151st Legislative Day

11/29/2016

Speaker Lang: "The House will be in order. 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 cell phones, and rise for the invocation and Pledge of Allegiance. Pastor Crawford."

Pastor Crawford: "Let us pray. Most gracious and sovereign and holy God, God of power, might, wisdom, and justice, through You authority is rightly administered, laws are enacted, and judgments are decreed. God, assist us today with Your spirit of counsel and fortitude. May Your blessings be upon this august Assembly, the Speaker of this House, all of its Leaders, and all of its Members. God, may they always seek the ways of righteousness, the ways of justice, mercy, and compassion. I pray that they may be enabled by Your powerful protection, Your infinite wisdom, to lead this great state with great strength, honesty, and with great integrity. This we ask in Your Son's name, Amen."

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

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

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

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record show that Representatives Reaves-Harris and Thapedi are excused today." Speaker Lang: "Mr. Brown."

Brown: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please let the record reflect that all Republicans are present this afternoon."

151st Legislative Day

11/29/2016

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, please take the record. We have 116 Members answering the roll and we do have a quorum. Chair recognizes Mr... Mr. Clerk, Committee Reports."

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Chapa LaVia, Chairperson from the Committee on Energy, reports the following committee action taken on November 29, 2016: recommends be adopted Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 2814."

Speaker Lang: "Chair recognizes Mr. Cavaletto."

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

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Cavaletto: "I'd like to introduce my Page for the day, Mr. Derrick Moore from St. Elmo High School. Just give him a welcome to the Capitol."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you. Mr. Phelps, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Sir."

Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I just want to take the time and wish my L.A. Beth Chapman a very happy birthday today. Beth, happy birthday. I love ya."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Representative. Chair recognizes Representative Williams. For what reason do you rise?"

Williams: "Point of personal privilege, please."

Speaker Lang: "You may proceed."

Williams: "Just wanted to welcome a group that is on the Capitol advocating for real solutions today. It's the Small Business Advisory Council and Greater O'Hare Association Regional

151st Legislative Day

11/29/2016

- Business Association up here in the gallery. Welcome and thank you for being here."
- Speaker Lang: "Welcome to the House chamber. Thank you for being here. Mr. Bennett is recognized. For what reason do you rise, Sir?"
- Bennett: "Thank you, Sir. For a point of personal privilege, if you would."
- Speaker Lang: "You may proceed."
- Bennett: "Thank you. On behalf of the Representative Keith Sommer and myself, I'd like to recognize a Page for the day. Patricia Marton, she's here and we're glad to have you with us today. Can you please help me give her a warm welcome, please."
- Speaker Lang: "Welcome aboard. Thank you for being with us. Mr. Brady is recognized. For what reason do you rise, Sir?"
- Brady: "Point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Lang: "Go right ahead, Sir."
- Brady: "Thank you very much. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, also, I'd like to introduce my Page for the day. From my district in Bloomington, Ean Atkinson, who's an eighth grader at Evans Jr. High, who's accompanied by his father, Richard, up in the gallery. Please welcome them to Springfield."
- Speaker Lang: "Glad to have you with us. Thank you for joining us. Mr. Moffitt is recognized. For what reason do you rise, Sir?"
- Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."
- Moffitt: "I am pleased that we have a former Member of the House, long time Member joining us, Member of the back row by the

151st Legislative Day

11/29/2016

way, now Illinois Director of Agriculture, Raymond Poe. Make him welcome."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Director, thank you for joining us. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Committee Reports. Representative Currie,

Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, reports the
following committee action taken on November 29, 2016:
recommends be adopted Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 2884."

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

Clerk Bolin: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 1481, offered by Representative Davis, W. House Resolution 1482, offered by Representative Durkin. House Resolution 1483, offered by Representative Fine. House Resolution 1484, offered by Representative Harris, G. House Resolution 1486, offered by Representative Butler. House Resolution 1487, offered by Representative Acevedo. House Resolution 1488, offered by Representative Ford. House Resolution 1489, offered by Representative Jackson. House Resolution 1490, offered by Representative Gordon-Booth. House Resolution 1491, offered by Representative Gordon-Booth. House Resolution 1492, offered by Representative Riley. House Resolution 1493, offered by Representative Riley. House Resolution 1495, offered by Representative Hoffman. House Resolution 1496, offered by Representative Bourne. House Resolution 1499, offered by Representative Tryon. House Resolution 1502, offered by Representative Moylan. House Resolution 1505, offered by Representative DeLuca. And House Joint Resolution 166, offered by Representative Sims."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The

151st Legislative Day

11/29/2016

'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. The Chair recognizes Representative Hammond."

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

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Hammond: "Mr. Speaker, I would like all of the Members of the House to join me in welcoming the state champion ladies volleyball from West Prairie, the West Prairie Cyclones. And if I may, the team members are Maggie Torrance, Hunter Griffith, Cora Vyhnanek, Erica Clark, Karlee Herman, Julie Shoemaker, Hannah Davison, Courtney Butterfield, Emily Kitch, Peyton Bowman, Hannah Thompson, Pema Zellmann, Kendra Hopping, Maddie Kieffer, Emily Richardson, Kyah Beck, Julia Huffmier, and their student managers Emily Huffmier, Emily Bartlett, and their head coach, 35 years in the making, Coach Teri Paul, assisted by Caleb Hall and Drew Snyder. Thank you very much. Congratulations."

Speaker Lang: "Congratulations and welcome to the House chamber.

Mr. Clerk, can you put House Resolution 1485 on the board.

This is the... this is the Resolution for Representative Hammond's Motion. Representative Hammond moves for the adoption of the Resolution. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. Congratulations, Ladies. Chair recognizes Representative Fine."

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

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Fine: "I just want to remind the chamber that today is a National Day of Giving. It's Giving Tuesday and you could go to

151st Legislative Day

11/29/2016

illinoisgive.com... Thank you. You can go to illinoisgive.com to find an organization to support today. And Illinois hopes to raise \$9 million in individual donations for nonprofits across the state. So, I hope you'll consider giving on Giving Tuesday. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Representative. Mr. Mitchell is recognized. For what reason do you rise, Sir?"

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

Speaker Lang: "You may proceed."

Mitchell, B.: "Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have, and they're just being seated right now, if they would stand. The folks stand. These are the junior and senior class at the folks from the Lutheran School Association in Decatur, Illinois. So, if everyone would give them a big hand. Welcome to the Capitol."

Speaker Lang: "Glad you're here with us. Thank you for joining us. Mr. Evans is recognized. For what reason do you rise, Sir?"

Evans: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "You may go ahead."

Evans: "As we mentioned a couple of weeks ago, we started a Cancer Caucus for the General Assembly. If you're interested, please come to Room 100 at 4:00 today. It'll be a quick informational meeting where we'll just lay out our plan for the 100th General Assembly's Cancer Caucus. So, any Members interested, if you can't make it, please feel free to send your secretary or staff. Just a quick informational meeting about the 100th General Assembly Cancer Caucus, Room 100, 4 p.m. Thank you."

151st Legislative Day

11/29/2016

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Sir. Mr. Clerk, House Resolution 1498.

Mr. Sommer is recognized."

Sommer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, can I ask for your attention, please. From time to time, we pause to recognize the good things about the State of Illinois and the extraordinary people who serve us. I draw your attention to the Speaker's Gallery where we have members of the Illinois State Police joining us today. This Resolution speaks directly to one trooper, and that is Illinois State Trooper Cynthia Pfau, who is standing on the left as we face the troopers. Cynthia is an extraordinary example of the talented State Police officers we have. She has degrees in Computer Science and Biology. She served in the private sector, but she had a yearning to do more. She understands that law enforcement also is a physical activity. This summer the Texas Police Games took place. Twelve hundred law enforcement officers from around the country were in attendance to compete. This extraordinary woman won gold medals in the triathlon, the 5k race, the 10k race, mountain biking, and sniper/precision rifle competition. Trooper Pfau is assigned to District 8 based in Metamora in Woodford County. She is a member of the Region III Crowd Control Team, a Field Training Officer, and to her passion, a certified Motorcycle Officer. So, come good weather, you may see her on her cycle. She is a no nonsense officer and has a terrific rating with the State Police for arrests. Let me say a few things about those who speak for her or about her. Colleagues who say she always commands respect and has no problem taking hold of a situation. Another comment, she has the best work ethic I've

151st Legislative Day

11/29/2016

ever seen, second to none. Her words, I always think when you pick certain jobs you have to strive to attain a certain degree of fitness and excellence. I want to be able to perform every aspect of my job to the best of my abilities which means basically that you need to be in good shape. We certainly know that to be the case. Standing beside her is her mother-in-law, Rita Wilsdorf, and joining her are also other members of the District 8 State Police. Please, with your warm applause, thank Trooper Pfau for her hard work and also thank all those troopers present and those troopers on the road or in their office today who are working so hard for us in securing the State of Illinois. Thank you, Trooper Pfau. You are extraordinary."

- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sommer moves for the adoption of the Resolution. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. Congratulations, Trooper. Leader Currie is recognized."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. I move to suspend the posting requirements, so that Senate Bill 2950 can be heard in the House Environment Committee, House Bill 5969 in Higher Education, Senate Bill 536 (sic 586) in Revenue & Finance, House Resolution 194 (sic 1494) in State Government, House Resolution 1503 also in State Government Committee. I would be happy to have your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "You heard the Lady's Motion. Is there leave? Seeing no objection, leave is granted. Leader Currie is recognized once again."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. I move to suspend the posting requirements so that House Joint Resolution Constitutional..."

151st Legislative Day

11/29/2016

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks is recognized."

Franks: "If I... I'd like to help the Majority Leader on her Motion.

I would like to move to suspend House Rule 46 and all applicable rules so HJRCA62 may be heard in State Government."

Speaker Lang: "You heard the Gentleman's Motion. Leader Currie."

Currie: "Please amend my Motion to include the same suspension of the same rule for purposes of House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 62. Representative Franks, what will I do without you?"

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."

- Currie: "Apologies, the same House Rule 46 suspended so that we can also hear House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 30 in State Government Administration. I apologize. I had the wrong number in my previous correction."
- Speaker Lang: "You all heard the Motion, well, in various parts you all heard the Motion. Is there leave? There being no objection, leave is granted. On page 3 of the Calendar, under the Order of Total Vetoes, there appears Senate Bill 250, Representative Gabel. Please proceed on your Motion."
- Gabel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to override the veto of Senate Bill 250. So this Bill was passed with 86 votes. It is the Automatic Voter Registration Bill. This is a Bill that will modernize our voter registration in Illinois. It will get more eligible voters on the rolls and make our voting lists more accurate and secure. The Bill was drafted and amended with the input of key stakeholders and has the support of the Office of the Secretary of State, the State Board of Elections. It has the support of county clerks from both

151st Legislative Day

11/29/2016

parties. It was passed with both... from both sides of the aisle. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Fortner on the Motion."

Fortner: "Thank you, Speaker. To the Motion. When we debated this Bill in May, I raised a number of concerns primarily about how the data in this Bill would be managed. It's one thing to say that we have automatic voter registration, a process which many states have implemented and can work well, but for it to be meaningful, voters or potential voters, people who would be eligible to register should have the opportunity to know that if they choose not to register, any personal data related to that is secure and goes no further. In the language in Senate Bill 250, as it relates to this other state agencies if a person opts out, the process ends there. If the language... I'm sorry... if the person comes before an office of the Department of Motor Vehicles, well, it turns out their data doesn't stop there. The law would require their data to be sent on to the State Board of Elections. So, now their data is replicated in another database elsewhere, doubling the security issues and eventually... eventually gets around to a local county clerk sending a postcard asking them to opt out. There's no reason to have to have such a long process when the person can easily just say no right at the Department of Motor Vehicles, the same way they would with any other state agency. That's actually not the only issue. That was one that I spoke on at some length in May. There are other issues. And as one looks at it, and looking at how those other states have done it, and a number of other states have done it, you could do it with something as easy as put a check box on the

151st Legislative Day

11/29/2016

form when they're at the Department of Motor Vehicles and say check box. In fact a check box would be a really good thing because Federal Law requires that the voter attest that they are eligible to register. They can do that all in the same... in the same shot. We can make this process better. And to that end, I have worked with staff, with Leader Durkin, and we put together House Bill 6627, which embodies the Governor's comments in his Veto message. I'm not going to read all of those comments. He goes into more detail on some of these other provisions where this Bill could be made to work better, could be made to work the way it is working now in other states. This election has passed. Any urgency that we had going into this November election, we don't have that same urgency right now. We have time to get this Bill right, either by taking up 6627, or let's work together to clean up the language in Senate Bill 250 and make it a good process for automatic voter registration. So to that end, I encourage a 'no' vote to sustain the Governor's Veto."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sullivan."

I voted for this Bill to start with. It was very complicated back when we were voting on this. Some of the things that we didn't know the unintended consequences. Certainly, all of us want to make it easier for people to vote, for more people to participate in what we're trying to do as a nation. But, we didn't make it right. And that's what the previous speaker is telling us is we didn't make right. We can do it better. And so while I voted for the Bill before, I think they've embodied the spirit of this Bill, added to it by saying, hey, if you

151st Legislative Day

11/29/2016

don't want to opt into this voter registration, you can check a box. Some people might want to do that. Wouldn't we want the voter or the… our constituent on the front end knowing what they're doing as opposed to going through the process of trying to get out of the database. That's what this does. This expands to other agencies that it… that you can go and opt into this program. I think, in the rush of the end of the session, we didn't get it right. Let's get it right now. Let's put this Bill to bed. Please vote 'no' on the override. And we can take up the Bill that the previous speaker has worked diligently on, and we can move forward with really good voter registration done the correct way. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ammons."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. This Bill is a Ammons: fundamental Bill. It's a Bill that has its present and its implications. This Bill quarantees for all unabridged right to vote in the State of Illinois. I find it ironic, and perhaps I should not, that people on the other side of the aisle who voted in support on a bipartisan measure on the Automatic Voter Registration Bill, to reverse their vote at this time should not surprise us. But the reversal of this vote really sends two messages to the public. One is consistent in what we saw in the electoral cycle this time of the rampant voter suppression supported by our Republican Leadership in this country, and two, the desire to deny people the right to vote, not to increase the franchise, but to reduce it. And so to vote against the AVR, that the Governor was directly opposed to because he's concerned about his own reelection, really sends the message to people that the

151st Legislative Day

11/29/2016

support of voter suppression in the State of Illinois will be upheld by certain Members of this House. And so, I am concerned and encouraging those who voted for it once to vote for it again because it is the right thing to do. Don't play data semantics on this Bill because this Bill really is a fundamental, simple Bill. Should everyone automatically have the right to vote in the State of Illinois, and should that be streamlined so that everyone's registered at every potential point? That is truly the question on this Bill. And I ask for people to vote 'yes' on the Veto overturn of this Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Demmer."

Demmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. The previous speaker made a number of allegations about the motives behind individuals who plan to vote 'no' today. I think our... the colleague to my right rightfully summed this up and said that many of us voted 'yes' originally because we were open to this concept. In fact, during debate on the floor, I stood and said I think this Bill is a step in the right direction, but I don't think it's there yet. I don't think it's ready yet. I called for an Amendatory Veto. We talked about some of the weaknesses that exist in the Bill as it's written today. Voter registration is open: it's open today as it's open every day of the year. What we're talking about here is not the ability for somebody who's entitled to vote to register. What we're talking about is what's the process look like, what steps do state agencies have to go through? What added requirements are we going to place... at the point of contact in state agencies, what added stress might we place on the

151st Legislative Day

11/29/2016

state's data systems? What kind of privacy protections do we have in place for individuals who choose to register to vote or to choose not to register to vote? We're not talking about the idea of voter suppression like it's been thrown around. We're talking about making sure that with a program as broad and as ambitious as Automatic Voter Registration, that we get the process right. We have a proposal. We have offered an alternative. We've offered an alternative we think is better, we think addresses those problems that we talked about in May and that we talk about again here today on the floor. So it's wrong to categorize the opposition to a specific piece of legislation and make accusations about what the underlying motives are. Rather, look at the positive, proactive solutions that we've offered, and let's take the time that we have now, the time that we have between today and when the next election takes place, let's take that time to make sure we get it right. That's why we'll vote 'no' today on this Motion to override. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reis."

Reis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Should this Bill get the requisite number of votes, I call for a verification."

Speaker Lang: "Your request is acknowledged, Sir. Mr. Franks."

Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to speak to the Bill.

We've often heard that we shouldn't sacrifice the good for
the perfect and we oftentimes here will pass a Bill and if it
needs to be fixed we can do a trailer Bill. I've never been
so confident that we need to pass this Bill today. Let me
tell you what happened during this last election a few weeks
ago in McHenry County. I was working outside of a voting

151st Legislative Day

11/29/2016

booth... greeting voters as they were coming in and tried to be removed three separate times. I was 300 feet away from the entrance and they said, well, this is private property and we'd like you to leave. I'm like ... well it may be private property every other day of the year, but on Election Day, if you choose to be a voting place, it's now a public place. It was clear that the judges didn't know the rules and they wanted us to leave, for whatever reason. But what I saw, 'cause I was there for almost 12 hours, at the voting booth... at the voting place, and I saw a number of people who were turned away to vote, who were told to get their documents, that were sent away, and every person in every instance that was turned away was a person of color. I ended up calling the election authorities to have them come to the polling place to escort one young lady, who was in tears, because she was not allowed to vote. They brought her in and spoke to the judges and laid down the law. And this lady was able to vote. But there were others that weren't. And it was clear that this was done for voter suppression, at least in my mind. We have an affirmative obligation to make voting accessible and easy. We have the greatest democracy on earth, but if it doesn't function, and it disqualifies and disenfranchises people, that's not what this country was founded on. We have an obligation to make it so everyone can register and to vote. I would encourage those who are thinking of not following their previous vote to instead vote for this to allow it to pass today, and if there are some tweaks you'd like for it to come forward, you can file a trailer Bill. But my concern is if you kill it today that we will never, never fix this issue.

151st Legislative Day

11/29/2016

So look at the long-term ramifications for our democracy and not the short-term political ramifications. Vote 'aye' on this Bill. And if you want to fix it, file a trailer Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Chapa LaVia."

Chapa LaVia: "Thank you, Speaker. You look very nice today. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Chapa LaVia: "How did you bring upon this Bill? What happened? What was the genesis of it?"

Gabel: "Automatic Voter Registration?"

Chapa LaVia: "In your district. Yeah, in your district. Was there an incident or was there an issue that you had with the clerk's office? What was... why was this brought to you?"

Gabel: "No, not that I... I mean, it's a long time issue that we know that there are over 2 million people who are eligible to vote who are not registered. And the essence of this Bill is to modernize our voter registration system, to use the new data systems that we have, instead of our system back from the 1950s, to be able to allow people to register to vote easily."

Chapa LaVia: "Okay. So, this has been an issue that's gone on for years and years, and most of the time, Illinois does things to correct issues so we can have more of a democracy represented at the polls, correct?"

Gabel: "Correct."

Chapa LaVia: "Okay. Listen, I think this is common sense. I think we should all vote to veto override this Bill. Plus, there's so many things going on in this country right now as far as voter fraud, rejection, telling people that they're out of

151st Legislative Day

11/29/2016

the system, they go see someone else, they get kicked around to another location, and you know. And it is our...it is a privilege to vote in this country, but also people died to give us this privilege. We should stand on the foundation to make sure that Bills like this are seen to get into statute and rerepresent the entire community in the State of Illinois. I think we should also look at issues with the voter machines. I think there's a lot of issues throughout this country as you see this last election cycle on how the popular vote was won by one person and the Electoral College was selected by the other. I think we should probably dive deeper. I think this is a great piece of legislation, but I think we really need to keep an eye on the ball on clean elections, fair elections throughout our country, and definitely in the State of Illinois. And I hope that you will see fit to override the Governor's Veto as well. Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Welch."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Welch: "All right. First of all, Representative, I want to thank you for bringing this important piece of legislation back, but I'm just a little confused as to why it's here in the first place. I'm looking at the analysis, and there are several proponents listed. Were there, or are there, opponents to the Bill right now?"

Gabel: "Not that I know of."

Welch: "So, the only person that you're aware of that's opposed

is the Governor?"

Gabel: "Correct."

151st Legislative Day

11/29/2016

Welch: "Did the Governor even reach out to you to..."

Gabel: "He did. And there were discussions. The advocates... there were many discussions with the Governor's Office. And the final... and at the end, the Governor's final proposal was 1) that he wanted the Bill to be effective after 2018. He wanted it to be effective 2019. And 2) he wanted the Bill to be an opt in rather than an opt out. The essence of the Bill is that it's an opt out. That people would... the data would automatically be transferred, and people would have an opportunity to opt out later so that. So that... and the reason that we didn't want to move the date over to 2019 is because we'd already moved it a year and we had worked with all of the departments and the departments said that it was totally doable to have the effective date in 2017."

Welch: "So, if I understand what you just said correctly, the Governor would want this to take effect after the next Governor's election? Is that..."

Gabel: "Correct."

Welch: "...is that correct? So, there were 86 votes on this Bill for passage in May which means it had strong bipartisan support. Have you heard from anyone on the other side of the aisle, before today, why they're going to change their vote?"

Gabel: "Well, I do know that they filed a Bill, but I... nobody has spoken to me about it."

Welch: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 250 was a good Bill then, it is a good Bill now. I think the fact that we are trying to increase voter participation and not suppress it is important. It's noble and I think the fact that 86 of us supported this initiative in the first place, 86 of us at

151st Legislative Day

11/29/2016

least should support it today. I would ask that we vote to concur with the Motion to override the Governor's Veto."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

Ives: "I call the previous question."

Speaker Lang: "Lady moves to call the previous question. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the previous question is called. Representative Gabel to close."

Gabel: "So, as my colleagues have said, this was a good Bill then, it's a good Bill now. It will modernize the voter registration; it will make our voting lists more accurate, and more secure, and it will really enfranchise many, many, many people. There are a number of departments that already do data sharing and what this Bill would do is just make it easier and more secure. I think that as we've heard, there have been issues with voter suppression. This is a good Bill to make sure that we get all the people who are eligible registered to vote and I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "The Lady's moved to override the Total Veto of the Governor. Those in favor of the Lady's Motions... excuse me. Ladies and Gentlemen, Mr. Reis has asked for a verification. Members will be in their chairs and vote their own switches. This Bill requires 71 votes. This Motion requires 71 votes. Those in favor of the Lady's Motion will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves, Members. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 67 voting 'yes', 47 voting 'no'. Mr. Reis, do you withdraw? Mr. Reis withdraws. This Bill, having

151st Legislative Day

11/29/2016

failed to receive the necessary Majority, the Motion fails. Chair recognizes Mr. Mitchell.

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

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Sir."

Mitchell, B.: "In the balcony right behind me, there's a Gentleman you might know. He is Ed Cross who is the reporter for the local Decatur T.V. station and for the last number of years has done a great job. I just heard he is now leaving WAND and going to be Director of Government Communications for the Department of Natural Resources. So, we all wish Ed well in his new experience."

Speaker Lang: "Congratulations. Mr. Sullivan, for what reason do you rise, Sir?"

Sullivan: "I rise for a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Sullivan: "Behind me to my right is some special people in my life that have come down to see me in my... what might be my last week in the General Assembly. My wife Trish, my mother and father. My mother likes to... when she was working at the library, she would turn on the General Assembly to watch all of us. She has one request though, that when the Bill is called, we can put up the board so that she can see how the vote went down, other than listening to Lou's voice. So, if you could all give a good welcome to my family that's down here for the week."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome. Thanks for joining us. And what's wrong with Lou's voice? Page 5 of the Calendar, under Total Vetoes, appears Senate Bill 2439, Mr. Zalewski. Out of the record.

151st Legislative Day

11/29/2016

Senate Bill 2536, Representative Ammons. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2767, Mr. Mitchell. Is Mr. Mitchell in the chamber? Out of the record. Senate Bill 2931, Representative Harper. Out of the record. Page 6 of the Calendar, House Resolution 1269, Mr. Phelps."

- Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Can I have House Resolution 1269. All I'm trying to do is just... I think Representative Butler will know about this. I got the Shawnee National Forest in my district and I'm just wanting the Forest Service just to look at opportunities because when I have horses that come down and ATVs they spend a lot of money, it's a big revenue generator for my district. I just want them to look at it. I think there's enough room for everybody in the Shawnee National Forest. I don't want to do anything to disrupt it. I just want to be able to use it 'cause I think there's enough room for everybody. And I just urge an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution will say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. Page 5 of the Calendar, under Amendatory Vetoes appears Senate Bill 2964, Mr. Hoffman. Please proceed on your Motion, Sir."
- Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to override the Amendatory Veto of Senate Bill 2964. As you know, this Bill passed with bipartisan support. And what it would do is, it would set a procedure in place to ensure that the prevailing wage is paid in the State of Illinois and ensure that the calculation of the prevailing wage follows long-standing precedent and that it would follow

151st Legislative Day

11/29/2016

the negotiations of a collective bargaining agreement. I believe that this would ensure that individuals who work on public works projects in Illinois receive adequate compensation. It would take out any question as to what is the prevailing wage and it would ensure that good, qualified people do the work on public works projects. I ask that the Governor's Veto be overridden."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Cloonen."

Cloonen: "On this Bill, what a lot of people don't understand is that when companies pay workers so low that it's not a living wage then those workers have to go apply for state assistance. So in essence, the state is supporting and subsidizing those companies and corporations which don't pay a living wage. Take for example a big box store. When someone goes to work at a big box store, they teach them how to go on public assistance and that's wrong. We need to vote to override this. And we need to make sure that we are paying a good, living, decent wage with benefits to those who do work for the State of Illinois."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Kay."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Kay: "Thank you. Representative Hoffman, I'm not sure I remember all the details of this Bill and I did not read the Governor's notes with respect to his Veto. Can you refresh my memory as to what the Governor said?"

Hoffman: "Well, I can tell you what the Bill did. The Bill would amend the prevailing wage and it would not... it indicates the prevailing should not be less than the rate for similar work

151st Legislative Day

11/29/2016

performed by the locality under a collective bargaining agreement, between the employers and the bona fide labor organization. If no such collective bargaining agreement would exist in a locality, the Department of Labor would determine the prevailing wage rate and benefits for each labor classification. Local governments would not be able to opt out prevailing wage and would no longer ascertain the prevailing wage for their locality. It would require all prevailing wage rates be posted on the department's website as opposed to a nonelectronic posting."

Kay: "Okay. That didn't answer my question though. What did the
Governor have to say with respect to the Veto of your Bill?"

Hoffman: "It's my understanding, although I can't... for whatever reason, I can't find it on my computer."

Kav: "I can't either."

Hoffman: "It's my understanding that the Governor's Veto...

Amendatory Veto would have changed the process of determining how the prevailing wage would be determined. Under this Bill, it would be determined under an agreement between employers and a bona fide labor organization which has been the long-standing practice. He would have said, and I'm paraphrasing, that we would not be able to use that practice in order to determine the prevailing wage."

Kay: "And did he suggest a different methodology?"

Hoffman: "I believe that the methodology he suggested was that the Department of Labor would send out surveys, and then those surveys would come back and they would then set the prevailing wage."

151st Legislative Day

11/29/2016

- Kay: "Okay. And so, what do you find disagreeable with the option
 that the Governor provided?"
- Hoffman: "Well, first of all, I'm a proponent of the prevailing wage. And it has been long-standing practice, so that there was never any doubt as to what the prevailing wage was, that we would accept the collective bargaining agreements between organized labor and the employer. If indeed, there is at least 30 percent of the laborers working, or the mechanics working of the same trade or occupation, if that was in place then we would accept the long-standing practice of the Department of Labor which would be accepting the agreement of a collective bargaining agreement. That was a long-standing practice under both Republican and Democratic Governors. And I believe that's a more stable way of determining prevailing wage. And I think that, unfortunately, the Governor's actions would reduce the prevailing wage in areas like ours."
- Kay: "Okay. So, do I understand it correctly... Speaker, I'm having a little bit... I think Jay's having to yell and I'm having to yell. So is it my understanding, Jay, that if there is a contract that has to do with public funds and public projects that within that contract there must be built in a prevailing wage?"
- Hoffman: "Any public works project in the State of Illinois, generally, is subject to the prevailing wage laws."
- Kay: "So, the answer to my question though is, if there's a contract, in that contract, a prevailing wage must be cited, must be used?"
- Hoffman: "Well, I don't want to confuse two different things. I'm trying to understand. First of all, there is a contract, a

151st Legislative Day

11/29/2016

collective bargaining agreement, that in a given area, any particular trade will work for a wage, a pension, sick leave, benefits, that type of thing. That's in a contract between the employer groups and the labor union. Then, if there is a public works project, the general contractor or the subcontractors must pay that prevailing wage in that given area."

Kay: "So the prevailing wage is, as I understand your answer, is the prevailing wage would be separate from the contract. Is that correct?"

Hoffman: "I think the con... I believe that under Illinois law, the prevailing wage must be paid and the Department of Labor will establish what that prevailing wage is in any given area. What had previously happened, and was long-standing practice and what this Bill would codify, is that the prevailing wage determination by the Department of Labor would be based upon a collective bargaining agreement for any given trade in any given area."

Kay: "And what you object to then is the fact that the Department of Labor would make the determination as opposed to some other principals or parties?"

Hoffman: "No, I don't object to that. I object to the process of using surveys and not using collective bargaining agreements as a process for determining the prevailing wage."

Kay: "Why is that?"

Hoffman: "Because I believe the long-standing practice has served us well. And I think that the surveys will actually result in a lower prevailing wage than what actually exists."

151st Legislative Day

11/29/2016

Kay: "Thank you, Representative. I would encourage everyone to think twice about how they vote on this Bill. We are having an extraordinarily hard time in this state finding resources to do work. And I'm talking about all kinds of work. What the Representative's suggesting today is that we pay the highest price, not a competitive price. And the truth of the matter is, you can get a competitive price and you can get it for the same quality of work. It's a mistake to lock yourself in, whether it's contractually or by a contractual labor agreement, to the prevailing wage. Many, many cities no longer can afford to do work because of prevailing wage. Many counties can't afford to do work because of prevailing wage. wrong concept. It's anticompetitive, а antibusiness. And I ask you to vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Wallace."

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

Speaker Lang: "The Sponsor yields."

Wallace: "Thank you. Thank you for bringing this legislation forward. I would like to start with that. But can you explain a little bit more about how the wage will be set, since there seems to be so much concern about local control over that?"

Hoffman: "Yes. The prevailing wage will be set, and it will be based on a collective bargaining agreement between a labor organization and employer groups in any given area. So, the prevailing wage in my area may be different than the prevailing wage in your area because those collective bargaining agreements may be different with regard to the wage rate. So, prevailing wage is actually a concept that was passed by Republicans. Republicans Davis and Bacon sponsored

151st Legislative Day

11/29/2016

the Federal Davis-Bacon Prevailing Wage Act in 1931. And the whole idea behind a prevailing wage is that it's going to be the priority of the State of Illinois as well as the Federal Government to pay a living wage, a decent wage to people who do public works projects."

Wallace: "Okay. So then based upon that answer, is the note to the Veto accurate? Because it seems as if the Governor has stated that it would take away from local authority and ability to set the prevailing wage for that area, but based upon what you just stated, the mitigating factors surrounding the organized bodies in that geographic region and the collective bargaining agreements that go along with that geographic region and then what pretty much would account for cost of living in that geographic region would all be taken into account even with this legislation."

Hoffman: "Yes. That's correct and your point is well taken. This would be collective bargaining agreements in regions of the state. That's what's done currently. And actually, it is more reflective of actually what the prevailing wage would be as opposed to some random survey that would be conducted by the department."

Wallace: "Well, I want to say thank you, again, Mr. Hoffman, for bringing this legislation forward. I do think that it is...

I'll go to the Bill. I do think it is a mistake for us to not attempt to override this, for us to not put votes on this. As the Representative from Kankakee noted, there are many, many obstacles in the way for working families and their ability to actually be able to provide for themselves without public assistance. Many know that I've continuously talked about

151st Legislative Day

11/29/2016

that point and I think a key factor in making sure that people are able to do so, provide for their families without public assistance, is to have a decent and living wage. Prevailing wage is one way to accomplish that. It allows for workers to be able to do what they need to do. Especially, if we consider that fact that since about 1970, our earned wages have not really changed much. We have not kept up with inflation or worker productivity in about 40-some odd years. Where at one point minimum wage was able to sustain a family, that is no longer the case. Prevailing wage is just one way for our members of organized labor to be able to do so, be able to provide for their families. I think that it is... it would definitely be a travesty if we're not able to override this particular Veto and it sends the message that as a Body we do not care about the workers in our state. So, I do encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ives: "So, I was just wondering. Representative Hoffman, could you explain to me a little bit... in more detail how this would work? So, if I had a collective bargaining agreement, let's say, in the DuPage area. So maybe Wheaton has one, Naperville, Carol Stream, they all have their own collective bargaining agreement. Who... where would you get the prevailing wage rate from? Which collective bargaining agreement would you get it from?"

Hoffman: "It's based on a specific industry. After negotiations and collective bargaining agreements are signed, setting the

151st Legislative Day

11/29/2016

wages and fringe benefits, as well as work rules that must be followed. This is an industry rate that we would be following. In fact, these rates are required to be paid on all projects, regardless of whether there is public or private money involved because prevailing wage has been a bipartisan effort for over 83 years."

Ives: "Okay. Now can you answer my question?"

Hoffman: "I did."

Ives: "Which collective bargaining agreement would then become
 the prevailing wage rate?"

Hoffman: "It would depen..."

Ives: "Or is Wheaton going to have a different prevailing wage rate than Carol Stream, than Winfield, than, you know, Bolingbrook, than whoever? Are they all going to have a different prevailing wage rate within their small city limits?"

Hoffman: "So, the laborers would have a prevailing wage... would have a collective bargaining agreement. That collective bargaining agreement in, for instance, the DuPage building trades area, would say they would get paid a certain amount of money, okay? The cement finishers, same thing. The operating engineers, the teamsters, the people who build things and the building trades will have a collective bargaining agreement between a multiemployer group and their organization. That is a collective bargaining agreement in the construction trades. I think you're confusing things. I think what you're talking about are people who possibly work for Carol Stream, or for the county. We're talking about the

151st Legislative Day

11/29/2016

building and construction trades who are going to build these projects."

Ives: "So is that... so why are you only using that type of a collective bargaining group... rate and not one that came from a public sector collective bargaining agreement?"

Hoffman: "Because they're the ones who build and that's what the project… excuse me… that's what prevailing wage deals with, projects that are being built by governmental entities."

Ives: "And government is also doing some of the maintenance, some of the other things. You have electricians, you have maintenance workers, all the same. They're under a different collective bargaining, why are they not included also in the determination of a prevailing wage rate?"

Hoffman: "Because the long-standing practice in Illinois has been the one that I described and it's served us well."

Ives: "Okay. No further questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Under the Governor's Veto message, Amendatory Veto message, he talks about previous case law in Bradley v. Casey before the Illinois Supreme Court. And in Bradley v. Casey and I'm going to read you directly from the court, defining wages under a collective bargaining agreement as the prevailing wage, rate of wages, in a given locality, is invalid for the reason that it delegates a discretionary power to private parties and that it intends to be too restrictive and discriminatory in defining that to be fact, which is not a fact. Upon close analysis, it can be seen that this amendment permits the fixing of the standard, rather than finding or ascertaining

151st Legislative Day

11/29/2016

to the existing fact. This amendment, then being vulnerable to the foregoing criticism is clearly unconstitutional. What they're saying is, you're taking away local control. That is the whole process. One of the previous speakers on that side said how does this effect local control? Well, you no longer have local control. What is controlling the rates of prevailing wage are collective bargaining agreements now. That has been declared unconstitutional by the Illinois Supreme Court. It will be found unconstitutional again. This is a futile exercise that we are trying to do right now and it takes away local control. So, all of us that have always talked about local control of what goes on in our communities should be opposed to this just like the previous speaker. So for that reason, I urge you to reject this and uphold the Governor's Amendatory Veto."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Breen: "Representative, I did want to get, lawyer to lawyer, what... what exactly is the thought?"

Hoffman: "I'm sorry. Someone was... someone was chastising my legal abilities behind me."

Breen: "All right. What is the real answer here to clear controlling case law from the Illinois Supreme Court? I mean, has there been some countervailing precedent since then or what?

Hoffman: "I don't believe that the indication that this was held unconstitutional was correct. In fact, the practice of public bodies almost always adopts the department's prevailing wage.

151st Legislative Day

11/29/2016

In a few cases that a public body chose not to adopt the department's rates, or attempted to ascertain the local prevailing wage rates independently, that determination was unsuc... was successfully challenged. And I would just point you to the case of Bernardi v. City of Highland Park, and Pavlis v. City of Naperville and I can provide you with those sites."

Breen: "What courts were those out of? Was it the Appellate Court, the Supreme Court?"

Hoffman: "It's the Circuit Court of Will County."

Breen: "A Circuit Court of Will County, but I mean, that... okay.

I mean, I need to... have you got..."

Hoffman: "I'll point to one more thing. The Bill prohibits a public body from opting out of provisions of the prevailing wage requirements stating that compliance is a matter of statewide concern consistent with current law, which is the City of Highland Park case, which was before the Illinois Supreme Court."

Breen: "On the opt out? Now what is the expected impact on the prevailing wage, if your Bill were to be adopted?"

Hoffman: "Well, if we overrode the Amendatory Veto, it would... it would then make the Bill law because it's already been overridden in the Senate. I don't believe there would be any significant impact on previous administration practices. And that previous administration practices are basically adopted in this Bill, in that a collective bargaining agreement between a labor organization and an employer group would be the prevailing wage in a given area.

151st Legislative Day

11/29/2016

Breen: "And why, again, was the local government preempted and entirely taken out of this and all of the power aggregated up in the Department of Labor?"

Hoffman: "Well, it's my belief that we should be consistent with a statewide policy. It's also my belief that prevailing wage should be paid on public projects. That we should, as Representative Wallace indicated, have a policy in the State of Illinois that we're going to protect the middle class. That if public money is going to be used, that we're going to pay an adequate wage for the people who build it. That's the policy determination and that's what's contained in this Bill."

Breen: "All right. To the Bill. I agree with Representative Hoffman on one thing, which is that we ought to pay a fair wage. The problem is this Bill is not the way to do it. This Bill, first off, is going to get struck down. It's unconstitutional. There's been no countervailing case law since the time of the Supreme Court so ruling. But as well it is an aggregation of power to the state at a time when we have seen the State of Illinois can't seem to run anything correctly. So, really, it's not a good policy and not a good precedent to set from that perspective. As well, I think necessarily the whole point of this is to increase the prevailing wage and at this time when we can't pay our bills, we can't get anything done appropriately, that is the wrong policy for the state. Would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wheeler."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

151st Legislative Day

11/29/2016

- Wheeler, K.: "Jay, I was listening to your comments earlier, and you mentioned in those comments that the Department of Labor will be determining the prevailing wage. Is that an accurate characterization of your comment?"
- Hoffman: "They wouldn't be determining it. They wouldn't be determining it, they would be accepting the collective bargaining agreement."
- Wheeler, K.: "So, okay. So, now it'd be the local collective bargaining agreement that would be determining the prevailing wage?"
- Hoffman: "They would determine it if there was no collective bargaining agreement in place. If it didn't exist, or if I believe, under 30 percent of the laborers working are mechanics in the same trade or occupation in the locality. If it's less than 30 percent, then they would also be determining it."
- Wheeler, K.: "Okay. So, if 69 percent of the workers in a particular area are not under the collective bargaining agreement, then the prevailing wage would not be determined by what they're getting paid, it'd be... rather be determined by what the collective bargaining agreement says. Is that accurate?"
- Hoffman: "Again, if employers employ at least 30 percent of the laborers, workers, or mechanics in the same trade or occupation in the locality, if it is less than 30 percent then the Department of Labor would not have to file the collective bargaining agreement."
- Wheeler, K.: "Okay. So, let me get this story right. Sixty-nine percent of the workers could be not under the collective

151st Legislative Day

11/29/2016

bargaining agreement and still be then affected by the prevailing wage rate based on the collective bargaining agreement itself? Just turning the numbers around is all I'm doing, Jay."

Hoffman: "I think it might be... Yeah, I think you're right."

Wheeler, K.: "Okay."

Hoffman: "You're turning it the other way. I got it."

Wheeler, K.: "I am. It's showing you a larger number. So at the same time, you're saying it's by trade, correct? It's by each industry trade group?"

Hoffman: "Yes."

Wheeler, K.: "So, if I've got a large concentration of operating engineers, but a very low concentration of concrete workers, then... This is aggregate or is it by trade for each one of the collective bargaining groups... or for the prevailing wage, at the threshold?"

Hoffman: "It's by trade... it's by trade. The laborers, workers, or mechanics in the same trade or occupation in the locality. So it is by trade."

Wheeler, K.: "Okay. So, in some case... in my example I brought for a reason, Jay, was that if you have one area where you've got 69 percent of a certain group, then it's going to be the CBA is going to dictate the prevailing wage. If it's 71 percent, then the local actual surveyed rate would be the one that would be used for that particular trade."

Hoffman: "Well, it'd be set by the Department of Labor. The Department of Labor could follow their longstanding practice.

I guess it would be who was in control of the Department of Labor at the time and they could also accept the trade that

151st Legislative Day

11/29/2016

- has fewer than 30 percent collective bargaining agreement. That would be up to them."
- Wheeler, K.: "Okay. I'm just trying to understand the mechanics of what you're getting at here. You mentioned also that the... that you thought that the survey process that's been proposed would propose... would actually generate a lower prevailing wage rate. Is that also right?"
- Hoffman: "Well, I was... I was told by union contractors in my area, they had not been surveyed. Now, whether that's changed since I passed the Bill originally, I can't talk to that. But at the time when the Bill was originally passed, it seemed to me that the survey wasn't going out to all of the contractors. It wasn't going to the union contractors and some were being missed; therefore, it could potentially result in a lower prevailing wage."
- Wheeler, K.: "But wouldn't all the union contractors be under the CBA, they don't need to be surveyed? We already know that wage rate?"
- Hoffman: "I don't know that they're taking a look at that. They
 haven't told me they are. The Department of Labor, you mean?"
 Wheeler, K.: "Yeah."
- Hoffman: "Yeah. I don't... I don't know what they're... I don't believe that they're doing via survey."
- Wheeler, K.: "Well, that's what I mean. The survey wouldn't necessarily need to be surveying the union contractors 'cause theirs is already published. So to me this, again, goes to the point that the survey may actually have value when determining a more accurate prevailing wage, as been proposed. I got a call, Jay, from my mayor who's concerned

151st Legislative Day

11/29/2016

about the local control issue. Currently, the villages and townships adopt their own prevailing wage rate. And you're saying this would be entirely usurped by the Department of Labor now. Is that also accurate?"

Hoffman: "I apologize."

Wheeler, K.: "It's hard to hear."

Hoffman: "Go ahead. Could you restate your question?"

Wheeler, K.: "Sure. Happy to. My mayor is asking about the local control issue. Currently, local units of government, townships, cities, counties, adopt their own prevailing wage rate. That would be removed in the current version of this Bill, right?

Hoffman: "It's my understanding that currently they do and they certify to the DOL and DOL publishes it, but in a few cases the public body chose not to adopt the department's rates, which they have published, or attempted to ascertain their own local prevailing wage rates independently, that determination was successfully challenged. So, if they had tried to do it on their own, different from what the Department of Labor had published, then it has been challenged and they had to pay the prevailing wage rate that the department has published."

Wheeler, K.: "Fine. So, then, Jay, is it the... the local control issue is going to be removed. We're not going to survey any of the nonunion or union workers, or workers who are not under a collective bargaining agreement with this proposal, unless it's under 30 percent CBA, right?"

Hoffman: "Okay. What we're doing, is we're saying that if a trade, in a given area has at least 30 percent of... has over 30

151st Legislative Day

- percent of an individual workforce, building things in that area, that we would use a collective bargaining agreement for that particular trade as the prevailing wage."
- Wheeler, K.: "Is that then determined by... what region, Jay, 'cause I'm confused about how... what region are we talking about? Is it the region that's covered by the collective bargaining agreement or is it covered by a county line? Or what's the regional aspect of this?"
- Hoffman: "It's my understanding that it would be the region of a given collective bargaining agreement. So, the jurisdictional issues are between the employers and the union of the… each individual trade, whether it's the laborers, the operating engineers, they have their own jurisdiction. So, those given jurisdictions, even within some of those locals, may have different collective bargaining agreements within a given local jurisdiction."
- Wheeler, K.: "Well, that's..."
- Hoffman: "So, wherever... wherever that collective bargaining agreement is in place, that would be the jurisdiction."
- Wheeler, K.: "So, you're talking about the lines that are not drawn by government, State Government, or local government, these lines are being drawn by the union management, as to how those locals are... or how those rates are determined for a particular area?"
- Hoffman: "Determination of the... under this Bill, the determination of the prevailing wage would be a result of the collective bargaining agreement."
- Wheeler, K.: "Right."

151st Legislative Day

11/29/2016

- Hoffman: "So, let's give you an example. If the operating engineers in my area, whatever area that they cover, it's Operating Engineers 520, whatever that collective bargaining agreement would be for their wages, would be in any locality that fits within their jurisdiction. Outside of their jurisdiction, it would be another local's collective bargaining agreement."
- Wheeler, K.: "Right. So, I'm just reiterating the fact that the lines drawn by the unions are going to determine this, not like our city currently has a boundary that's determined by the city, it's going to be determined by that fact that we have one prevailing wage rate for our city. Now it's going to be, if there's two unions, two locals within our local area, we're going to have two different prevailing wage rates within our own village."
- Hoffman: "It's my understanding it's always been done by trades." Wheeler, K.: "Well, I'm just talking about the fact that when you adopt, like for the, let's say its DuPage County like was mentioned earlier. There's probably more than one local in DuPage County, for any given trade. Well, except for 150."
- Hoffman: "No, they won't overlap. The construction trades will not overlap. No."
- Wheeler, K.: "Well, not overlap. I'm saying there's more than one local within a particular county jurisdiction."

Hoffman: "It could be, yes."

Wheeler, K.: "That's what I'm saying. So if ...

Hoffman: "But... but see, most of the time they'll be... so like in my area, the laborers."

Wheeler, K.: "Right."

151st Legislative Day

11/29/2016

Hoffman: "The Laborers District Council, which is, I believe 13 counties, they'll come up and they will do the collective bargaining basically on behalf of the construction trades with the employer group. With... not on behalf of the construction trades, on behalf of the laborers, part of the construction trades."

Wheeler, K.: "Got ya. All right. I wanted to just understand that these... there are just two parts that are changing here, the way I see it, Jay. One is they're changing how we're determining the prevailing wage and the other is where the prevailing wage is going to be determined. Because it's not by, necessarily my city, which may straddle county lines, it's going to be based on whatever the union local geographic regions are set by."

Hoffman: "No, I don't believe that's the case. I think it would be basically codifying what has been the longstanding practice of the Department of Labor. But, this administration wants to change it by doing surveys as opposed to accepting the longstanding practice of the collective bargaining agreements."

Wheeler, K.: "Well, I think that's..."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wheeler."

Wheeler, K.: "Yes, Sir?"

Speaker Lang: "You've had the microphone for some time. Could you bring your remarks to a close, Sir?"

Wheeler, K.: "I'll go to the Bill, then. I appreciate the Representative bringing the Bill forward and the discussion we've had multiple times on this. My experience with this as a young person who grew up in a union household, as a union

151st Legislative Day

11/29/2016

worker, and ultimately as part of a management team at a union contracting firm, we were competitive regardless of what the prevailing wage was because we competed against nonunion companies and won regularly. So, I think that could hold true at the same level with this situation in government projects as well as it does in the private sector. Therefore, I urge a vote to sus... not to override the Veto. And I request a verification, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Your request is acknowledged, Sir. Mr. Batinick."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Batinick: "I will be very brief, compared to my neighbor over here. Couple quick questions. How is prevailing wage calculated in other states?"

Hoffman: "Well, this one would be based off of, I believe, the New York model. How it is done in other states, it varies from state to state. I know that the whole idea of prevailing wage started under the Davis-Bacon Act of 1931 and then it spread to the states."

Batinick: "I'm glad that you brought up the Davis-Bacon Act of 1931 'cause that's my next question. And that is, when it was originally started, how was it intended to be set up?"

Hoffman: "I have a better answer to your first question."

Batinick: "Okay."

Hoffman: "Okay. The 30 percent threshold proposed is similar to New York's prevailing wage law. Other states that expressly rely on collective bargaining agreements to determine the prevailing wage rate include California, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Jersey and New Mexico."

151st Legislative Day

11/29/2016

Batinick: "So, about seven states?"

Hoffman: "That are on my analysis."

Batinick: "Okay. Do you know how many states have a threshold for prevailing wage or had? I'm sorry. Do you know how many states have no threshold for prevailing wage?"

Hoffman: "I don't know that. I don't."

Batinick: "Okay. It's a small number. We happen to be one of them. In 1931, the Davis-Bacon Act, how did they determine the prevailing wage back then when the… the Bill's original intent?"

Hoffman: "That's a good question. I wasn't around in 1931. I know
I look like I may have been around in 1931."

"You reference it. Here's the point. The prevailing Batinick: wage should be the prevailing wage. I think this is an over distortion of the market. It especially hurts small counties and municipalities that maybe have one employer in the county, like a lot of our universities fall under this scenario where they're paying wages that far and above exceed anything that happens in the private sector. I strongly support a prevailing wage. I think simply... simply having the idea that whatever the union rate is, is the prevailing wage is circular logic. So, basically the prevailing wage is whatever is negotiated by the union which doesn't seem like the true prevailing wage since it doesn't account for what's happening in the private sector especially with a 30 percent threshold. That's a sig... that's a strong minority of the workforce that is determining what the prevailing wage is. I strongly urge a 'no' vote. Thanks."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski."

151st Legislative Day

11/29/2016

Zalewski: "Hey, Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield? Will the Sponsor yield, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lang: "Yes. Sorry, Sir."

Zalewski: "Jay, I have one question about the process. In subsection (c) the language says in the event to determine that after a written objection is filed and a hearing is held, in Section... within accordance with Section 9 of the Act. Can you explain what Section 9 of the Act is?"

Hoffman: "Yes. But, I got to find it on the computer."

Zalewski: "Okay, I'll wait. Patiently."

Hoffman: "Mr... or Representative Zalewski, could you repeat what Section you were making reference to, where in the Bill?"

Zalewski: "The statute... the language says that in speaking to whether in subsection (c) page 6, line 5, there's a discussion of the process if there is an objection filed. And it cross references Section 9 of the Act. And I'm just wondering which Act?"

Hoffman: "I'm getting to what you're talking about, hold on."

Zalewski: "Okay."

Hoffman: "You said page 6, line 5?"

Zalewski: "Yes. What's that cross referencing?"

Hoffman: "I'm not sure. I can't... for whatever reason, the full text..."

Zalewski: "Well, can you describe the pro... you describe that process for me, I guess, generally. What would happen?"

Hoffman: "And what would happen, if what, Sir?"

Zalewski: "If there is an event determination. If it is determined that after there's an objection filed that there's going to be a hearing. What would the hearing be about?"

151st Legislative Day

11/29/2016

Hoffman: "Well, local governments would not be able to opt out of the Prevailing Wage Act and would no longer ascertain prevailing wage for their locality and require all prevailing wage rates be posted on a departments website. Determining prevailing wage, if the prevailing wage cannot be applied in any locality because no agreement exists, the department must determine it."

Zalewski: "So, the Department of Labor would make the determination?"

Hoffman: "Yes."

Zalewski: "Okay. That answers my question. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Walsh."

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

Speaker Lang: "Of course."

Walsh: "Hi, Jay, how are ya? So, Jay, I got a couple quick questions. With our current prevailing... or under this legislation with the prevailing wage, where would that rank us among other states in the nation as far as our prevailing wage? You know that?"

Hoffman: "Well, it would just follow the practices of several other states. Those states would include: New York, Kentucky, California, New Jersey, New Mexico, and a few other states. So, depending on what their collective bargaining agreements show and their wage and fringe benefits show... or what it shows in their collective bargaining agreement or their agreement is, that's what we would be doing. So, we'd just be following them. I'm not sure where our collective bargaining vis-à-vis other states put us. But, I would think it would probably put

151st Legislative Day

11/29/2016

us in a fairly decent position knowing the strength of our construction organizations."

Walsh: "Do you think that our prevailing wage under this legislation would be competitive?"

Hoffman: "I believe that prevailing wage, currently in Illinois, is competitive and this would basically maintain the same practices. What it does, Representative, is it ensures that workers who do public works projects, and it'll be the policy of the state, are paid fairly and we can ensure that they are paid with an adequate wage with adequate fringe benefits."

Walsh: "So, going off of this collective bargaining agreement, who is partnered in this collective bargaining agreement? Is it the laborers union and do they do that all themselves or do they actually sit down and negotiate with their contractors to set that rate of pay?"

Hoffman: "I think that's the point. The point we've been trying to make is this is an agreement between business and labor. Collective bargaining agreements are made between employer organizations and organized labor organizations and they are done trades specific. Whether you're a cement finisher, you would have an agreement with employers who do cement finishing or pour concrete. If it's a... if it's a laborer, you would have an agreement with labor employers who actually do that type of work. So, that's the crux of it. If there is an agreement between an employers' organization and a labor organization in a given area, we just believe that should be the prevailing wage in that given area."

151st Legislative Day

- Walsh: "So under that prospect, Jay, you would say that the business community is in support of this legislation then, too?"
- Hoffman: "I would say..."
- Walsh: "At least the contractors that are dealing in this... in this realm?"
- Hoffman: "The contractors that build things and do public works projects are... that I understand are in favor for the most part of this Bill, yes."
- Walsh: "Well, it's just... this is sensible. This is protecting not only Illinois workers, but our public works projects to make sure they're done in a safe, timely manner within cost. I don't understand why we have to have this discussion here today. And I would urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hoffman to briefly close."
- Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I believe this makes sense. It just codifies the long standing process and it makes sure that construction workers in Illinois and their families are adequately compensated."
- Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves to override the Amendatory Veto of the Governor. This requires 71 votes. Mr. Wheeler has asked for a verification. Members will sit in their own chairs and vote their own switches. Those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Mitchell. Mr. Phillips. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 70 voting 'yes', 42 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'. And the Gentleman's Motion

151st Legislative Day

- fails. Senate Bill 2884, Representative Will Davis. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2884, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 1 and 2 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Will Davis."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davis on Amendment 1."
- Davis, W.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I move to adopt Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 2884. Both of these Amendments speak to the underlying Bill. For the past several years, I have participated on the Governor's Budgeting for Results Commission as started under the previous Governor and this is the result of the Mandates Committee where we walk through all of the mandates and other things that have been codified and we try to clean up, if you will, State Law, the Codes, if you will. We try to take those things out that are obsolete, that haven't been used. So, this is just an effort to do so. So, I'd move to adopt Amendment #1 which is primarily most of the work of that Mandates Committee under Budgeting for Results."
- Speaker Lang: "Chair recognizes Mr. Harris. But the Chair wonders if we could just debate this on Third, Sir."
- Harris, D.: "Yes, Mr. Chairman... or Mr. Speaker. I don't have a debate, but I do have a question. Now, is there another Amendment after this one?"
- Speaker Lang: "There's Amendment 2 after Amendment 1."
- Harris, D.: "Thank you."

151st Legislative Day

11/29/2016

- Speaker Lang: "Thank you. Those in favor of Amendment 1 will say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #2 offered by Representative Will Davis."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davis."
- Davis, W.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I move to adopt Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 2884. This is a cleanup Amendment to correct a drafting error in the previous Amendment."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment will say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And Amendment is adopted.

 Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2884, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davis."
- Davis, W.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. So, previously, I talked about the efforts of the Mandate Committee. So, what these Amendments do are to leave in statute items that were flagged by various agencies that they would like them to remain. So, these Amendments are just leaving these items still in statute. I'd more than happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

- Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Question of the Sponsor."
- Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields, Sir."
- Harris, D.: "Representative, this is an initiative of the Budgeting for Results Commission. Is that correct?"

151st Legislative Day

11/29/2016

Davis, W.: "Yes, it is."

Harris, D.: "And Amendment #2... as I understand, Amendment #2 took a number of items out of the Bill. Is that correct?"

Davis, W.: "Yes."

Harris, D.: "Okay. Without going into specifics, but they were deletions from what was initially in the Bill, correct?"

Davis, W.: "Deletions from the original Bill, yes."

Harris, D.: "Thank you. I appreciate it and I stand in support."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Franks: "Will, I'm just trying to understand what this is. I see that it's called mandate relief. Now, what will this Bill do?"

Davis, W.: "Well, the original Bill were efforts of the Mandates Committee to flag items that we thought were obsolete, that needed to be removed. Many of them were causing audit findings for agencies, so this is to try to relieve that pressure from them. These items were items that... that were... that needed to be left in so we're not taking these out. So, these are... this is... the Amendments are just putting these items back in or leaving them where they are."

Franks: "I see. But the original Bill would take out a bunch of the stuff that was obsolete and that's still in there."

Davis, W.: "Well, it's still the case, but these are items that still need some more discussion. So, we're not ready to just simply remove them. We want to allow the appropriate discussion to take place before any additional action takes place."

151st Legislative Day

11/29/2016

Franks: "Well, I appreciate the review and I hope you continue to do that because there's a lot of stuff that probably should go. So, thank you."

Davis, W.: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davis to close."

Davis, W.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. That's it."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Guzzardi. Please take the record. There are 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 5 of the Calendar, under Amendatory Vetoes, there appears Senate Bill 440, Representative Dan Burke. Please proceed on your Override Motion, Sir."

Burke, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On my Motion to override the Governor's Amendatory Veto, let me tell the Members that in this last spring session the House with 86 votes and the Senate with 39 votes passed Senate Bill 440 with Amendment #1. Despite the bipartisan Roll Call, the Governor issued an Amendatory Veto on August 26. This legislation contains agreed language for widows who receive a minimum pension and simply provides that prospectively, these modest annuities shall be no less than 125 percent of the federal poverty level. The legislation further corrects the unintended consequences of Public Act 86-1495 regarding benefits for a Tier 2 firefighter who is killed in the line of duty or dies while not in receipt of an annuity. It clarifies the original intent of Tier 2 Bill to ensure that spousal survivors,

151st Legislative Day

11/29/2016

children, disabled beneficiaries, and dependent parents are entitled to a benefit in the event of a participant's untimely death. Currently, we have retired members, who have not had a cost-of-living adjustment, a COLA, in the last 5 years. No other employees in the City of Chicago or the state have been saddled with such an unfair COLA restriction. Since 1982, the city has maintained the practice of providing a 3 percent simple COLA to firefighter annuitants; however, they have done so by regularly moving the 'born before' eligibility requirements every 5 years to ensure all retirees, regardless of age receive a simple COLA. The current date of 1955 has not been moved since 2004. The language simply moves the 'born before' date to January 1, 1955 to January 1, 1966. The firefighters and paramedics contribute to this benefit out of each paycheck using the following formula. I don't think I'll go into all of the technical aspects of it. But Ladies and Gentlemen, those of you who were here in the spring understand that we passed this matter. It was amply discussed. All questions were asked. And I would be happy to answer any questions at this time."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sullivan."

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

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Sullivan: "Representative, can you explain the differences between the Bill as passed and the changes that the Governor had asked for that you're trying to override now? What's the main topics of disagreement, if you will? I read the Veto message and it sounded like he had some good ideas, but I'm just trying to get a further understanding here."

151st Legislative Day

- Burke, D.: "Basically, the COLA is the whole issue here, the costof-living adjustment."
- Sullivan: "Okay. And so, you were taking the COLA from 1.5 percent to 3 percent under this Bill, is that correct? Simple, simple."
- Burke, D.: "For a specific population of individuals, those that were born before 1955."
- Sullivan: "Okay. And the Governor, in his Veto, did he indicate that maybe we shouldn't work on the COLA? Is that the main...

 I'm trying to get at... what's the main disagreement we're having here?"
- Burke, D.: "I'm having a difficult time understanding what his concerns were. And I don't think..."
- Sullivan: "Can you verbalize those for the Body on what..."
- Burke, D.: "Here's the Governor's statement. The Governor's Veto removes the increase in the COLA rate for retirees born between 1955 and 1965 due to funding pressures that this will place on the funds. He believes this change should be a part of the broader pension reform discussions."
- Sullivan: "Okay. So, that's... that's the disagreement then? He's not necessarily opposed to the COLA, but it should be in broader discussions. Is that in essence...?"
- Burke, D.: "That's his statement. The city has no issue with this legislation, Representative Sullivan."
- Sullivan: "And so this is basically an agreed Bill other... absent the... the Amendatory Veto."
- Burke, D.: "Absolutely."
- Sullivan: "Okay. I appreciate your comments."
- Burke, D.: "Thank you."

151st Legislative Day

11/29/2016

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hays."

Hays: "Thank you. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Hays: "Representative, where's the city on this Bill?"

Burke, D.: "The city is neutral."

Hays: "Is that... does that surprise you that the city wouldn't take a position on a Bill of this nature?"

Burke, D.: "The city has been persuaded and convinced that this will be no additional financial strain on the city's resources."

Hays: "You know what... and if you covered this previously, I apologize. What is the fiscal impact of this concept?"

Burke, D.: "The very tiny amount of .6 percent annually over 40 years."

Hays: "Point six percent annually over a period of 40 years?"

Burke, D.: "Yes, Sir."

Hays: "Is there..."

Burke, D.: "Now, I want you to fully understand that the firemen and paramedics are currently contributing to that COLA."

Hays: "One other question, Representative. Is there a particular reason that you didn't accept the Governor's recommendation?

I mean, is that something where you're miles apart? I read that language. It looked to me like maybe there was a discussion to be had there."

Burke, D.: "Well, as the Sponsor of the Bill, I certainly wasn't part of any discussion or negotiation. This has been a matter that has been debated and discussed for several years and as I said, for the last 5 years, those who probably need this resource the most. We're talking about widows, beneficiaries

151st Legislative Day

11/29/2016

of people who died in the line of duty on the fire department as paramedics, their beneficiaries have not received this very humble increase in over these many, many years. And I've been filing this Bill for the last 5 years. So, we finally came to an understanding, particularly with the city, as I said previously that when they were convinced that the fiscal impact would be very minor, their position went from being opposed to being neutral. And we were, again, this last spring able to persuade 86 Members of this chamber that this was an appropriate tact to take, that we need to pass this legislation on behalf of individuals who have very limited resources. And I might suggest to this Body that the increase that widows would be receiving probably won't even be a notch on the cost of their Medicaid and Medicare."

Hays: "Thank you very much. I appreciate the responses."

Burke, D.: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Morrison."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Morrison: "Representative, is there... so there is no income test for the recipients of the survivor benefits. Is that right?

Is there an income test?"

Burke, D.: "To be clear, are you suggesting that any beneficiary of a fallen firefighter or paramedic that earns a certain amount would be in some way ineligible for this? Is that what you're suggesting?"

Morrison: "What I'm suggesting is, if we raise this, isn't it possible that the recipient has other sources of income,

151st Legislative Day

- Social Security you know, maybe a pension from a job that the surviving spouse had?"
- Burke, D.: "That could very well be. As far as I'm aware, there is no income restriction. And I would say to those who have lost their loved one in the line of duty that that would be kind of an extreme imposition on them, to deny them this very, very minor stipend in view of their tremendous loss."
- Morrison: "Representative, I think we've talked at length about the problems with the City of Chicago's pension plans. They're in deep, deep trouble. Of course, we want to make sure that we're taking care of our first responders, their families, but we have to be very careful about adding to the cost. I mean, you said on the record, hey, this is just a small cost, but you're painting a pretty bleak picture that we... that may or may not be accurate. There is, we don't know, we as a state, we as a Body, we don't know if these individuals are getting other sources of income from other jobs that they have, pensions, Social Security..."
- Burke, D.: "Well, let me interrupt you for one moment. Let me tell you that the firefighters and paramedics do not receive, they are not in the Social Security system."
- Morrison: "No, not the employee, or the deceased employee, but the surviving spouse. It's possible that that individual has had a career of their own. Is it not?"
- Burke, D.: "On their own, they could very well."
- Morrison: "Okay. So, I guess that... Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. The problems with the City of Chicago's pension plans are well known and while the Sponsor, while we share a desire to make sure that our first responders are well compensated, we have

151st Legislative Day

11/29/2016

to make hard decisions. We have to make hard choices otherwise we put the entire pension systems at risk. We need to reform these systems. We should not be adding to the cost of these pension plans. And I would respectfully ask for a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Harris, D.: "Representative, I want to just make sure I understand both what the underlying Bill did, or does, and then the Amendatory... or the Veto of the Governor. The Bill, as I understand it, had basically two provisions. One, increase the COLA for a certain segment of retirees to 3 percent, correct? He's shaking his yes."

Burke, D.: "Yes."

Harris, D.: "That's okay. And then the second one is the minimum benefit for retire... widows, correct?"

Burke, D.: "Correct."

Harris, D.: "Okay. So, the Governor's Amendatory Veto changed or eliminated just the COLA."

Burke, D.: "That is correct."

Harris, D.: "But it left in place the benefit for widows, correct?"

Burke, D.: "You are correct."

Harris, D.: "Okay."

Burke, D.: "It's just the cost-of-living adjustment."

Harris, D.: "And that's what... and quite frankly, that is what concerns me. I can understand the logic of the COLA, but I'm concerned about not giving a benefit to the widows who deserve

151st Legislative Day

11/29/2016

a minimum level. So, if I may, Ladies and Gentlemen, to the Bill. Just very briefly. Here's a case where I think the Governor was reasonable and I think the Gentleman could have moved to accept the Amendatory Veto. This is a case where I do not think the Governor has exceeded his executive authority to make a reasonable change in a piece of legislation that we have passed. So, I think the Governor's Amendatory Veto is reasonable, but because of the review procedures by the Majority Party, we don't deal with the acceptance of Amendatory Vetoes. We have to deal with total overrides. So, since we are dealing with a total override, as the Sponsor said, the impact for the 3 percent is very minimal over a long period of time, very minimal. The city is neutral. This is a benefit of a minimum level for the widows who deserve these benefits. And I can... and I do encourage a 'yes' vote on this override."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wehrli."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Wehrli: "Sir, is this a benefit increase?"

Burke, D.: "These individuals that are Chicago firefighters and paramedics are already contributing to this benefit."

Wehrli: "But is..."

Burke, D.: "So, this is not a gift from anyone to these entities.

They are contributing and they've been denied this COLA for the last 5 years."

Wehrli: "So, is there a corresponding increase by either the employee or the employer to pay for this increased benefit?"

151st Legislative Day

- Burke, D.: "The employee contributions are that the annuity would be 7.125 percent, the spousal part is 1.5 and ordinary disability is .125, and the COLA is .375. They are already paying for this benefit."
- Wehrli: "Is that the current level or is there any additional money going to pay for this additional benefit by either the employee or the employer?"
- Burke, D.: "It's the .375 that would be contributed to by the City of Chicago."
- Wehrli: "Is that... is that an increase?"
- Burke, D.: "I beg your pardon. That's the employee's contribution."
- Wehrli: "Is that the current level or is that an increase? Does that have an..."
- Burke, D.: "That's the current level."
- Wehrli: "So, there is no increase to pay for this additional benefit? So, to the Bill."
- Burke, D.: "No."
- Wehrli: "This is... this is how we got to where we are on pensions. I understand what the fine Gentleman is trying to do, but without a way to pay for this types of stuff, we just continue to kick the can and increase our pension liabilities and we're just digging ourselves into a deeper hole. So let's stop digging. Let's support the Governor's Veto of this Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Burke to close."
- Burke, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, very briefly. This matter has been considered previously, as I said, in the spring session. It received very comfortable Majority support, bipartisan support. The

151st Legislative Day

11/29/2016

Senate acted appropriately and supported it as well. This is a matter that is not a gift to any sworn firefighter or paramedic in the City of Chicago. This is a matter that would benefit individuals who suffered the loss of one of their family members who was either a firefighter or a paramedic. This is something that individual firefighters and paramedics are paying for already. The City of Chicago has no objection to this. And I would ask for your favorable consideration."

- Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves to override the Amendatory Veto of the Governor on Senate Bill 440. This requires 71 votes. Those in favor of the Motion will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 81 voting 'yes', 31 voting 'no'. And the House passes Senate Bill 440, notwithstanding the specific recommendations for change by the Governor. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Leader Burke."
- Burke, D.: "Thanks, Speaker. On a point of personal privilege."

 Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."
- Burke, D.: "Might I take a moment to introduce our Comptroller elect Susana Mendoza. Our former colleague is with us on the House floor."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, committee announcements."

Clerk Hollman: "The following committees will be meeting immediately: Appropriations - Human Services is meeting in C1, Judiciary - Criminal is meeting in 122, Labor & Commerce is meeting in 413, the Executive Committee is meeting in 118,

151st Legislative Day

11/29/2016

Transportation: Regulation, Roads & Bridges in D-1. Meeting in one hour at 4:00 is Revenue & Finance in Room 118, Elementary & Secondary Education School Curriculum & Policies in 413, Transportation: Vehicles & Safety in 115. Meeting in one and a half hours at 4:30 is Higher Education in 122, Judiciary - Civil in 115, Personnel and Pensions in D-1."

Speaker Lang: "And now, leaving Perfunctory time for the Clerk, Leader Currie moves that the House stand adjourned 'til Wednesday, November 30 at the hour of 10 a.m. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the House stands adjourned. Off to committees, Members."

Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Committee Reports. Representative Greg Harris, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-Human Services reports the following committee action taken on November 29, 2016: do pass Standard Debate Senate Bill 261; do pass as amended Short Debate Senate Bill 1367, Senate Bill 1821; do pass as amended Standard Debate Senate Bill 3131. Representative Sims, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary - Criminal reports the following committee action taken on November 29, 2016: do pass as amended Short Debate Senate Bill 3368, recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 845. Representative Hoffman, Chairperson from the Committee on Labor & Commerce reports the following committee action taken on November 29, 2016: do pass as amended Short Debate Senate Bill 2799. Representative Daniel Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on Executive reports the following committee action taken on November 29, 2016: recommends be adopted is a Motion to Concur in Senate Amendment 2 to House

151st Legislative Day

11/29/2016

Bill 6074, Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1673, Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1751, Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 2566. Representative Beiser, Chairperson from the Committee on Transportation: Regulation, Roads & Bridges reports the following committee action taken on November 29, 2016: recommends be adopted is Senate Joint Resolution 50. Representative Bradley, Chairperson from the Committee on Revenue & Finance reports the following committee action taken on November 29, 2016: do pass as amended Short Debate is Senate Bill 116, Senate Bill 303, Senate Bill 516, Senate Bill 581, Senate Bill 2537, Senate Bill 2812; recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1488, Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 3337. Representative Crespo, Chairperson from the Committee on Elementary & Secondary Education: School Curriculum & Policies reports the following committee action taken on November 29, 2016: do pass as amended Short Debate is Senate Bill 514 recommends be adopted House Resolution 917. Representative D'Amico, Chairperson from the Committee on Transportation: Vehicles & Safety reports the following committee action taken on November 29, 2016: do pass Short Debate Senate Bill 2808. Representative Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on Higher Education reports the following committee action taken on November 29, 2016: do pass as amended Short Debate House Bill 5969. Representative Nekritz, Chairperson from the Committee on Personnel and Pensions reports the following committee action taken on November 29, 2016: recommends be adopted, Floor Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 2437.

151st Legislative Day

11/29/2016

Clerk Bolin: "Second Reading of House Bills to be read and held on the Order of Second Reading. House Bill 5969, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Second Reading of Senate Bills to be read and held on the Order of Second Reading. Senate Bill 116, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 261, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Senate Bill 303, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. Senate Bill 514, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 516, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 581, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 1367, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Senate Bill 1821, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Senate Bill 2537, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 2799, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 2808, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Senate Bill 2812, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 3131, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 3368, a Bill for an Act concerning the Secretary of State. Second Reading of these Bills. First Reading of House Bills. House Bill 6629, offered by Representative Bellock, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Introduction of Resolutions for referral to the Rules Committee. House Resolution 1501, offered by Representative Phelps and House Joint Resolution 167 offered by Representative Durkin. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned.