: "Please state your point."

Hernandez, L.: "I just want to add to Mr. Ron Powell. I want to thank him very much for all his work he's done for immigrant families in his role as Union President. Mr. Ron Powell, thank you for all you work. The immigrant community thanks you."

Speaker Davis: "Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk Hollman: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 249, offered by Representative McDermed. House Resolution 250, offered by Representative Ammons. And House Resolution 251, offered by Representative Didech."

Speaker Davis: "Leader Harris moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it.

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

An Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Mr. Clerk, please read the Adjournment Resolution."

- Clerk Hollman: "House Joint Resolution #57, offered by Representative Harris. be it
 - RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ONE HUNDRED FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE SENATE CONCURRING HEREIN, that when the two Houses adjourn on Thursday, April 04, 2019, the House of Representatives stands adjourned until Tuesday, April 09, 2019, or until the call of the Speaker; and the Senate stands adjourned until Tuesday, April 09, 2019, or until the call of the President.
- Speaker Davis: "Leader Harris moves for the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution. All those in favor say 'aye; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Adjournment Resolution is adopted. And now, allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, Leader Harris moves that House stand adjourned until Thursday, April 4, at the hour of 9 a.m., at the hour of 9 a.m. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the House stands adjourned."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order.

 Introduction First Reading of House Bills. House Bill 3826,
 offered by Representative Skillicorn, a Bill for an Act
 concerning local government. House Bill 3827, offered by
 Representative Carroll, a Bill for an Act concerning persons
 who are deaf, hard of hearing, or deafblind. First Reading of
 these House Bills. Introduction First Reading of Senate
 Bills. Senate Bill 1627, offered by Representative Halpin, a
 Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. First Reading of

36th Legislative Day

4/3/2019

this Senate Bill. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."