67th Legislative Day

- Speaker Harris: "The House will be in order. Members will please be in their chairs. We shall be led in prayer today by Lee Crawford, the Pastor of the Cathedral of Praise Christian Center in Springfield. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops. Turn off all your cell phones, and please rise for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance. Pastor Crawford."
- Pastor Crawford: "Let us pray. Gracious and most sovereign God, you art the author and the finisher of our faith. We pray that your goodness, your new mercies, and your unwavering love and guidance be present amongst us today. We pray that you would bless this august Assembly, the Speaker of this House, its leaders, and all of its Members, and all of their families. We pray today, oh God, that you would grant them the spirit of unity, grant them the spirit of hope, and grant them a spirit of compromise, and the spirit of cooperation. Oh God, I pray your blessings upon this task that lie before them. I pray that you would bless them, bless all of their efforts with clear insight, bless all of their deliberations with wisdom, and all of their work with great clarity and accuracy. I pray that you will bless all of their decisions with all impartiality. This we pray in your precious Son's name, Amen."
- Speaker Harris: "We'll be led in the Pledge today by Representative Frese."
- Frese 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."

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

- Speaker Harris: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Willis is recognized to report any excused absences on the Democratic side of the aisle."
- Willis: "There are no excused absences from this side of the aisle."
- Speaker Harris: "Representative Spain is recognized to report any excused absences on the Republican side of the aisle."
- Spain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There are no absences on the Republican side of the aisle."
- Speaker Harris: "Have all recorded themselves who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. There being 100... being 117 Members present and answering the Roll Call, we do have a quorum and we are ready to conduct business. Representative Spain, for the purpose of an announcement."
- Spain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With very concerning investigations taking place within the Legislature and urgent need for ethics reform, the House Republicans request an immediate caucus. We request that all Members not currently on the floor report to Room 118."
- Speaker Harris: "Republicans will caucus immediately in Room 118.

  House... House Democrats have caucused yesterday. We will stand
  in recess to the call of the Chair. The House will be in
  order. Members, please take your seats. Under the Order of
  Agreed Resolutions, we have House Resolution 543, offered by
  Representative Murphy. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Resolution 543, offered by Representative Murphy."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Murphy..."

Clerk Hollman: "be it

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ONE HUNDRED FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that we mourn the passing of Wesley L. 'Wes' Barr Jr. and extend our sincere condolences to his family, friends, and all who knew and loved him."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Murphy is recognized."

"Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present House Resolution 543 to honor the life of former Sangamon County Sheriff Wes Barr. Wes grew up in the John Hayes Homes Housing Projects, living there 'til he was 13 years old. After graduating from Southeast High School, Wes decided to serve our country by joining the Marine Corps. Upon returning, Wes began his career in law enforcement by serving as a correctional officer in Sangamon County Jail and an officer in Loami, Illiopolis, and Chatham before joining the Sangamon County Sheriff's Office as a deputy in 1991. In 2014, Wes was elected Sangamon County Sheriff, but Wes was more than just a member of our law enforcement community. Wes embodied the best of public service by being involved in so many wonderful causes that improved the lives of children and families across Sangamon County, including Contact Ministries, The American Red Cross, Habitat for Humanities, United Cerebral Palsy Fund, and the Springfield Park District Foundation. Wes was the organizer for Toys for Tots, and he's actually the face of Toys for Tots and always will be. Wes collected over 14 thousand toys in 2006 alone. In 2007, Wes was named First Citizen by the State Journal-Register, an honor given to individuals who go above and beyond to help other fellow citizens in need. Wes was the kind of person that was so easy to become friends

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

with. His love of country, community, and family was always on display. Joining us today in the Speaker's Gallery is Wes' wife Sherry, members of the family and friends, and also members of our law enforcement agencies from the State Police, City of Springfield, and Sangamon County Sheriff's Office. Sherry, I want to thank you for letting us share Wes for so many years. He was a wonderful man, a friend, and a protector of all that needed be protected. I also want you to know that we are praying for you and your family. Thank you very much."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Butler is recognized."

Butler: "I hate death Resolutions. Sherry, Sheriff Campbell, thank you for being here. Mike did a great job of telling all the accomplishments of Wes, but I'm sure a lot of you would recognize Wes. He was around the Capitol here, and if you've spent some time in Springfield, Wes was no stranger to a lot of us. He had a smile on his face. He was already ready and... always ready and willing to help. And he was just a tremendous, tremendous individual. Gone way too soon at 56 years old, but he leaves quite a legacy on our community of Springfield and Sangamon County. So, it's with deep sympathy, Sherry, that we have to do this, but he was a great man. Thank you."

Speaker Harris: "The Body will take a moment of silence. Representative Murphy moves for the adoption of House Resolution 543. 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 Bryant, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

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

Speaker Harris: "Please proceed."

Bryant: "I have with me, today, here, Cori. Cori is my youngest granddaughter, and she's serving as my Page for today. So far, she's had a great time. We've been to a committee hearing. We've had some lobbyists that have talked to us about some stuff. She's soaking it all in. She's going to let me know a little bit later how she feels about what the lobbyists said. And we might let her stick around long enough to take my seat since... I think that... she told me last night she wants to be the first woman president. I hope it doesn't take that long, but she's around waiting just in case. So thank you, and help me welcome her here today."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Swanson, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

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

Speaker Harris: "Please proceed."

Swanson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With me, today, is serving as my Honorary Page is Joshua Gibson from Viola, Illinois. Joshua's a senior at Sherrard High School, and his ambition is to go to Georgetown University to study to be a history professor and also political science. He's very active in Sherrard School. He runs on the cross country team, marching band, symphonic band, jazz band, pep band, theater, track and field, Fellowship of Christian Athletes, Scholastic Bowl, National Honors Society. A very active student at school. His community actives include, he'll soon receive his Eagle Scout where he helped to raise 14... over \$14 thousand to add

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

Sherrard's school system's sound system within their auditorium. He also is a member of the National Honors Society and attends Viola United Methodist Church. He also is a graduate of the Ronald Regan Student Leadership Program, Order of the Arrow Brotherhood, captain of Scholastic Bowl team, and many, many, many, other significant activities to include many sports activities. Today, Joshua is accompanied by his father, Charles, who's up in the gallery behind me. Charles. There he is. So, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to have a warm welcome for Joshua here, today, with me. Thank you."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Barbara Hernandez, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Hernandez, B.: "A point of personal privilege."

Speaker Harris: "Please proceed."

Hernandez, B.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to welcome my intern in from Aurora, Haley Edwards. She is a master's student right now and getting her master's in public administration. So, I just want to welcome her. She's up in the gallery."

Speaker Harris: "Welcome all to your State Capitol. Mr. Clerk,
Committee Reports."

Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Hurley, Chairperson from the Committee on Human Services reports the following committee action taken on October 28, 2019: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment(s) 1 to House Bill 1300. Representative Ford, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-Higher Education reports the following committee action taken on October 29, 2019: do pass as amended Short Debate is House Bill 3904. Representative Gabel,

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-Human Services reports the following committee action taken on October 29, 2019: do pass as amended Short Debate is Senate Bill 115. Representative Zalewski, Chairperson from the Committee on Revenue & Finance reports the following committee action taken on October 29, 2019: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 119, do pass as amended Short Debate is House Bill 3902; Senate Bill 1042; recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment(s) 1 to House Bill 961, Floor Amendment(s) 1 to Senate Bill 1909. Representative Evans, Chairperson from the Committee on Labor & Commerce reports the following committee action taken on October 29, 2019: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment(s) 1 to House Bill Representative Feigenholtz, Chairperson from the Committee on Adoption & Child Welfare reports the following committee action taken on October 29, 2019: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment(s) 1 to House Bill 392, Floor Amendment(s) 2 to Senate Bill 1797. Representative D'Amico, Chairperson from the Committee on Transportation: Vehicles & Safety reports the following committee action taken on October 29, 2019: recommends be adopted is Motion to Concur is Senate Amendment(s) 1 to House Bill 188."

Speaker Harris: "So, Members of the House, we are going to proceed to the Order of Second Readings. Members, if you have a Bill on Second Reading, please be prepared. If there is an Amendment to adopt, we will be adopting the Amendments on Second Reading. If the Bill is eligible to be moved to Third Reading, it will be moved and voted on today. We are going to try to move through these things quickly 'cause we have quite

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

a number of item on the Calendar, so please follow along beginning on page 2. On page 2 of the Calendar, there appears House Bill 597, Representative Ramirez. Representative Ramirez. Mr. Clerk, out of the record. On page two of the Calendar, House Bill 744, Stuart. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 744, a Bill for an Act concerning education. This Bill was a read a second time a previous day.

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

Speaker Harris: "Representative Stuart on the Amendment."

Stuart: "The Amendment is just a technical Amendment that changes a reporting time for the AIM HIGH Scholarship to match the academic calendar instead of the fiscal year calendar."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Stuart moves the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 744. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. 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 Harris: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 744, a Bill for an Act concerning

education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Stuart."

Stuart: "I think I just explained it very briefly, but I'll say it again. For the AIM HIGH Scholarship that we created to encourage more of our Illinois student to attend our schools, we put in the language that the reporting was based on the fiscal year, but since it's an academic institution, it makes

67th Legislative Day

- sense to switch that to the academic year. That's all this Amendment does."
- Speaker Harris: "Representative Bristow, do you wish to speak on this piece of legislation? No. There being no further debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 744 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Didech. Halbrook. West. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. With a vote of 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present', this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 2 of the Calendar, appears House Bill 745, Mr. Zalewski. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 745, a Bill for an Act concerning education. This Bill was read a second time a previous day.

  No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Zalewski, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Harris: "Representative Zalewski on the Amendment."
- Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On the Amendment, we wish to adopt it. It becomes the Bill in-chief with respect to privacy concerns on student loans applications, so I ask for its adoption on Second and move to Third."
- Speaker Harris: "Representative moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 745. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. 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."

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

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

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 745, a Bill for an Act concerning

education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 745 is an initiative of the Illinois Student Assistance Commission. It brings certain student loan applications and things into compliance with the disclosure laws that protect student privacy. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Batinick."

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

Zalewski: "Yes."

Speaker Harris: "He indicates he'll yield."

Batinick: "Representative, what was the vote in committee on this

Bill? The Amendment?"

Zalewski: "Leave. It got leave."

Batinick: "You got leave on it. And basically, what we're doing here is we're basically just keeping private... student information private and exempting it from FOIA, correct?"

Zalewski: "From FOIA, correct. My understanding is some applications for student aid already have these protections, and we're just making it uniform across the board."

Batinick: "Appreciate the clarification."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Skillicorn."

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

Speaker Harris: "He indicates he'll yield."

Skillicorn: "Representative, quickly on exemption of the FOIA. Do parents have the ability to FOIA their own student's

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

information so they know if they're denied or not denied and why?"

Zalewski: "So... my staff informs me, Allen, that... that instance where you'd FOIA, in this particular moment, wouldn't quite work because it's just a binary classification of whether you got the application... or you got the aid or you didn't. There's no subjective criteria that a parent could use via the FOIA."

Skillicorn: "Is there requirement to inform an applicant that they've received the application?"

Zalewski: "Is there a..."

Skillicorn: "A requirement. Let's say it gets lost in the mail and the applicant doesn't know. Is there a way that... is there a requirement to inform them?"

Zalewski: "I don't know that."

Skillicorn: "Okay. Would you be open to something like that down the road?"

Zalewski: "Yeah. If you came to me and said down the road that you wanted some sort of notice provision, we could revisit this statue at a later date."

Skillicorn: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Harris: "Being no further questions, Mr. Zalewski, do you wish to close?"

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

Speaker Harris: "Question is, 'Shall House Bill 745 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Unes. Walsh. Windhorst. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a vote of 91 voting 'yes', 24 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 745, having

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Bristow, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Bristow: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Harris: "Please proceed."

Bristow: "On behalf of Representative Jennifer Gong-Gershowitz,

Terra Costa-Howard, and myself, we have a group of young folks

from the organization We Will and I'd like to introduce them

very briefly. We have Lexie Boyd, Milani Flores, Izzy Boyd,

Angela Gerbeski, Anna Gerbeski, and Austin Major. Would you

please give them a warm Springfield welcome?"

Speaker Harris: "On page 2 of Calendar, appears House Bill 1271,
Representative Zalewski. Out of the record. I'm sorry. We'll
get back to Representative... I missed Representative Moeller.
Representative Moeller, on House Bill 1269. Representative
Moeller. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1269, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. This Bill was read a second time a previous day.

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

Speaker Harris: "Representative Moeller on the Amendment."

Moeller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Amendment... House Floor Amendment #1 to Senate... House Bill 1269 makes a small change in the medical license renewal fee. It equalizes the fee for physicians, whether they are in-state or out-of-state residents. Currently, out-of-state physicians are charged a higher fee. This is an initiative of the Department of Professional and Financial Regulation. There was no

67th Legislative Day

- opposition to this Bill, and I would be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Harris: "Seeing no questions, do you wish to close? It's on the... it's on the Amendments, so I'm sorry"
- Moeller: "Yes. I ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Harris: "All those in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And House Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 1269 is adopted. Third Reading. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1269, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Harris: "Representative Moeller on the Bill."
- Moeller: "I explained the substance of the Amendment and the Bill. Would ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Harris: "Being no questions, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 1269 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Davis. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On the vote of 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 1269 is declared passed. On page 2 of the Calendar, appears House Bill 1271. Back to Representative Zalewski, 1271."
- Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #1 becomes the Bill. It's a technical change in the Liquor Code adding the word 'craft' to the fee structure. I ask for its adoption."
- Speaker Harris: "All those... seeing no discussion, all those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #1 to

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

House Bill 1271 is adopted. Third Reading. Mr... are there any further Amendments?"

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

Speaker Harris: "Third Reading. Mr. Zalewski. I'm sorry. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1271, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Harris: "Mr. Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I ask for the Bill's passage. It simply changes the fee structure for craft distilling. This was an oversight in the spring on my part, so we're going to fix it and make sure the fees are commiserate with what the Legislator intended."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Wheeler."

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

Speaker Harris: "He indicates he'll yield."

Wheeler: "Mike, we talked about this yesterday in committee. I want to make sure everybody on my side of the aisle understands, it's a little different than what our analysis may state regarding the… a fee increase. This is not a fee increase, correct?"

Zalewski: "Not a fee increase."

Wheeler: "This essentially..."

Zalewski: "If the existing law were to be implemented by the Liquor Control Commission, their fees would go up. This actually reduces the fees."

67th Legislative Day

- Wheeler: "It reduces them right now because the part that got missed in the drafting actually increased their fees inadvertently. Is that accurate?"
- Zalewski: "Correct. By absence of the word 'craft', it increased their fees."
- Wheeler: "Perfect. I want to make sure everyone knows this is not a fee increase. Thank you, Mike."
- Zalewski: "Thank you, Keith."
- Speaker Harris: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 1271 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'nay'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a vote of 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 1271, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 4 of the Calendar, appears Senate Bill 1784, Representative Hoffman. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1784, a Bill for an Act concerning government. This Bill was read a second time a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 1 and 2 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Hoffman."
- Speaker Harris: "Representative Hoffman on the Amendment."
- Hoffman: "Okay. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #1 is the substance of the Bill, and then Floor Amendment #2 is a technical revision. I would ask that we adopt the Floor Amendments, and then discuss this and debate it on Third Reading."

67th Legislative Day

- Speaker Harris: "Representative Hoffman moves adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1784. All those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Hoffman and has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Harris: "Representative Hoffman on the Amendment."
- Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I previously indicated, this is a technical Amendment. I ask it be adopted and we debate the Bill on Third Reading."
- Speaker Harris: "Representative Hoffman moves the adoption of Floor Amendment #2. All those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'nay'. 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 Harris: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1784, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Harris: "Representative Hoffman."
- Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is what I would call the post-Janus piece of legislation. It is a response to the U.S. Supreme Court's 2018 ruling in the Janus Case, which overturned 40 years of settled collective bargaining law. Basically, the provisions of this Bill can be divided into 3 categories. Number 1, it protects employees' personal information and would prohibit the disclosure to third parties of personal information

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

regarding employees. And it would ensure that if you authorize voluntary payroll deductions to unions or organizations or other voluntary associations, it would prohibit public disclosures of information regarding the employee. Secondly, it would affirm collective bargaining rights and would clarify and codify rights to the benefit and protection of collective bargaining. It'd require employers to provide collective bargaining representatives with up-todate information on the bargaining unit employees. It would ensure that bargaining representatives have the right to meet with new bargaining unit employees and to communicate through worksite channels with all representative employees. It would codify the criteria for establishing what constitutes supervisory or managerial employees for collective bargaining purposes based on actual job duties, rather than job titles and unsupportive designations. And then finally, the third broad category is clarifying dues deduction procedures. And it would simply allow authorization of dues deductions by written or electronic means, allow employees to voluntarily..."

Speaker Harris: "Excuse me, Representative. Members, it's an important Bill. Could you please take conversations to the rear of the chamber?"

Hoffman: "Again, the third broad category regarding this Bill. It would clarify dues deduction procedures of employees by allowing the authorization of dues deduction by written or electronic means, would allow employees to voluntarily agree to reasonable limits, and would be in accordance with established Federal Law and long established practices in the private sector. And it would reaffirm that dues and fair share

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

fees collection procedures in effect prior to the Janus Decision were consistent with the pre-Janus established law and would limit retroactive liability for employees and collective bargaining representatives. It would also ensure that this legislation is a tenet to allow the information regarding membership information to be shared with labor unions and organizations representing members of the fund, including organizations representing retirees."

Speaker Harris: "Mr. Batinick."

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

Speaker Harris: "He indicates he'll yield."

Batinick: "Representative, I probably heard about four to five percent of what you said there, so I'm sorry if I'm going to go through... go through some stuff. And if we can get our Members to quiet down a little bit, that'd be swell. Can you talk about who is opposed to this Bill right now?"

Hoffman: "I think the Municipal League and the School Management Alliance may have had some concerns. They've not reached out to me, and according to staff, they have not indicated that they were opposed to them. They may have filed slips that we went through committee during the spring Veto Session. To be quite honest, I don't recall which slips were filed."

Batinick: "Okay. We show the Illinois Chamber and Chicago Public Schools in opposition as well. That..."

Hoffman: "That could be correct. Okay. I'm not disputing it. I just don't recall the slips that were filed in the spring."

Batinick: "All right. I'm trying to go through the Bill here because I couldn't hear everything, all your explanations.

Let's talk about some of the things that this actually does.

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

Tell me what this does regarding union access during work hours. Does that address that in any sort of way?"

- Hoffman: "What this in... what this would indicate is that you could have access, but what has to happen is the access provisions are drafted to ensure that the exclusive representative can contact and work with the employees and then with the employer to address workplace issues in a timely and effective way. That is in the best interest of government and both membership of... in... membership in the union and dues paid are entirely voluntary. However, we want to make sure that access is only granted when the union representative needs to discuss a grievance or workplace related complaints, so this would be a very rare occurrence, I believe."
- Batinick: "Okay. So, the way I read it here on page 13, 'the right to conduct worksite meetings during lunch and other non-work breaks, and before and after the workday, on the employer's premises to discuss collective bargaining negotiations, the administration of collective bargaining agreements, and matters related to the duties of the exclusive representative.' So, during the regular workday, the union now has access to the employee to discuss those matters. Seems a little bit more broad than what you stated there."
- Hoffman: "Right. And I... it's also to ensure and will not impede normal operations. So, the access show at all times be conducted in a manner so as not to impede normal operations."
- Batinick: "Okay. I guess I'm unsure... don't impede normal operations when it's during the workday. Tell me about the fair share forfeiting. What provision is in there? There's a section about forfeiting their fair share. And understand,

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

Representative, I just want to fare it out, the main points and anything you can do to help me with that would be great. Back pay on the fair share."

Hoffman: "I... it is not a forfeiting of fair share. It's... so, the Attorney General is currently litigating cases in the Seventh Circuit. And what this is doing is it says that the District Court in a federal case have ruled that the union organization did not have to pay back those fees. Nevertheless, this is a federal case, and rather than spend the money to litigate a state case, this indicates that they would not have to pay back under State Law either."

Batinick: "Okay. So, I'm reading something here. There's a one year revocable payment... irrevocable payment. How does that... how does that survive Janus? How does that survive the Janus decision? That's the best look I've ever seen a staffer give me by the way."

Hoffman: "Are you... are... what I'm try... I... we may be mixing up."

Batinick: "We may be."

Hoffman: "So, it's my understanding that if you want to opt-out or you don't want to be a part of payment to the... of your dues, that every year can come up for review or you can negotiate a longer time period."

Batinick: "So, for a year, whatever you decide, you're in that for a year. You... you've made... somebody can't make the decision... it's... so... it sounds like it's like an open enrollment period. So, whatever you decide, you've got a year and you're stuck with that decision for a year."

Hoffman: "That'd be fair."

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

- Batinick: "Good answer. Any... you probably spoke for about two to three minutes. Can you hit some of the main points that haven't asked questions on yet, Representative?"
- Hoffman: "Yes. As I indicated, there are three main provisions in this Bill. One would be the protecting of employees' personal information. It indicates what personal information can and cannot be disclosed. And basically, it ensures that the privacy of employees is paramount. It would also affirm collective bargaining rights and that would require employers to provide collective bargaining representation with representatives with up-to-date information on bargaining unit employees, including their current contact information. As you know, under post-Janus, you have to represent these employees no matter what, so the bargaining representative needs to know the information in order to contact them."
- Batinick: "Okay. So... that's... it's a great point. I'm sorry for interrupting you. But in an effort to speed this up, so when there's a new employee, that information gets sent to the union so that we can have... they can have a conversation about everything. That's kind of the mandatory set-up now, right?"

Hoffman: "Yes."

- Batinick: "Okay. Okay. We'll skip that point. What was the third point that is the main part of the Bill?"
- Hoffman: "We would clarify the dues deduction procedure. It would allow and authorize the dues deduction be in writing or by electronic means. It would also allow the employees to voluntarily agree to reasonable limits on the revocation of such authorization. We talked about the one-year issue, and you could negotiate with the bargaining unit a longer period

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

of time and reaffirm that the dues and fair share fee collection procedure, which we discussed, and that the pre-Janus established law would limit the retroactive liability for employees and collective bargaining representatives."

Batinick: "Okay. Thank you, Representative, for answering all my questions. I'm sure we'll have some people on my side of the aisle, on both sides. I'm going to listen to the rest of the debate. Thank you."

Hoffman: "Thank you."

Speaker Harris: "And to that point, Representative, there are a number of people who wish to speak. Even though this is on the Order of Short Debate, we will allow those who want to speak an opportunity to ask questions, but we'll be going to a five minute timer. But we will get to everyone. Representative Wheeler is recognized."

Wheeler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Harris: "He indicates he'll yield."

Wheeler: "Thank you. Jay, I'm looking at our analysis on this Bill regarding Amendment 1, and there's a section in here I want to ask you about and how it's going to work in reality. It says that it provides that the employer shall refer all inquiries about union membership to the exclusive bargaining representative with certain exceptions. Does that mean that the employee cannot ask the employer about the impact of staying in the union or withdrawing from the union as what it would have an impact their personal paycheck?"

Hoffman: "I think they can ask any questions that they would like, however, the... it will prohibit the employer from coercing the employee into not joining the union."

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

- Wheeler: "Okay, but it says, 'refer all inquiries'. I read that differently than coercing. I mean, if I have a question as a union... or as an employee of the employer, how would this impact my actual take home pay? How would this impact my potential benefit package?"
- Hoffman: "I believe that the whole issue is an attempt to dissuade an individual from joining the union. Those inquiries should be... those type of inquiries should be given to the bargaining unit."
- Wheeler: "I understand that intent. I'm just looking if the words match that intent. And then it says, with certain exceptions.

  Can you describe those exceptions to me, please?"
- Hoffman: "Representative, it would help... is... do you know the page of the Bill that you're looking at? The page of the Bill? And if you don't, we can find it."
- Wheeler: "Let me get that for you. Just one second, if you don't mind. Give me a second. We're still looking at that right now, we're going to get that to you in just a second here."

Hoffman: "Yeah. Could we ... could we go to the next question?"

Wheeler: "Yes, Sir."

Hoffman: "And we're still looking as well."

- Wheeler: "Yeah. We had one question about whether this could or could not violate the Fair Labor Standards Act. Did you have a response to that, if this goes over the line in its restrictions?"
- Hoffman: "No, I believe that this is in compliance with the Fair Labor Standards Act."
- Wheeler: "All right. Jay, we'll need to get back to you on that...
  on that question... that's the question line... the question I

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

want to work on with you, but let me see if somebody yields me time once we find this. We can continue the debate without this, okay?

Hoffman: "Thank you."

Wheeler: "Thank you."

Speaker Harris: "Should we move on to Representative Skillicorn and come back to you, Representative? Representative Skillicorn for five minutes."

Skillicorn: "Thank you for your patience, Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Harris: "He indicates he'll yield."

Skillicorn: "Representative, just a couple questions here. In the opening remarks, there was this quote, 'shall not impede normal operations'. Can I get a definition of that?"

Hoffman: "Well the ... I would say that... what I would view it as is normal work operations, whatever the duties of the employee are, that you couldn't impede the normal operations of them carrying out those duties."

Skillicorn: "Okay. Thank you. So, I just want to get a feeling of what that looks like. I understand that someone can come into work, punch in, and instead of doing their normal job, they could be meeting with their... their rep or whatever. Is there a time limit to that? I mean, is it just an hour?"

Hoffman: "Well, it's my understanding, access would be granted when the union representatives needs to discuss a grievance or workplace-related complaint, so this would be a rare occurrence. The intent is to prohibit an employer from denying a union representative access to an employee when a timesensitive manner, such as a grievance, is being investigated.

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

Yet, in quotation marks, it says, 'This access shall at all times be conducted in a manner so as not to impede normal operations.' I think that speaks for itself."

Skillicorn: "Okay. And we can all, you know, agree what access sounds like, but that... does that mean that they might set aside two hours of the work day to talk to their rep?"

Hoffman: "Well, I would say..."

Skillicorn: "Or would it be four hours? Or would it be the full day?"

Hoffman: "I believe, if I remember correctly in committee, there were some questions asked about, for instance, a teacher was in a classroom. So, that teacher has time for preparation when they're preparing for classes and not in the classroom. There's lunch and there's after work or before work. So, I don't believe that, unless it's absolutely essential, that the union representative would be able to engage unless it is time-sensitive and is such as a grievance or there's other type of investigation."

Skillicorn: "I just want to make sure the intent is clear that we're not talking about taking someone out of the classroom, a valuable classroom time. Let's go on. There was a mention about the retroactivity this addresses. Are you familiar there's court case going on right now? I mean, what happens if the courts, you know, they rule one way or the other on this?"

Hoffman: "So, it's my understanding that that is a federal action.

That is before the Seventh Circuit. The... actually, the lower court, the District Court, ruled that they didn't have to... have to pay back. This would simply address state actions."

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

Skillicorn: "And then... one more question about, specifically, the opt-out. Basically, there's this 12 month period. Does that mean that if someone opted out has to do it every year?"

Hoffman: "Yeah. So, no. It's my understanding, the way the process works, is you actually opt-in for payment and then you have certain time periods, a year later or longer, if there's an agreement collectively bargained where you could opt-out. I... if you... if you haven't opted-in and you've opted-out, then it's my understanding that you would remain opted-out."

Skillicorn: "Okay. Thank you. So, there's just a couple things that I want to comment to the Bill. Essentially, the... this came up in debate already, that you're stuck with this decision for a year and that's something that I'm concerned about. And effectively, we're talking about people's civil rights and this is a civil right not to have a third party extract dues from your paycheck. And this is significant. People, the Supreme Court has ruled that we have civil rights. The Supreme Court has ruled that you do not have to have a third party subtract dues from your paycheck if you do not like. And that's something that is precious and it's something that we protect, so I'm urging a 'no' vote on this."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Mazzochi for five minutes."

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

Speaker Harris: "Indicates he'll yield."

Mazzochi: "So, the first question I have is on page 10, Section (c), line 12. You start off by saying that the employer has to disclose certain information to the collective... to the exclusive bargaining representative, which I understand the rationale for trying to do that for compliance under Janus.

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

But then in (c-5), some of that same information that you say must be disclosed, you then say, 'No employer shall disclose the following information of any employee.' So, that would seem to negate the very thing you're trying to allow the disclosure of in (c-5). How do you reconcile that?"

Hoffman: "Well, I think you're talking about two different types of disclosure. One is to the union representative and the other is to prohibit disclosure to an outside third party."

Mazzochi: "Right, but (c-5) isn't drafted that way. So, the whole point is, is that (c-5) by... it just says, 'No employer shall disclose the following information of any employee', full stop. You didn't say, except for a collective bargaining representative or employee to a member of the public. That's a problem. And the other reason why it's going to become a further problem is that, as you start going on, you've given the employee a right to litigate these types of issues or an improper disclosure in Circuit Court. But you now... you've made it a statutory prohibition about disclosure. So, how are you... how is somebody in litigation supposed to actually get this information if... in an Illinois Court if our Illinois statute has basically prohibit turning it over? You can't even get the discovery and evidence you're going to need to litigate your case."

Hoffman: "So, the... two things. I think you're misreading the law or the Bill as it is written. The first is the disclosure to the union representative so they can conduct the representation that is required pre-Janus and post-Janus. The second is regarding to disclosure under things like the Freedom of Information Act, where it would prohibit this

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

sensitive employee information from being disclosed so that it could... it would not allow organizations to send certain things to the employees and it would protect the safety of the employees."

Mazzochi: "Yeah, but I understand that you're trying to say carve it out of FOIA. But then on line 12, on page 12, you then say, 'This subsection does not apply to disclosures required under the Freedom of Information Act.' So, that's why I'm really concerned because, you know, some of this stuff which I actually agree with philosophically, the way in which the language is drafted, it's self-contradictory, and I don't understand how you're going to be able to apply it effectively. But, you know, that ... be that aside ... and if you can try to correct that through Amendment to make that clear, I would appreciate it. The other question though is, how are you going to survive the Janus standard that says the First Amendment does not permit the government to compel a person to pay for another party's speech in view of your irrevocable payment system that you have set up here? Because the hypothetical that I'm thinking about is, let's assume an employee is perfectly happy to join a union, and then maybe the employee decides I want to switch to a different collective bargaining unit. Or maybe the employee says, you know what? I don't want to be a member of this union at all because the union has now taken a political stance I disagree with. As I understand how you've written this, you've now made it impossible for the employee to get any of the further dollars subsidizing this speech back for the ... at least a year. And I don't understand how that can comply with Janus. I... if

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

you had a pro rata provision, I think it might be more liking to pass constitutional muster but how are you going be... I don't know that you can necessarily lock people in to the full one year without running a fowl of Janus."

- Hoffman: "I think that several other states have done it already and it has passed judicial review. I believe this is consistent with the Janus decision."
- Mazzochi: "Right. How... yeah... but how can it be though when the whole point of the Janus decision was to say employees need to have a right to opt-out without subsidizing? If you're... if a union makes a decision that the employee now says, I wish to opt-out and not associate, if you keep all the money, how do you make it consistent with Janus? And if you've got a case citation, I'm happy to have it, but I don't know that you can keep it... I don't know that you can keep it consistent."
- Hoffman: "So, there is provisions in the Bill that allows an employee to opt-out. There are provisions in the Bill regarding the timing of doing that."
- Mazzochi: "Right, and you've made it for a full year of dues, so that's the problem. So, if on January 1 the employee pays the dues, the union takes a political position, the employee disagrees with, say in a primary in March...

Speaker Harris: "Excuse me. Excuse me, Representative..."

Mazzochi: "...the employee says, I no longer wish to associate. Then the employee is now subsidizing the speech that it ... "

Speaker Harris: "Excuse me, Representative Mazzochi."

Mazzochi: "Yeah, I..."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Wehrli."

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

Mazzochi: "That's fine."

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

Speaker Harris: "We'll give her five... your five minutes."

Mazzochi: "Thank you. So, I... so that's the problem is that... and maybe the union takes the decision on January 15. So, by having that one year irrevocable period without a pro rata time period, how is this not going to then fall under Janus?"

Hoffman: "I believe this is consistent with the Janus decision."

Mazzochi: "Based on what?"

Hoffman: "Based on the provisions that are contained in this Bill."

"Well, that's really vaque. I mean, is there a case Mazzochi: statute? Because to me what you're basically doing, is you're not complying with Janus, because Janus specifically says you got to allow employees to not subsidize the speech they disagree with. I think if you were at 30 days, it could probably pass. I think if it passed muster from an administrative perspective, I think if it was on a pro rata basis, it could probably survive. But to say that once the employee opts-in, for 1 full year, no matter what position they take, they're stuck with subsidizing this speech. That's going to run a fowl under Janus. Again, if there's a case you can cite to me, I'm happy to go read it. But if you don't have that, you're setting this up for failure and I don't think that's what you want to do. I really would not like to see this subjected to further legal challenge if it can be easily avoided that way. Can... do you have an answer?"

Hoffman: "I didn't... I missed the question."

67th Legislative Day

- Mazzochi: "The question is, is... do you have a case that you can cite to me that suggest that locking an employee in for a full one year period after payment, even if the employee would like to opt back out 2 days later, 10 days later? Is there anything that says that's going to survive as opposed to if you had... you can get a pro rata share of the rest of the dues back? Because otherwise, you fall under the subsidizing trap of Janus."
- Hoffman: "That is a question, and I don't have a case to cite you."
- Mazzochi: "Okay. So, then why... so then, we really don't know if this is going to be able to survive any future court challenge. And I would just urge that if you want this to survive a future court challenge, having a pro rata provision or at the very least, you know, some way to say that you've got a 30 day window or within a political decision being made to change your mind. You're falling back into the same thing that Janus said you can't do. And I'm concerned about that. Are you willing to at least try to make that change, maybe in a trailer Bill?"
- Hoffman: "It's my belief, Representative, that this is consistent with the Janus decision. Because of administrative functions and other things, you can't allow people to constantly optin and opt-out. This is a reasonable time period, that I believe, that you will have the opportunity to opt-out of payments."
- Mazzochi: "One... but yeah... but you're saying... just to be clear, you're saying that if someone signs up on January 1 and they decide, for example, the union is not representing me

67th Legislative Day

- effectively, I'd rather join another union. They don't get to get their dues back. They can't transfer the dues. That one union gets to keep all their money for the next three hundred and sixty plus days. There's no way of getting any pro rata share of that back."
- Hoffman: "This Bill provides for a time period where they could opt-out. You don't like the time period, I get it. I believe it's reasonable, and it's consistent with Janus."
- Mazzochi: "Right, but if you're saying I charge the dues annually and then your decision is irrevocable for a full year, then that's not a practical opt-out after you've joined for that year. So, you really are limiting somebody's ability to join one bargaining unit or another for just... once the decision is made, you've effectively, as I understand this, made it irrevocable. And that's dangerous under Janus. You're likely to make this fall if it does."
- Hoffman: "I understand your point. You've made it several times.

  I simply disagree. I believe this is consistent with the Janus decision."
- Mazzochi: "Right. And I keep asking you to explain to me why you think it's consistent and you keep saying the conclusion but not giving me the reason."
- Hoffman: "I think I have on several occasions."
- Mazzochi: "No. You can't cite me a case. You can't cite me any interpretation on it. You know, I just think that you're setting this up for failure. And for this Bill to have to have come this far, that's really a pity."
- Hoffman: "So, I assume you're in favor of the rest of the provisions of the Bill."

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

Mazzochi: "There are some provisions in the Bill that I'd be in favor of if they weren't internally inconsistent on the disclosure parts, I actually would be. I'd love to fix them."

Speaker Harris: "Representative, your time has expired.

Representative Reick."

Reick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would yield my time to Representative Wheeler, please."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Wheeler."

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

Speaker Harris: "He indicates he'll yield."

Hoffman: "Yes."

Wheeler: "Jay, I've got the page number. It's page 29."

Hoffman: "I found it."

Wheeler: "Line number 13 is where it begins. You found it, too?"

Hoffman: "Yes."

Wheeler: "Good work. Appreciate it. So, I'll just read this very quickly. 'The employer shall refer all inquiries about union membership to the exclusive bargaining representatives, except that the employer may communicate with employees regarding payroll processes and procedures.' My question is, if I am an employee, and I asked the employer if I participate in union membership, how does it affect my take home pay? And I..."

Hoffman: "I think that the… that section… subsection (d), you need to read it in its entirety. And in its entirety, it indicates that employers shall not discourage public employees or applicants to be public employees from becoming a remaining union members or authorizing dues deductions. So, I think that is a crux of this section."

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

Wheeler: "No, I understand. I just... I'm looking at... go ahead."

Hoffman: "And then there is... there is an exception. Where you read, as it indicates except that the employer may communicate with the employees regarding payroll processes and procedures."

Wheeler: "Right. I just..."

Hoffman: "But they cannot discourage a public employee from becoming or remaining a member of the union."

Wheeler: "I understand. I'm just... I'm trying to point out to you I think that while the intent is clear by the first sentence, the second sentence undermines a real life situation that could occur where I would want to know the answer to that question. How much would it impact my actual take home pay based on my deductions, based on my choice of benefits, other things along those lines? Something that the exclusive bargaining representative really wouldn't have the ability to answer. And I just don't want to see an employer be dinged in this case for something that they're just trying to help the employee with, but they're violating the terms of the second past sentence there. I just read that that way and I'm concerned about that. So, but this way then. It's not your intent to restrict employers from answering questions about what their employees' take home pay would be if they were to ask a question about whether union membership would affect or not affect that."

Hoffman: "That's... I'm sorry. You were talking and I started to answer. I apologize."

Wheeler: "Well..."

Hoffman: "But, no, that is not my intent."

67th Legislative Day

- Wheeler: "I was just trying to narrow it down to that part of the question, 'cause that's a real life thing. I want to ask the question, hey, how does this effect my family's income? I want to know the answer to that question because that's my responsibility. So, I think that would be a fair thing someone to ask an employer. I don't want an employer to be in... violating the laws we set forth today by asking that question and actually answering it for the employee."
- Hoffman: "But the inquiry, it indicates that refer inquiries about union membership."
- Wheeler: "Right, but would membership..."
- Hoffman: "About Union Membership. So, if I asked... If I'm an employee and I asked the public employer, how much do I make a year? That's not an inquiry about union membership."
- Wheeler: "Okay, but there's more than that because, in my opinion...

  I guess in my experience, you can choose different parts of different elements by being in the union, it's not just always, you know, two percent of my wages are going to go toward my dues. There could be other elements that you involved by choosing something, union options that may be offered. How's that work within the deductions I have based on the number of dependents I have? There's questions like that that I want to know the specific... I can budget my money, account, what it would take. I don't know."
- Hoffman: "So, I think... the way I view that, those are processes and procedures that you can ask your employer about and that don't have to do with union membership and is not discouraging public employees or applicants from being part of the union."

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

Wheeler: "Not arguing that part of it at all. I just think that the second sentence is to too restrictive. I think that some folks might look at it as a, almost like a free speech or start of a breakdown in the communications between the employer and the employee. Jay, I always appreciate the answers to the questions that I have for you in these debates. I know our staffs have worked hard in getting these things right for us. I'll go to the Bill at this point. Ladies and Gentlemen, I understand that... this Sponsor's intent, but again, we vote on the actual language that's in the Bill. I think this could be easily fixed. I think that it should be fixed. In this point, I won't be able to support the Bill as it currently stands but look forward to fixing it with many of the trailer Bills we get to do in this place based on language that isn't quite ready for prime time. Thank you."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Welter."

Welter: "Mr. Speaker, I yield my time to Representative Batinick."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Batinick."

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

Speaker Harris: "He indicates he'll yield."

Batinick: "I guarantee I won't be five minutes. Quick question 'cause you hit something there with Representative Wheeler. You said in that section that the employer can't talk about union membership, but can they clarify union dues cost? That's what he was trying to get at."

Hoffman: "I believe that would be payrolls, procedures, and precedent... or processes and that is an exception."

Batinick: "Okay. So, what you're saying then is for the intent...

for legislative intent, is that the... and I understand this,

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

the employer can't encourage or discourage union membership, however, they can say how much it costs."

Hoffman: "They cannot. Did you say cannot? Okay."

Batinick: "Right. Right. I agree with you. Right. Right. They cannot do that, nor should they. However, the employer can... if somebody goes to them and say, well, how much should my union dues cost? They can say exactly what it is and explain it to them. Because the way you read that sentence, that's part of what you read."

Hoffman: "Yes."

Batinick: "Okay. That's clarification I wanted. Thank you."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Wilhour."

Wilhour: "Yeah. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Harris: "He indicates he'll yield."

Wilhour: "Representative Hoffman, what if I, as an employee, am absolutely opposed to the union or the outside party getting my personal information? What if I am absolutely opposed to that?"

Hoffman: "So, here's the issue... I apologize, I do my best. Sometimes I have to ask assistance. But... and right now, my legal staff here is correct. Because under Janus, they indicate that there is an absolute duty, regardless of whether fair share is paid or not, regardless of whether union dues are paid or not, there's an absolute duty on behalf of the union organization to represent those employees. Whether it's on a grievance or whether it's on collective bargaining. If you don't have that information, you cannot comply with Janus."

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

- Wilhour: "What if I took this job and I made expressly clear upon taking the job that I didn't want my personal information to be given to a third party? Do I have no right to privacy on that?"
- Hoffman: "It doesn't matter because of the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court laid the duty on the union organization to continue to represent that induvial."
- Wilhour: "Fair enough. To the Bill. You know, any American citizen should never be put in a position where they are forced to give up their personal information to a outside party that is expressly against their will. I would encourage a 'no' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Welch."

Welch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a few questions for the Sponsor. Thank you. Mr. Sponsor, thank you for bringing this Bill. I got a few questions for legislative intent purposes if you don't mind."

Hoffman: "Yes."

- Welch: "Why does the Bill refer to the Electronic Commerce Security Act in the amended Section 6(f) of the IPLRA, in the new Section 11.1, of the IELRA?"
- Hoffman: "Well, the General Assembly intends to remove any doubt regarding the validity of electronic signatures, reduce deduction authorization under Illinois Law by incorporating the definitions of electronic signatures already contained in the Electronic Commerce Security Act directly into the IPLRA and the IELRA."

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

Welch: "Why does the Bill require that cases involving allegations that a union unlawfully collected dues be brought exclusively before the Labor Relations Board?"

Hoffman: "Because the General Assembly, we believe, that will be far more efficient to have such claims heard by one administrative agency, was a expertise in labor relations, than in Circuit Courts all over the state. In addition, the administrative process used by the labor boards is much simpler than the process followed by the parties and the lawsuit. Both of these factors made the labor boards much more efficient than the courts for these types of cases resulting in savings to employers, labor organizations, as well as employees."

Welch: "How soon will the requirements of the Act take effect?"

Hoffman: "The Act will be effective when signed by the Governor.

Employers with labor organizations must then take the steps needed to bring their operation into compliance with the Acts with respect, for example, to the disclosure of information to exclusive bargaining representatives, the restrictions on disclosure of employee information to outside third parties, the provisions on the union access to employees, and the provisions on dues deductions. As stated in the provisions, with respect to certain specific topics, the requirements in this Bill cannot be changed. Where a modification is permitted, however, a provision can only be modified if there is a mutual agreement to the modification by the labor organization, as well as the employer."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Thapedi."

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

Thapedi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to yield the balance of my time to Representative Welch."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Welch, please proceed."

Welch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Does the Act apply retroactively?" "We intend... the General Assembly intends that the Hoffman: provisions, regarding dues deductions, apply retroactively to the extent provided by law. In the wake of the Janus decision, dozens of lawsuits have been brought both in Illinois and around the country. These are seeking to recover fair share fees or dues paid before the Super Court issued the Janus decision. Thus far, the Federal Courts have rejected these claims, holding that unions acted in good faith based upon existing law. The Federal Courts have, however, remanded claims based on State Law to State Courts. The General Assembly believes that the causes of action for the refund of fair share fees or dues have no basis in Illinois Law and that a similar good faith defense exist under State Law as well. The provisions of the Bill will serve to eliminate unjustified and costly litigation involving both public employers and labor organizations, both because they will bar lawsuits and because any such claims will have to be brought before the labor boards."

Welch: "The prohibition against employers disclosing information to an entity other than a labor organization provides an exception if the disclosure is required for purposes of conducting public operations or business. My understanding is that an example that was discussed during the drafting of this Bill, was that an insurance company with whom the employer has contracted to provide health insurance to

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

employees, might need to have this kind of information. That makes sense to me, but is the exception for conducting public operations or business intended to be narrowly construed?"

Hoffman: "Employers should not be able to circumvent the main purpose of the Amendments in this Bill with broad claims that the disclosure of information is to conduct public operations or businesses."

Welch: "Does this Bill clarify that an exclusive representative is permitted to use an employer's email system where there has been mutual agreement between the exclusive representative and the employer or where the employer's policies would otherwise allow you... allow such use?"

Hoffman: "Yes."

Welch: "This Bill prohibits employers from attempting to influence employees' decisions to seek representation, become a union member, and/or authorize dues deduction. Is that correct?"

Hoffman: "Yes. There's overwhelming evidence that employer's attempt to so influence employees as inherently coercive since the employer is understandably perceived as having a great deal of power over its employees. Such power can prevent employees from feeling free to genuinely exercise free choice in deciding whether to exercise their state... their right to join and support a labor organization."

Welch: "Will you add me to this Bill as a Sponsor?"

Hoffman: "I already did."

Welch: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. This is too important. Please vote 'yes'."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Hoffman to close."

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

- Hoffman: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. And thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I certainly enjoyed the debate. Let me just indicate that this is an attempt to restore employees' rights and lay out what public employers in Illinois can and cannot do with regard to union representation and an employee joining a union. This does not overturn the Janus decision. This is post-Janus and it would do three things. It would protect employees' personal information, it would affirm collective bargaining rights, and it would clarify dues deduction procedures. I ask for a favorable Roll Call."
- Speaker Harris: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1784 pass?'
  All in favor vote 'aye'; 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, please take the record. With a vote of 93 voting 'aye', 23 voting 'nay', and 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1784, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the bottom of page 2, appears House Bill 1300, Representative Gabel. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1300, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Gabel, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Harris: "Representative Gabel on the Amendment."
- Gabel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to adopt Floor Amendment

  1. This Amendment is a... makes a technical change. It changes
  the effective dates July 1, 2020."
- Speaker Harris: "Representative Gabel has moved the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 1300. All those in favor say

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Motion is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

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

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

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1300, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Gabel."

Gabel: "Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What this Bill does is it just changes the effective date to July 1, 2020 for providing early intervention services for children who are found to have high levels of lead in their blood, who are very young and are not yet showing signs of delay. But we want to get them treated in the early intervention program before it... before these delays are permanent."

Speaker Harris: "Is there any discussions? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 1300 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Gabel. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. With the vote of 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 1300, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 3 of the Calendar, appears House Bill 3888, Representative Mayfield. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3888, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day.

Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments but a balanced budget, correctional, fiscal, Home Rule,

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

- housing, judicial, and other notes have been requested but not filed as this time."
- Speaker Harris: "Representative Mayfield."
- Mayfield: "Hello. I'd like to rule the Bill as inapplicable. I mean that the notes inapplicable on the Bill, and move it to Third."
- Speaker Harris: "Representative Mayfield has moved to rule the notes inapplicable. There any discussion? Representative Demmer. Representative Demmer."
- Demmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to have a recorded vote on ruling the notes inapplicable and take them individually."
- Speaker Harris: "Yes. Mr. Clerk, we'll acknowledge Mr. Demmer's request and we will take each note individually. Mr. Clerk." Clerk Hollman: "The first note is the balanced budget."
- Speaker Harris: "Representative Mayfield has moved that the balanced budget note be held inapplicable. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all in favor say 'aye'... I'm sorry. All of those in favor please vote 'aye'; those in opposed please vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Andrade. DeLuca. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a vote of 66 voting 'yes', 49 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', the balanced budget note is ruled inapplicable. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "The correctional note."
- Speaker Harris: "Representative Mayfield has moved that the correctional note be ruled inapplicable. All those in favor vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Hammonds. DeLuca.

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

Hurley. Stephens. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a vote of 68 voting 'yes', 47 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', the correctional note is ruled inapplicable. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "The fiscal note."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Mayfield has moved that the fiscal note be declared inapplicable. Mr. Demmer."

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

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

Demmer: "Representative Mayfield, I notice as I'm reading though this analysis that the agency, the IEPA, is referenced many, many times, including things that they're required or mandated to do. When we require or mandate a state agency to do something, doesn't that often come with some kind of cost?"

Speaker Harris: "Representative Mayfield."

Mayfield: "Not in this particular case. It is already a part of what they do, so it's no additional cost.

Demmer: "Have they..."

Mayfield: "And they are a proponent of the Bill."

Demmer: "Have they filed a note?"

Mayfield: "So, they are in agreement with what they're doing and they did state that there was no additional cost. So, vote 'yes'."

Demmer: "They could file a note to let us know what the estimated fiscal impact of this Bill is. Have they done so? No, we're ruling..."

Mayfield: "That's not necessary."

Demmer: "...we're ruling that inapplicable."

Mayfield: "It is not necessary. It is not necessary."

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

- Demmer: "It's certainly necessary that this Body understand the costs of legislation to the people of the State of Illinois prior to voting on it. That's the purpose of the Fiscal Note Act."
- Mayfield: "This Bill asks the I... the EPA to do what they've already been charged with doing. It's part of their mission, so the Bill is... I'm sorry, the note is inapplicable. Please vote 'yes'."
- Demmer: "Thank you. And Mr. Speaker, to them to this Motion. I think we all understand that there are a wide variety of notes that can be requested on individual Bills. Certainly, one of the most central is the fiscal note. The fiscal note helps us get information from the state agency, from the very state agency who this will impact, about what the cost is. We might think the cost is justified. Great. We might think it's not justified. Fantastic. But we don't have the information today, and for us to pretend like the note is just inapplicable is really a subversion of the process. I encourage you to vote 'no'."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Butler."

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

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

Butler: "Representative, what would happen if this legislation is enacted to companies like Medline and Advantage? Would they shut down?"

Mayfield: "We can discuss that when the Bill is called. We are focusing on the note right now."

Butler: "Okay. So, if Medline or Advantage would shut down due to this legislation, wouldn't that have a negative fiscal impact

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

- on the State of Illinois, with revenue that would come into the State of Illinois?"
- Mayfield: "We are discussing the note that is before you right now."
- Butler: "Yeah, and it's a fiscal note, correct?"
- Mayfield: "My answer is, no. We're not asking them to shut down and I don't deal in 'ifs'. So, thank you so much and please vote 'yes'."
- Butler: "Well, we do deal with the legislation that's in front of us and this fiscal note has to do with the legislation that's in front of us. And concerns have been raised, in the hearing that you sat in yesterday, about the fact that these companies might close. And that would have a negative impact on the revenue for the State of Illinois, I believe."
- Mayfield: "Where was you concern when the call for Sterigenics to close down?"
- Butler: "So, I do... Representative... Representative, this is... I'm asking the questions here. So, I do believe that the fiscal note is applicable because this would have an impact on the fiscal state of the Illinois. It would a fiscal impact on the agency that oversees this. That's why I would urge people to vote 'no'. Thank you."
- Mayfield: "I'm asking everyone to vote 'yes.' The fiscal note is inapplicable."
- Harris: "Representative Keicher."
- Keicher: "So, help me understand. If we're basically putting a business from failing to operate in the State of Illinois, how that doesn't have a fiscal impact to the State of Illinois."

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

Speaker Harris: "The Representative yields."

Keicher: "Thank you. Appreciate it."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Mayfield."

Mayfield: "Oh, to answer the question, yeah. Let me just be very clear that what we are asking to do today is no different from what we were asking for Sterigenics when all of you stood up in full support of shutting down Sterigenics, when all of you stood up in full support of protecting the lives of women and children in Willowbrook. I'm asking for the same support in my district where children are dying. Maybe that doesn't matter to you but, yes..."

Keicher: "Are we talking about the notes or are we talking about the merits of the Bill?"

Mayfield: "Oh no, I'm talking about the note. I'm getting there.

I'm getting there because your question is in regard to fiscal impact. Well, guess what? A lot of these children in my district are on Medicaid. So, if their... if we don't have to pay for their cancer treatments, if we don't have to pay for all their visits to the doctor, we're going to save some money here. We're going to save a lot of money."

Keicher: "What is the current burden... what is the current burden of the IEPA concerning this facility in your district?"

Mayfield: "Monitoring."

Keicher: "What is the current..."

Mayfield: "And that's all we're asking them to do. We're not asking them to do anything that they're not already charged with doing, which is monitoring. So, that's already been covered. It's already in their current budget. There is nothing additional we're asking them to do but monitor. This

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

Bill... I'm sorry, this fiscal note is inapplicable. You can ask me a thousand times over, I'm going to say the same thing. It is in applicable and you should vote 'yes'. If you don't care about anything else, care about the children that are dying in my district."

Keicher: "To the note. I'm curious how we passed a Bill out of
 committee yesterday without having the IEPA's input on this.
 I encourage you a 'no' vote on this note."

Speaker Harris: "Leader Durkin."

"Thank you. I'll be brief and I'm going to speak to the Durkin: Bill. This issue regarding ethylene-oxide has been something that's been very... at the front of my thought process over the past year. And, yes, we did have a very good discussion about this matter last Session. We produced a good Bill. I went a little further and I gave ... presented a Bill yesterday which would've allowed for ... if Sterigenics was still operating, allowing for the Villages of Willowbrook and also Waukegan the opportunity to immediately shut down and eliminate ethylene-oxide from their municipalities. The Bill that is being discussed right now would not have shut down Sterigenics. It's not going to shut down Medline. So, I think it's disingenuous to suggest that we'd not do enough, particularly, when the Sponsor and also every Democrat in that committee yesterday voted 'present' on my Bill, which would immediately given them relief that they're asking for. So, I'm not quite sure why the politics of the moment got into play, but it's unfortunate because there was a Bill. Mine was simple, straightforward, and we would've addressed the problem immediately, but you chose not to go down that

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

path. So, I'm a person that believes in goodwill and I've been... I think it's quite obvious in the way Session ended last year. And I plan to extend the same goodwill that I received yesterday, today, on my vote on the floor, and ask my Members to join me as well."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Stava-Murray."

Stava-Murray: "Okay. To the fiscal note. The fiscal note seems inapplicable in the face of children dying and the health costs and the delay of seeing a Bill like this. And I would urge those, not only on our side of the aisle but across the aisle, to not give in to pettiness and to support the health of the residents of Illinois."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Mayfield has moved to rule the fiscal note inapplicable. All those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Burke. DeLuca. Hurley. Turner. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a vote of 65 voting 'yes', 49 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', the fiscal note is ruled inapplicable. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "The Home Rule note."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Mayfield on the Home Rule note."

Mayfield: "I rule the vote... I'm asking for a 'yes' vote and rule Home Rule note inapplicable."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Mayfield has moved to rule the...
moved to rule the Home Rule note inapplicable. All those in
favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have
all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Cabello. Carroll.
DeLuca. Hurley. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please
take the record. On a vote of 66 voting 'yes', 48 voting 'no',

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

and 1 voting 'present', the Home Rule note is ruled inapplicable. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "The housing note."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Mayfield on the housing note."

Mayfield: "I move the housing note inapplicable."

Harris: "Representative Mayfield has moved that the housing note be held inapplicable. All those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a vote of 65 voting 'yes', 48 voting 'no', and 1 voting 'present', the Home Rule... the housing note has been held inapplicable. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "The judicial note."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Mayfield on the judicial note."
Mayfield: "I rule the judicial note inapplicable."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Mayfield has moved the judicial note be held inapplicable. All those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a vote of 67 voting 'yes', 46 voting 'no', and 1 voting 'present', the judicial note is held inapplicable. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Land conveyance."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Mayfield on the land conveyance note."

Mayfield: "I move that the land conveyance note be held inapplicable."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Mayfield has held that the land conveyance note be held inapplicable. All those in favor vote

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

'aye'; those opposed vote 'nay'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a vote of 67 voting 'yes', 47 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', the land conveyance note is held inapplicable. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "The pension note."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Mayfield on the pension note."

Mayfield: "I move that the pension note be held inapplicable."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Mayfield has moved the pension not be held inapplicable. All those in favor vote 'aye'; 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, please take the record. On a vote of 67 voting 'yes', 46 voting 'no', and 1 voting 'present', the pension note is held applicable (sic-inapplicable). Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "The state debt note."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Mayfield on the state debt note."

Mayfield: "I move the state debt note inapplicable."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Mayfield has moved the state note...

debt note be held inapplicable. All those in favor vote 'aye';

those opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted

who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a vote of 64 voting

'yes', 48 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', the state debt

note is held inapplicable. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "The state mandates note."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Mayfield on the state mandates note."

Mayfield: "I move the state mandate note be held inapplicable."

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

Speaker Harris: "Representative Mayfield has moved the state mandate not be held inapplicable. All those in favor vote 'aye'; 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, please take the record. On a vote of 65 voting 'yes', 48 voting 'no', and 1 voting 'present', the mandates note has been ruled inapplicable. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "No further Motions are filed."

Speaker Harris: "Third Reading. Representative Mayfield on the Bill. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Representative, do you have Floor Amendment #2 on the Bill. Did you wish to adopt that?"

Mayfield: "Yes, I do. It's not out of Rules yet. Can we move it to Third, hold it on Third, and then when the Amendment comes out, then move it back?"

Speaker Harris: "We'll hold this, pending the Amendment, Representative."

Mayfield: "Thank you."

Speaker Harris: "Mr. Demmer, did you have a comment?"

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

Speaker Harris: "State your point."

Demmer: "I'd just like to refer Members to the process that we just went through here. Here the Bill was offered on the floor, we had filed notes to seek further information about the Bill, those notes then were all ruled inapplicable and the Bill is not even ready to be voted on right now. Instead of taking the time that was available to us, the time that we have to wait until the Bill's actually ready for a Third Reading vote, and ask those state agencies to file the notes

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

to give us the information, we instead voluntarily chose not to have more information before the vote and then simply to rule each and every note inapplicable and then wait. During this time we're waiting, we could've gotten more information that would help us make an informed decision. What is the point of the State Notes Act if we always rule notes inapplicable? Repeal the Act. Don't pretend like a fiscal note does not apply to a Bill that creates state mandates."

- Speaker Harris: "On page 2 of the Calendar, going back to House Bill 597, Representative Ramirez. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 597, a Bill for an Act concerning health. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day.

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

Speaker Harris: "Representative Ramirez on the Amendment."

- Ramirez: "Thank you, Speaker. I would like to move to adopt House Floor Amendment 1 in House Bill 597."
- Speaker Harris: "Seeing no questions, the Motion is...

  Representative Ramirez moves the adoption of Floor Amendment
  #1 to House Bill 597. All those in favor say 'aye'; those
  opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes'
  have it. The Motion is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr.
  Clerk?"

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

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

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 597, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Ramirez."

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

- Ramirez: "House Bill 597 is... it's a gut and replace Amendment for House Bill 3711. And it's really just for a technical change to House Bill 3711. The reference to the State Fire Marshal was an error. As a local fire department, the fire protection district, the building permitting entity, or other building inspectors are who makes up the recommendations and occupancy. So, the Bill itself is just a technical change to remove the State Fire Marshal as the entity that recommends occupancy as we look at the changing stations. I urge an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Harris: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 597 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a vote of 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 597, having achieved a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 3, under the Order of Senate Bill's Third Reading, Senate Bill 1857, Representative Gordon-Booth. Representative Gordon-Booth. Mr. Clerk, out of the record. On page 3, under the Order of Senate Bill's Second Reading, Senate Bill 1200, Representative Harper. Representative Harper. Oh, here she is. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1200, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendment 1 was adopted at committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

- Speaker Harris: "Representative Harper on the Amendment. There's no Amendments. I'm sorry. Representative... Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1200, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Harris: "Representative Harper."
- Harper: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thought there was an Amendment for this Bill."
- Speaker Harris: "That was a Committee Amendment. It's already been adopted in committee."
- Harper: "Okay. Well, put it out of the record."
- Speaker Harris: "Out of the record. On page 4 of the Calendar, appears Senate Bill 1597, Representative Smith. Mr. Clerk, Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1597, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No... correction, Amendment #2 was adopted in committee.

  No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Harris: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill." Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1597, a Bill for an Act concerning
  - civil law. Third reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Harris: "Representative Smith."
- Smith: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1597 is a gut and replace that authorizes four land transfers. The first three were originally a part of HB3222, which was amendatorily vetoed because of a fourth land transfer which is not included in this Bill. The fourth land transfer on this Bill includes agreed upon language of a land transfer between the Village of Manteno and CMS. All other three are agreed upon between

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

DNR and the respective local governments. I urge a 'aye' vote."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Batinick for a question."

Batinick: "Yeah. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Harris: "He indicates he'll yield."

Batinick: "Representative, I didn't quite hear where the land was and what the situation was for the land conveyance. I see golf course in the... what are the..."

Smith: "Which... the Manteno transference?"

Batinick: "Yeah. Sure."

Smith: "Okay. This is a golf course in Manteno. Yeah, this is an authorization..."

Batinick: "Right. It's going from where to where?

Smith: "From CMS to the City of Manteno."

Batinick: "And what's the reason we're... why we're doing that?"

Smith: "Manteno has had this golf course and maintained it for decades and they just want ownership."

Batinick: "Okay. Thank you for answering my question."

Smith: "Thank you."

Speaker Harris: "Seeing no further questions, Mr. Smith to close."

Smith: "I urge a 'aye' vote."

Speaker Harris: "Question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1597 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; 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, please take the record. With a vote of 104 voting 'yes', 9 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1597, having achieved the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

4 of the Calendar, appears Senate Bill 1670, Representative Burke. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1670, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. The Bill was read for a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1670, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Burke."

Burke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1670 addresses a situation in which a downstate police officer originally starts in IMRF because they work for a department with a town of a population of less than 5 thousand. And once that town's population increases to 5 thousand, they have to form an Article 3 pension. And so, this clarifies the law that an officer who started in the IMRF pension, when it was an under 5 thousand population... municipality is considered, if they were a Tier 1 in that original IMRF pension, that they're a Tier 1 employee in the newly created Article 3 Fund. This would affect 8 departments state-wide and approximately 50 officers. I ask for an 'aye' vote and will... happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Batinick is recognized."

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

Speaker Harris: "She indicates she will."

Batinick: "Representative, I had to get the cobwebs out of my head for this one 'cause we voted on this in the end of May in committee, correct?"

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

Burke: "That's correct."

Batinick: "Okay. I want to be clear on what we're doing here because one of the things that many of the Members do not know, I know some on my side, Tier 1 in IMRF is different than Tier 2 in downstate police and fire and different in other pension systems, correct?"

Burke: "Correct."

Batinick: "So, what was... what happened was, somebody's a Tier 1 police officer... and I believe Eureka's one of the villages. They're a Tier 1 police officer, they get over 5 thousand... the limit of 5 thousand. They have to start a new pension system so they go into Tier 2 downstate police and fire, correct?"

Burke: "There is a... it's not clear in the Tier 2 legislation about what happens with these folks. Timewise, they're Tier 1 people. They started before January 1, 2011. And we're trying to make a clarification that they should be Tier 1, if and when their... they switch over from IMRF to the Article 3 Pension Fund."

Batinick: "Okay. Do we know what the fiscal impact is to the municipalities for the increased pension liability?"

Burke: "I don't have that information, but I know that the people who are... who would fall into this very small class work for 8 different departments. And these are people... they were... they're not switching between departments. These are people who are... have been with the same department and it's only because there was a change in population and they had to go into a different pension fund that they're in this situation. But that it's roughly 50 people spread over 8 departments.

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

So, I don't have all the finical detail but it's a small number."

Batinick: "Okay. I'm going to go to the Bill 'cause there's an important piece to this. The members were Tier 1 IMRF. There's a strong argument that Tier 2 downstate police and fire is already a benefit enhancement versus Tier 1 IMRF. In Tier 1 IMRF, you have a much older retirement age. So, going from Tier 1 IMRF to Tier 1 downstate police and fire is a pretty significant increase in benefits. There was a way to solve this problem fair for both the municipality and fair for the individuals. And that's just to keep their... give them the option of staying in IMRF or keeping IMRF type benefits as opposed to switching them to Tier 2, giving them that choice. This is a situation where we are unnecessarily giving somebody a fairly significant benefit enhancement when the fairer thing to do would be to keep the benefits flat. One of the things we've been talking about all week is the pension consolidation for local downstate police and fire. Some of these pension funds that are very, very small and have the small number of people, they're the ones that are impacted the most because they don't have the same size, same rate of return. Their administrative costs are already high. So, what we're doing for those 8 departments is, is we're dramatically increasing the benefits that they have to pay for their employees simply because they got over a magical number of 5 thousand, which somebody decided way back when was a magical number for when you need to start your own pension system, which is a pretty small number. So, I'm sure I'll have some

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

people on my side of the aisle vote 'yes'. I'm going to have some vote 'no', but I'm going to recommend a 'no' vote."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Ugaste."

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

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

Ugaste: "Thank you. I understand Representative Batinick just went through some of the enhancements. Are there any other enhancements these people will receive going from Tier 1 in IMRF to Tier 1 in the downstate police pension?"

Burke: "These are folks who started in their current positions prior to January 1, 2011. So, what's been the north star of who's in Tier 1 is your start date. So, anyone who started in their position after January 1, 2011 is in Tier 2. These folks started before January 1, 2011. It's not anything of their doing that moves them this their different pension system. It's by operation of law and I think they should have their service as Tier 1 participants recognized."

Ugaste: "I understand that, Representative. I'm just trying to understand before I vote whether or not there are other enhancements that may come with this. Because while you indicate there are only eight current municipalities that will effect, there may be other municipalities in the future. One of which is in my district, so I'd like to know what it is I'm exactly voting for before I do it."

Burke: "There is nothing in the legislation that changes any benefit. It merely clarifies that if you had the start date of prior to January 1, 2011, you will be in Tier 1."

Ugaste: "Okay."

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

Burke: "Just like anyone else who started prior to January 1, 2011."

Ugaste: "Thank you."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Skillicorn."

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

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

Skillicorn: "So, since this is an enhancement of benefits, who's going to pay for that enhancement? I mean... so, they've been paying dues at Tier 1 IMRF. If they're going to go to Tier 1 downstate police, there's an enhancement to that benefit. Who's going to make up the difference in the contribution amount?"

Burke: "Just like any pension system, it's a combination of the employee's contribution, plus the employer's contribution."

Skillicorn: "To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a property tax increase. The taxpayers are going to paying for a benefit enhancement to pensions. I can tell you for a fact there are senior citizens in my district that are losing their homes because of property taxes. How can we have a property tax taskforce and we ignore the big issue of pensions, the lack of funding of pensions, and the sweetening of pensions. This is a pension sweetener. This is a property tax hike. You cannot say you're against property taxes if you vote for this Bill targets."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Burke to close."

Burke: "Again, this merely clarifies that people who were in the pension system prior to the start of Tier 2, so prior to January 1, 2011, they are Tier 1 folks and they will remain Tier 1 folks in there... when they have to switch over through

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

operation of law to a new pension system. I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Harris: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1670 pass?'
All those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'nay'.

Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a vote of 79 voting 'yes', 34 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1670, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 4 of the Calendar, appears Senate Bill 1711, Representative Bristow.

Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1711, a Bill for an Act concerning health. The Bill was read for a second time previously.

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

No Motions are filed."

Speaker Harris: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk." Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1711, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Bristow."

Bristow: "This is an initiative of the Lazarex Cancer Foundation and creates the Cancer Clinical Trial Participation Program Act. The Act provides for the creation of reimbursement programs aimed towards reimbursing the ancillary costs, travel, lodging, parking, and tolls, of cancer patients who are medically eligible to participate in cancer clinical trials. In addition, this clarifies FDA guidance around the distinction between reimbursement of patient ancillary costs, participation costs, and undo inducement coercion to participate. The Act requires no state funding and is

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

effective immediately. It is also designed to include and increase minority participation in clinical trials. And it has been enacted in California, Pennsylvania, and Texas and has increased clinical trial participation significantly. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Harris: "Seeing no questions, the… seeing no questions, the Motion is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1711 pass?' All those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair… I'm going to start this one over. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1711 pass?' Will all those in favor please vote 'aye'; will all those opposed please vote 'no'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Representative Stava-Murray. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a vote of 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1711, having achieved the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 4 of the Calendar, appears Senate Bill 1786, Representative Ammons. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1786, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. The Bill was read for a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1786, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Ammons."

Ammons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I present the License to Work Act, Senate Bill 1786,

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

which removes many of the reasons for which a person could have their driver's license suspended that have nothing to do with driving. The driver's license suspension is a draconian debt collection tool of which I am happy to report to this Assembly that the Secretary of State is in support of this change to Illinois Law. We know that people who can least afford doubling, tripling, a boot, all of these things, are the hardest hit in our communities and with this Bill, we will stop this practice. I want to clarify that those who owe money for traffic tickets will still have to pay those tickets. We will just simply remove the provision of the suspensions of driver's licenses. And with your help, return people's ability to return to work, as a result of this Bill, without the penalty of being stopped driving on a suspended license. And with that I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Batinick a for question."

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

Speaker Harris: "She indicates she will."

Batinick: "Hey. Good afternoon, Representative. Couple quick questions here. A lot of proponents and that's fantastic. I found it odd that the Illinois Petroleum Marketers Association and the Illinois Association of Convenient Stores was against this legislation. What was the reason for their opposition? Is there something in the legislation that affects them directly?"

Ammons: "I don't know anything about the convenience stores.

Nobody's reached out to from the Convenience Store

Association. I will tell you that, in 2018, there was a
question about motor fuel theft, but under this provision it

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

does not prevent the crime of motor fuel theft from being prosecuted as it normally is. And I think that that's what their concern is."

Batinick: "Okay. That is actually... that's a great answer 'cause I'm looking through the provisions here and I want to make sure I hit each and every one of them pretty quickly in terms of... so, the idea here is you still want people to be able to drive to work..."

Ammons: "Yes."

Batinick: "...not have their license suspended for what are some petty driving-related crimes. So, we got failure to pay 10 parking tickets, you're getting rid of that, right?"

Ammons: "That's correct."

Batinick: "Five tolls, correct?"

Ammons: "Yes."

Batinick: "Failure to pay any fees, civil penalties owed to the Illinois Commerce Commission or taxes due?"

Ammons: "Correct."

Batinick: "Transporting medical cannabis is a... or anything sealed is removed from this. So, if you're caught transporting illegal drugs, you can't have your license removed anymore?"

Ammons: "Well, they won't be suspended but you know, of course, in the marijuana legislation, there's still criminal penalty there."

Batinick: "Okay. What about other illicit drugs?"

Ammons: "We don't deal with that. Whatever the criminal penalties are for any other illicit drug remains what it is."

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

Batinick: "Okay. Okay. You know what? I'm going to go ahead and listen to the rest of the debate. I think some of my other Members want to wrap this up."

Ammons: "Thank you."

Speaker Harris: "Leader Durkin."

Durkin: "Thank you. Representative Ammons, you may find this very odd, but I will be supporting your Bill today."

Ammons: "I don't find it odd at all."

Durkin: "No, no, no. I think that we haven't agreed on many issues but this is something that we do agree on."

Ammons: "Certainly."

Durkin: "The policy behind suspending license for these parking tickets, I'm not sure when it was started but it just doesn't make sense. You know what? I think that we should be a little easier and allow people not to destroy their lives and prohibit them from being able to do things that they should be doing, driving to work, picking up their kids. And having your license suspended for these minor violations is something that was a mistake years ago, and I'm glad we're fixing it today. So, thank you for bringing this Bill. And I'm encouraging my Members to vote 'yes'."

Ammons: "Thank you, Leader Durkin."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Ugaste."

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

Ammons: "Yes."

Speaker Harris: "Indicates she'll yield."

Ugaste: "Thank you. Just a quick question because I'm trying to follow what Representative Batinick asked you. So, if the crime is motor fuel theft and they're found quilty, then you

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

can or cannot suspend the license after this Bill, if it's passed?"

Ammons: "The crime of motor fuel theft will be prosecuted the way that it is currently prosecuted in State Law. We believe that taking away a person's ability to drive and take care of their family as a result of that, no matter what the adjudication of their case is, is not the best practice. And so, what we're asking for here is to remove the suspension but not necessarily the penalty of the theft itself."

Ugaste: "Okay. So, it removes the ability to suspend though because of the motor fuel theft, just so I'm clear."

Ammons: "That's correct."

Ugaste: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Skillicorn."

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

Speaker Harris: "She will yield."

Skillicorn: "Representative, so we're talking a little bit about penalties and for certain crimes. Are these crimes punished in other ways than removing a driver's license?"

Ammons: "They are."

Skillicorn: "So, if you commit one of these crimes that were mentioned, there's actually a criminal penalty for that. It isn't just solely taking someone's driver's license, right?"

Ammons: "It's more severe in many cases."

Skillicorn: "So, in many cases the criminal penalty is more severe than taking a driver's license. So, why the heck are we taking driver's licenses away from people that are committing crimes other than the act of driving?"

Ammons: "I can't answer that."

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

Skillicorn: "Okay. To the Bill. I want us to take away the driver's licenses of bad drivers, not people who do petty crimes other than driving. Let's let the criminal justice system punish people appropriately for the crimes they commit. Let's not arbitrarily take their driver's license away for something else. And here's the other thing, is that we want people to turn from petty crime and go to a productive lifestyle and earn a living for themselves. So, I urge an 'aye' vote. Let's stop taking away driver's license to people that trying to get back to work. Stop taking away driver's licenses for things that don't have to with driving. Thank you."

Speaker Harris: "Representative McDermed."

McDermed: "I have one question for the Sponsor. Will she yield?" Speaker Harris: "She yields."

McDermed: "This Bill's been around in various forms, perhaps with different Sponsors over time, and one of the largest issues has been suspension for failure to pay child support. Where are we with respect to that issue in this Bill?"

Ammons: "This Bill has no bearing on the failure of paying child support."

McDermed: "And I told you earlier this Session that I would be a supporter of this Bill because of that reason. I think that this Bill does an excellent job of... fellow Members, of threading the needle between things that no longer need to be cause for loss of driver's license and things where we probably do want to keep the pressure on. And for that, I honor the process that we've gone through to get this Bill to the place where it is. I think it does a good job of protecting interests that need to be protected and getting rid of things

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

that prevent people from leading a productive and positive life. Please vote 'yes'."

Ammons: "Thank you."

Speaker Harris: "Representative DeLuca."

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

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

DeLuca: "Representative Ammons, I... according to my analysis, the Secretary of State did not weigh in on this. Is that the case?"

Ammons: "No, we've been in talks with the Secretary of State for two years on this Bill. And as of the last conversation, they were neutral on this Bill."

DeLuca: "So, what... what is the hammer going to be? Obviously, taking a driver's license was their hammer. How will they collect these fees and..."

Ammons: "Actually..."

DeLuca: "...what's their approach for the future?"

Ammons: "I do appreciate the question. Actually, taking a driver's license has been just the opposite of the hammer. What has happened is people have lost their driver's licenses and things have literally spiraled completely out of control in that person's life. So, they can't get to work. So, 42 percent of the people whose licenses are taken, as a result of nonpayment of nonmoving violations, have lost their driver's license and lost their jobs as a result of that. And I could go on and on about the consequences of that. It has not enhanced the ability of a person to pay and it has not changed the outcomes of the Secretary of State's Office being the

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

collection agency, which we think is wrong. And that's why we're bringing this Bill today."

DeLuca: "Thank you. Appreciate your answers."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Ammons to close."

"Thank you. I do appreciate the questions that were brought on this Bill. This Bill has taken us, really, two years to get done. We wanted to cover many issues that would return people back to work and give them the opportunity to even pay the debts that they owe. We understand that in this society people need a driver's license to do just that. And in many cases, they need a driver's license to even get a job. And so, this Bill gives people back their right to drive so that they can take care of their family, to medical appointments, to school, to doctors, to work, and to give them the ability to actually pay their debts. And so, I want to thank the City of Chicago who has worked with us on this Bill over the last six months or so. And thank our mayor there who's helped us get to this point, as well as all of the advocacy organizations, ACLU, and Chicago Jobs Council, and all of those folk who have really, really dug deeply on this very critical issue. And I do urge an 'aye' vote. And thank you so much, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Harris: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1786 pass?'
All those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'nay'. The
voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who
wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the
record. On a vote of 88 voting 'yes', 27 voting 'no', 0 voting
'present', Senate Bill 1786, having achieved a Constitutional
Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 5 of the

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

Calendar, appears Senate Bill 1970, Representative Smith. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1970, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. The Bill was read for a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1970, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Harris: "Mr. Smith."

Smith: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. SB1970 gives students entitled to vote in a primary, general, or special election the right to be absent from school for two hours during the school day to vote. This Bill is a Bill that we want to encourage our young people to be engaged in civics. We're adding civics back to the curriculum in a classroom. And here's an opportunity for them to band together, leave school for a couple hours, just like people do when they are at work, and go vote and return to school. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Batinick."

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

Speaker Harris: "He indicates he will yield."

Batinick: "Representative, how long is the typical... how long is the longest school day in Illinois? Do you know?"

Smith: "I have no idea."

Batinick: "Okay. I don't know... I do not know of a school that's actually in school more than eight hours. How long are polls open on Election Day?"

Smith: "Twelve hours? Can't remember, it's been a while."

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

- Batinick: "Okay. I think it's longer than that. But I guess my question is... schools get out like 3:00, 3:30? Are we saying we don't have time to do this? We're going to take away from the school day. They don't have time to do this after school?"
- Smith: "This is an encouraging effort to get our young people involved in electoral politics. It's their civic responsibility and duty. They can go as a group together. The kids get out of school to go to the zoo. They get out of school to go to a football game. Why can't they get out of school to vote?"
- Batinick: "Right. The school's making those decisions. We don't force that upon the school."
- Smith: "The schools will decide which hours those students are permitted to go vote."
- Batinick: "I understand that, but the schools decide if and... if and when and, you know, they decide the 'if' as well. What is the genesis of this? Where did this come from?"
- Smith: "My Senator actually was involved in a march with young high school students who were at voting age and were not able to participate in this march on Election Day because the school prohibited them from leaving the school during school hours."
- Batinick: "Okay. So, there was a march that was during school hours?"
- Smith: "It was a march to the polls. Yes."
- Batinick: "Okay. I... here's the other question. So, is there any requirement that they show that they actually went and voted?"

  Smith: "They have to be a registered vote... I'm not aware of that."

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

- Batinick: "'Cause I don't see that in the legislation. So basically... here's what I'm looking at here. Tell me why this word isn't going to get out and then everybody's just going to, you know, hey this is two hours off for part of the students' day. I mean, you have a situation where..."
- Smith: "Well, I believe when you vote, you usually get a sticker, or a wristband, or something to say that you voted."
- Batinick: "Right. I understand but doesn't say that that's..."
- Smith: "So, that would be proof positive that they actually voted."
- Batinick: "Right. Doesn't say that this is a requirement of the legislation."
- Smith: "Well, we'll leave that to the school themselves to determine that."
- Batinick: "Well, I don't know... but if the legislation doesn't outline that the school can request that, I don't know if they can. The legislation says they're required two hours off, I would presume, that is says that they can just say, hey, I want two hours off. It's Election Day."
- Smith: "You have a very good point."
- Batinick: "And a reason to oppose this Bill. I mean, and if...
  another reason is that if we do go the other route of
  requiring them to, you know, show it on that particular day,
  that discourages voting early which is something... voting by
  mail and voting early. You're actually discouraging..."
- Smith: "They have... this is another tool in the toolbox for our young people to be able to vote. They are not required to take the two hours. It's optional."

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

Batinick: "I'm going to go to the Bill. I mean, they can... students can literally vote for, I believe, 40 days before the election by mail. They can vote early. They can vote the weekend before. They can vote after school on Election Day. They can vote before school on Election Day. Heck, half the time the election booth is at their school. So, you're going to have a student who can actually go to the election booth that's after school, but we have to mandate that they get two hours off. I'm just... this toolbox of all the things that we're giving people to vote is apparently endless and we are obviously coddling people. This is a completely unnecessary Bill. I don't think there's... I don't think it's extremely difficult with everything that we have offered in terms of voting early, vote by mail, voting if you're not registered at the County Clerk's Office, or in most counties, you can vote at any precinct in the county. It is so unbelievably easy to vote. I can't believe that we're just basically giving high school students a two hour time out, where you can take two hours out of your school day, when we need to be teaching people responsibility. Hey, guess what? You need to vote. You need to research. It's not an excuse to get two hours off of school. You know what it is? You need to be an active participant in the process. You need to pay attention. This is just going to be an excuse to get out of something. We're coddling people. This is ridiculous. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Butler."

Butler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A few questions of my good friend with the best voice in the Legislature over there, Mr. Smith." Speaker Harris: "He yields."

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

- Butler: "Thank you. Nick, we had a few questions in committee yesterday. But can you tell me, again, your... the reasoning behind this legislation?"
- Smith: "Well, again, my Senator was participating in a march to the polls during school hours with a bunch of voting-age high school students who could not fully participate in this march to the polls because the school did not allow them to do so."
- Butler: "They could've scheduled that march to the polls on a Saturday or a Sunday to be able to get out to the polls."
- Smith: "Well, I don't think all the students are in class together, the peers, the friends at school. I don't know if they hang out on Sundays and Saturdays."
- Butler: "So, it's our responsibility at our schools to be able to gather people to go vote. Is that the responsibility of our schools?"
- "You know, this discussion... you know, we have a lot of Smith: opportunities to vote. That is correct. However, unfortunately, people are not taking advantage of those opportunities. So, let's provide a few more and encourage our young people at their early onset of their voter registration process to participate in this system. So, if it takes a couple hours during the school day where a group of kids, together, can go to the polls, that may mean something to them. You know, it may not mean as much if they're going with grandma, grandpa, or their dad, or mom. You know, people that work nine to five jobs get two hours off to go vote. And they can vote early. They can vote absentee. They can vote on the weekends. But they still take those two hours from work."

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

Butler: "But they don't... so basically, to correlate that to mom and dad, that would be mom and dad getting paid to be able to take two hours off of work to go vote."

Smith: "Well this..."

Butler: "Not even... I mean, we don't allow that in Illinois to be able to take 2 hours off work to go vote. All right. You know, look... to Representative Batinick's point earlier, and this is what we discussed in committee yesterday. To the Bill. In Illinois, you can vote for 40 days before the primary election. You can vote for 40 days before the general election. We have no excuse absentee voting now in Illinois. You can vote by mail. You can ... there is no impediment to voting in Illinois. We have all the opportunities to vote in Illinois. And now, we're... we have a Bill in front of us that will say that children... school children can take two hours out of their school day, that the schools will have to track and figure out how to do it, to be able to go vote. And I'm all for encouraging voting, it's not that. But people have the opportunity, very good, to vote today. If we want to have a conversation about nationally moving elections to Saturday so people can make it easier, let's have a conversation about that. I'd be happy to have that conversation so people make it easier. The other thing I will say about this legislation, and I looked it up right here. So, two hours, right? So, two hours in a lot of areas in parts of the state, it's not hard to get... to go vote. To go vote 15 days before the election, in most of downstate counties, you have to go to the courthouse to vote. Okay? You've got to go to the courthouse. There's not a polling place at your school, or around the

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

corner, something like that. So, in Tazewell County, my part of Tazewell County that I have, Armington, Illinois, it takes 41 minutes to get from Armington, Illinois to the Tazewell County Courthouse to go vote. And 41 minutes to get back. So, if there's a problem that comes up or if they run into a line at the polling place or something like that, that's going to be an issue, I think. So, they have plenty of opportunities to vote. And I think, obviously, this is going to be harder for people, the downstate, to vote under your law than people in the urban areas of the state. Finally, I'll say this. And I... my friends on the other side, I'm just very skeptical of elections Bills that come out of the Democrat Majority in Illinois. Time, and time, and time, and time again, I'm just skeptical of these pieces of legislation. So, I appreciate your work on this. You're a good guy, but I cannot in good conscience support your legislation."

Speaker Harris: "Ladies and Gentleman, we're going to let people talk, but we're going to the five minute timer. Representative Wehrli for five minutes."

Wehrli: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I assure you I will not spend five minutes. I'm going to go straight to the Bill. So, I applaud my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who repeatedly try to make it easier to vote. And a colleague on my side of the aisle said they're endless. You know what? There is an ending point. Let's just all come together and decide that voting in Illinois should be a day off of work. It should either, you know... nobody should work. It should be a state holiday that we go... all go out and exercise our right to vote. That's how democracy works. Let's stop kidding

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

ourselves. We all know this is a terrible Bill because there's stuff buried in this Bill that obviously favor one party over the other. So, let's stop. Let's just come together and make this a state holiday that everybody has a day off of work and go vote."

Speaker Harris: "Representative LaPointe for five minutes."

LaPointe: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Harris: "He indicates he'll yield."

LaPointe: "Do we know of any other states that have a similar law to this?"

Smith: "Not that I know of."

LaPointe: "Okay. To the Bill. If no other states are doing this, to me, that means Illinois could be a leader in something that encourages voting in young people and for adults as well. I'm of the mind that we have dismally low voter turnout rates. And so, anything we can do to encourage young people to vote, but also adults, is a win for democracy. I think that this is a great way to get good civic habits early on and it could even trigger some of the adults that works at the schools to think about going to vote after work. So, I will be voting 'yes'."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Mazzochi."

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

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

Mazzochi: "Thank you. So, which State Senator was the one that you said was organizing this march that led to the origination of the Bill?"

Smith: "My State Senator. My predecessor on this."

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

Mazzochi: "Yeah, I don't... and I apologize, I don't know who that was."

Smith: "Starts with an 'S'. Sims, Elgie Sims. I'm sorry."

Mazzochi: "Sims. Okay. Do you recall what school year or what election it was?"

Smith: "I do not."

Mazzochi: "Okay. Do you know which school was involved?"

Smith: "I can't remember."

Mazzochi: "All right. One of the things that I'm always very concerned about are opportunities for... this is to the Bill. One of the things that I am very concerned about are areas where administrators have coercive power over students. And as I read the text of this legislation, number one, you're allowing the administration to specify the hours during which an eligible student may be absent. That means you're putting administrators in control over how, when, and where the students move. I'm always concerned get to administrators are going to exercise undue influence in those types of scenarios. So, I can really see circumstances where administrators can exercise their power imbalance to encourage... or not even encourage, to really compel students to do something they may not want to. This Bill, again, I understand it may be well intentioned, but the nature of it, making it in the school, putting this in the power of the administrators, and then moreover, by saying that the school gets to specify when students can be eligible. If you're a school say of two thousand students, maybe you've got 50, a hundred eligible voters, and the administration says, yes, I give you all one two-hour window to transport, to move, to

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

come back. You do a rush at the polls. Those students even when they get there may not have enough time to actually exercise the right to vote. So, then you're going to run into additional issues. There's going to be lawsuits about denial of due process and access. And you're also going to start creating scenarios where students may think that this is their option, and then when they actually get to the polls, they will realize to their detriment they just don't have enough time. So again, I think that this is... I understand the point, but in terms of the execution, you're giving too much power to administrators to dictate the lives of students and you're giving them too much coercive power. And for that reason, I'm a 'no' vote."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Smith to close."

Smith: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is an optional opportunity.

This is not mandatory. Students can do it if they choose. No one is forcing them to do it, but it is their right and it will not be denied. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Harris: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1970 pass?'
All those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is opening. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. With a vote of 74 voting 'yes', 40 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1970, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 4 of the Calendar, appears Senate Bill 1698, Representative Willis. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1698, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. The Bill was read for a second time

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

previously. Amendment #2 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Harris: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1698, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this Senate Bill." Speaker Harris: "Representative Willis."

Willis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is a fix to some unintended consequences from a... actually, a very good Bill that was passed last spring. The Bill last spring prevented employ... elected officials that paid into IMRF, as their paid elected position, to also, at the same time, collect a pension from IMRF. And I think... I supported that Bill and it had a good premise, but we found that the Bill, as it finally came through, had some unintended consequences. And one of those was that there are a number of elected officials at part-time positions that are in part-time positions that are no longer IMRF eligible and they... they'll have occurred an IMRF pension through many years of service, possibly in another position, not the elected position they're at. And we wanted to make sure that we did not penalize them and not allow them to get their part-time salary and if they were, due to age, eligible for their IMRF pension at the same time. The thing in here though that is very, very important to make sure is that we put in here some protections so that people would not do a back-door fix on it. And that means that that position, that elected position, prior to January of 2019, had to have been a part-time position. And if it was changed from a full-time position to a part-time position, also had a reduction in salary prior to January of 2019. That's truly important to

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

stress to you all so that nobody can come through and say, I'm reducing my position to a part-time position and no longer paying into a pension. And I don't... I know... and have a very small insignificant pay reduction and still be qualified. So, it had to be something that was thought of prior to the Bill. With that, I respectfully request an 'aye' vote and we'll be happy to take any questions."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Batinick."

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

Speaker Harris: "She indicates she will yield."

Batinick: "Representative, I know we had some conversation about this in committee because it was... I am the spokesperson for that committee. So, just for the purposes of educating my Members, I just want to rehash some of the things that you know I already know the answer to. This had... this did have bipartisan support, however, I believe there is a Republican Member and some Republicans voted against it, correct?"

Willis: "Correct."

Batinick: "Okay. And the nature of the opposition, including mine, was this is... there might've been another fix for this situation, so this... you believe this affects one individual, correct?"

Willis: "Well, I know of specifically one individual. I actually believe that there's more than one individual that has this affecting them as we see through."

Batinick: "So, there are other people who had their salaries reduced prior to that date?"

Willis: "I believe there are other elected... yes."

Batinick: "Okay. And..."

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

Willis: "I honestly can give you one name, but I believe that there is more than one that it affects."

Batinick: "The individual that you know the name of, that's the mayor. He was in IMRF for being a mayor and he will start collecting the pension because, he is how old now?"

Willis: "He's over 65."

Batinick: "Over 65... however, he reduced his salary, but he's still getting his salary for being a mayor."

Willis: "His salary..."

Batinick: "He's getting the salary for a mayor and some pension for being a mayor."

Willis: "Right. So actually, his IMRF years of service has a total of 42 years of service. Some of that was working for the Park District, some of it was working for the Secretary of State, and only 8 years was as an elected official. Also, the salary and the positon was reduced in 2017, so way before we ever considered making sure of this double dip type of thing, if you want to call it a double dip. And I actually do believe that the whole intention behind the Bill last spring was that you could not collect your IMRF pension and be paying into IMRF, hence sweetening your pension at the same time."

Batinick: "To be clear that it wasn't paying into IMRF and getting your pension, it was getting a salary for a job that you're getting retirement benefits for and that was the issue with my accounting. I'm going to go the Bill. I mean, I'm sure some of my colleagues will be for it on my side of the aisle, some against it. Most of us on our side know where they are on pensions. I just wanted to fare it out the rest of the Bill. Thank you and I'll watch the board."

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

Speaker Harris: "Representative Reick."

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

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

Reick: "I want you to know that the Bill that you are amending, I voted against the last time because I didn't think it was a very good Bill. That says nothing about your Amendment to it. I just have a question. Are you telling us that going forward, there is no one in the State of Illinois who could collect a... who could accrue pension benefits as a result of manipulating their pay and status of pay going forward. This had to be in place before January 1 of 2019. Is that correct?"

Willis: "Correct. So, they cannot go and try to play the system and next week take a reduction in their salary and reduce their position to part time and qualify under this legislation that I've put in."

Reick: "And this person is... these people are not accruing further pension benefits under any pension plan that you know of. Is that correct?"

Willis: "That is correct. That is the whole intent that they are not adding in additional pension credits."

Reick: "So, the pension that they would've otherwise... let's use this one individual as an example. The pension that this person is eligible for is fixed and determined and absolutely not subject to change by virtue of additional service credits or accruals."

Willis: "Not under the elected position that he is in, no."

Reick: "What if he goes to another position?"

Willis: "No, it would not."

Reick: "Why?"

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

Willis: "You would not be getting your pension at that time.

Certainly, not an IMRF pension at the same time."

Reick: Well, let's... let's give you an example of this individual who is a public official of some sort, who's had these qualifications before January 1 reduction and all that. Let's say he goes to a neighboring jurisdiction and takes over the same job at a full-time or part-time, increased or reduced rate of pay. Would he be eligible for further accruals under IMRF?"

Willis: "No, because that is the legislation that we passed last year that was Representative Didech's legislation."

Reick: "Which I previously said I didn't support."

Willis: "Yeah."

Reick: "But nonetheless, I do believe that this is a nonoffensive fix to an otherwise bad Bill but... and therefore, I will support your Bill. Thank you."

Willis: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Skillicorn."

Skillicorn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. When this original Bill came to... came up in Legislature, I looked into it and I asked IMRF what could someone do if they're in this situation. And IMRF responded to me that if they are in this situation, if this someone had earned benefits, was retired, collecting benefits, and then was going to go serve on a board, they would either have to not be paid or, and I add or, IMRF allows these people who are beneficiaries to stop receiving benefits. So, IMRF actually allows people to say, hold on. I'm going to go back to work. I'm going to go be part of a part-time board. Please don't send me benefits. It

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

doesn't hurt their benefits. It doesn't take away from their benefits. And then they qualify to be paid to be on this board. So, this is a situation where there already is something that is in the law that handles this. This effectively allows people to double dip and we're going to sign off on it. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Didech."

Didech: "To the Bill. This Bill is a follow-up Bill to a... what I think was a very good Bill that was passed earlier this year. But there were some aspects of it that slipped through the cracks that I think this cleans up in a very elegant way. Essentially what this Bill does, is it make sure that we are not punishing local governments and punishing elected officials who made the fiscally responsible and, in my opinion, ethically sound decision to reduce their elected officials' salaries as a result of them qualifying for their pension contributions. This is not people who are double dipping. This is people who made the very, very, in my opinion, good decision to reduce their salaries to correspond with the change in their pension status. So, this is a very good Bill, and I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Willis to close."

Willis: "Thank you. One final thing I'd like to point out. I actually had a conversation with the IML this afternoon and they are slipped in support of this. They see that it is a good way to be fiscally responsible. We do not want to penalize elected officials that choose to work at part-time positions and get part-time salaries and possibly avoid doing

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

that because they put their pension in jeopardy. So, with that being said, I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

- Speaker Harris: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1698 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a vote of 83 voting 'yes', 29 voting 'no', and 1 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1698, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page the Calendar, appears House Resolution Representative Edly-Allen. Mr. Clerk. And this... Representative Edly-Allen."
- Edly-Allen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Resolution 109 recognizes November as Food Pantry Month. People in every county, and in every one of our 118 districts, struggle with food insecurity. They are our neighbors and children in our communities. They were some of the students I taught. In Illinois, one in nine people struggle with hunger and one in six children go hungry each day. This equates to nearly 1.4 million Illinoisans, including nearly 500 thousand children. Please support HR109 and join me in communicating the need to bring awareness to our local food pantries. Help by advocating for and volunteering at your local food pantry and vote 'yes'. Thank you."
- Speaker Harris: "There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Resolution 109 pass?' All those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And House Resolution 109 is declared passed. Mr. Clerk, committee announcements."

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

- Clerk Hollman: "The following committees will be meeting immediately after Session. International Trade & Commerce and the Agriculture & Conservation will be meeting together in Room 114. Once again, International Trade & Commerce and Agriculture & Conservation. Also meeting at... right after Session will be Human Services, Room 118, and Energy & Environment in D-1."
- Speaker Harris: "Representative Butler, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Butler: "Please... there we go. A point of personal privilege, please."
- Speaker Harris: "Please state your point."
- Representative Butler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Over here on the Abraham Lincoln side of the chamber, I would like to welcome Skye Kretzinger. Skye is a graduate of Mount Pulaski High School. She lives in Chestnut, which is the geographic center of the State of Illinois. She is currently a student studying agriculture at Lincoln Land Community College. She's leaving tomorrow for the FFA convention in... or the national convention in Indianapolis. She's president of the Ag Club at Lincoln Land Community College. She is the reigning Miss Logan County from the Logan County Fair this summer. And more importantly, today is Skye's 21st birthday. So, welcome to Springfield, Skye."

Speaker Harris: "Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk Hollman: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 556, offered by Representative Hoffman. House Resolution 557, offered by Representative Meier. House Resolution 560, offered by Representative Brady. House Resolution 561, offered by

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

Representative Halpin. House Resolution 562, offered by Representative Buckner. House Resolution 563, offered by Representative D'Amico. House Resolution 565, offered by Representative Brady. House Resolution 566, offered by Speaker Madigan. And House Resolution 567, offered by Speaker Madigan."

- Speaker Harris: "Leader Willis 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. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Mr. Clerk, please read the Adjournment Resolution."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Joint Resolution #89, offered by Leader 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 Wednesday, October 30, 2019, the House of Representatives stands adjourned until Tuesday, November 12, 2019, or until the call of the Speaker; and the Senate stands adjourned until Tuesday, November 12, 2019, or until the call of the President."
- Speaker Harris: "Leader Willis moves for the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those who oppose 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 Willis moves that the House stand adjourned until Wednesday, October 30 at 10 a.m. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

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. Committee Reports. Representative Williams, Chairperson from the Committee on Energy & Environment reports the following committee action taken on October 29, 2019: do pass as amended Short Debate is Senate Bill 557. Representative Hurley, Chairperson from the Committee on Human Services reports the following committee action taken on October 29, 2019: do pass as amended Short Debate is Senate Bill 391. Instruction of First Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 558, offered by Representative Carroll, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Senate Bill 639, offered by Representative Gabel, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Senate Bill 667, offered by Representative Guzzardi, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 670... Senate Bill 670, offered by Representative Jones, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 718, offered by Representative Williams, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Senate Bill 1864, offered by Representative Williams, a Bill for an Act concerning health. First Reading of these Senate Bills. Introduction and First Reading of House Bills. House Bill 3935, offered by Representative Kifowit, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3936, offered Representative Scherer, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 3937, offered by Representative Cabello, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 3938, offered by Representative West, a Bill for an Act concerning law enforcement training. House Bill 3939, offered

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

by Representative Andrade, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. House Bill 3940, offered by Representative Butler, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. House Bill 3941, offered by Representative Welch, a Bill for an Act concerning athlete agents. House Bill 3942, offered by Representative Slaughter, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 3943, offered by Representative Skillicorn, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. House Bill 3944, offered Representative Bristow, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3945, offered by Representative Spain, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 3946, offered by Representative Demmer, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 3947, offered by Representative Demmer, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. First Reading of these House Bills. Second Reading of House Bills. House Bill 3902, offered by Representative Bristow, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 3904, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of these House Bills. These will be held on the Order of Second Reading. Second Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 115, offered by Representative Rita, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Senate Bill 119, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 557, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Senate Bill 1042, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Second Reading of these Senate Bills. They'll be held on the Order of Second Reading. Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 558, offered by Representative Kifowit. House Resolution 559, offered by Representative Kifowit. House Resolution 568, offered by Representative Greenwood. These are referred to

67th Legislative Day

10/29/2019

the Rules Committee. Second Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 391, a Bill for an Act concerning children. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. This will held on the Order of Second Reading. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."