153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

- 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 cell phones, and rise for the invocation, and Pledge of Allegiance. Pastor Crawford."
- Pastor Crawford: "Let us pray. Most gracious, and holy God in Heaven, God of all wisdom, God of all power, God of all presence, God of all creation. Today, we invoke Your blessings up on this august assembly, upon the Speaker of this House, upon its Leaders, and all of its Members. May they be empowered today with Your wisdom from above. May they be lead today by Your precious spirit. May they find today their strength in You Oh God. May Your grace, may Your mercy, may Your peace be with them, all of them, throughout this day and forever more. This we pray in Your Son's name, Amen."
- Speaker Lang: "We'll be led in the Pledge by Mr. Franks."
- Franks 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. There was an assumption that you didn't know it, Mr. Franks. Leader Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker please let the record show that Representatives Ammons, Costello, Dunkin, Phelps, and Reaves-Harris are excused today.

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Brown."

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

- Brown: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please let the record reflect that Representatives Bryant, David Harris, and David Reis are excused this morning. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, please take record. We have 109 Members answering the roll and we do have a quorum. Mr. Clerk, House Resolution 584, Mr. Brady. Will Members please be in their chairs? And please rise. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Resolution 584, offered by Representative Brady."
  - Resolved by The House of Representatives of the 99th General Assembly, the State of Illinois that we, along with his family and friends, mourn the passing of Paul Penn."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Brady."

Brady: "Thank you very much. Ladies and Gentleman, what we're doing here today and paying tribute to a man who simply knew what it takes to get things done and put people to work. Paul Penn was a man who dedicated his life to putting people to work. Through the skills and work ethics that he had as directing laborers throughout our community, our district, my district, and throughout the State of Illinois in his days. He simply knew, as I said, how to put people to work. Paul Penn could disagree with me, in fact probably at times adamantly disagreed with me, but other times he agreed with me. What was always there was communication and mutual respect. He would surround himself with good people, whether that be in labor, business, community leaders, or others, to simply get things done and put people to work. His accomplishments were many which is articulated in the Resolution that will be presented to his family. Unfortunately his wife could not be

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

with us today, June, but some of his family are here who I would like to recognize in the Speaker's Gallery. John Penn, Don and Norma Penn, Tony and Eric Penn, Jeff Penn, and grandchildren Tim and Kaitlyn Ryan. And I think it would be appropriate if we would give actually a round of applause to the Penn family to thank them for their father, their grandfather, and the husband who did so much for so many throughout my district and across the great State of Illinois. Please join me."

- Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Brady. Ladies and Gentleman this Resolution had been previously adopted so you may take your seats. Mr. Clerk, Committee Reports."
- Clerk Bolin: "Committee Reports. Representative Nekritz, Chairperson from the Committee on Personnel and Pensions reports the following committee action taken on December 01, 2016: do pass Short Debate for Floor Amendment #6... recommends be adopted Floor Amendment #6 to Senate Bill 2437. Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolutions 1524, offered of Representative Andrade and House Joint Resolution 168, offered by Representative Kay."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions"

Clerk Bolin: "Agreed Resolutions: House Resolution 1522, offered by Representative Will Davis, House Resolution 1523, offered by Representative Sims. House Resolution 1525, offered by Representative Costello, House Resolution 1526, offered by Representative Ford, House Resolution 1527, offered by Representative Phelps, House Resolution 1528, offered by Representative Chapa LaVia, House Resolution 1529, offered by Representative McAuliffe, House Resolution 1530, offered by

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

Representative Beiser, House Resolution 1531, offered by Representative Durkin, House Resolution 1532, offered by Representative Durkin, House Resolution 1533, offered by Representative Durkin, House Resolution 1534, offered by Representative Durkin, House Resolution 1535, offered by Representative Durkin."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Chair recognizes Representative Fine, for what reason do you rise?"

Fine: "Point of personal privilege, please."

Speaker Lang: "You may proceed."

Fine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to remind the Body that we passed a Resolution last May for Random Acts of Kindness week and that's coming up December 11th-December 17th. I know there are a lot of schools and community groups that are participating. So, it's a great time just to remember to hold the door to somebody... for somebody, talk to a stranger, and do something kind because you never know how that's going to impact somebody else's life. So, don't forget Random Act of Kindness week December 11th-17th."

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

Kifowit: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to announce the filing of the Veteran's Suicide Report. For the attention of the General Assembly, today myself and I'm joined with Senator Cullerton are officially filing the findings of the Veteran's Suicide Taskforce that we've been meeting all year long. I realize that this subject matter is not one to be taken lightly but

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

I do believe that this task force traveled the whole State of Illinois and actually embarked on a listening tour to hear about the needs and to express the services that the Veterans are lacking in our state today. I would be remise if I did not publicly thank the members of the task force for all their work. Representative Jeanne Ives, the Representative on the task force, Greg Dooley from the Department of Veterans' Affairs, Lieutenant Colonel Steve Foster from the Department of Military Affairs, Tom Miller from the Department of Human Services, Jennifer Martin from the Department of Public Health, Paul Schimpf from the Senate Minority Leader Representative. We spent countless hours working on this subject matter and I hope and I want to implore upon all of you that in the next year that we embark to prevent and to eliminate the epidemic of Veteran suicide and I hope and pray that we do not lose a Veteran to suicide again. So, with that Mr. Clerk, I also want to acknowledge Will Attig, in the Gallery who was instrumental in getting this started... this initiative started and coming together to make sure that we are here as a resource and that the State of Illinois will not turn its back on our Veterans. So, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you Representative, thank the task force for its hard work. Representative Ives is recognized."

Ives: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I personally want to thank Representative Kifowit, for her professionalism during every task force meeting, for writing the majority, if not the bulk of the report, for actually... actually running the Bill that allowed this Suicide task force to exist and for really being

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

there the entire time without fail at every meeting no matter where it was around the state she, your professionalism was remarkable in a very delicate and difficult topic to speak to. Especially when you had personnel, person, people coming in and giving their very personal stories about how suicide, veterans' suicide is affected them. So, I commend you for you wonderful report and your professional style and everything that you did with it. It was a wonderful experience to work with you on this endeavor."

Speaker Lang: "Representative McAsey is recognized. For what reason do you rise?"

McAsey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On a point of personal privilege." Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

McAsey: "Thank you. This morning it's come to my attention that some very integral members of our House Democratic staff are going to be leaving us and I just wanted to take a moment to recognize Eric Lane and Julia Larkin, who are on the floor today. As, well as Chris Maley, who's back in the D Wing and to thank them all for their many years of service. I know that they've each been very helpful to me over the years and I think that other members would... would likely agree. Today is also Eric's birthday. So, if we can give these three around of applause to thank them for their service and wish them well in their next endeavor."

Speaker Lang: "Thanks to all of you for your service to the Illinois General Assembly and to the people of Illinois. Mr. Evans is recognized. For what reason do you rise?"

Evans: "Point of personal privilege, please."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

Evans: "Ladies and Gentleman, it was man that was raised in East Saint Louis, received his Bachelors of Science in Education, a Masters of Planning from Southern Illinois University, was an Assistant Principal, a Teacher, and a Principal. And he did all of this prior to 2009, he was great leader in his community. And in 2009, this Gentleman joined this Assembly and made a difference for his community and residents throughout the State of Illinois. He will not be returning but he made an impact on my life. I met Representative Jackson in 2012, when I came to this Assembly. And we've built a friendship and he's been a great influencer of my life, encouraging me to continue do some things, just a huge impact. So, I think we should definitely give Representative Jackson a great round of applause, for not only all he's done for his region prior to 2009, but for taking upon the challenge to come to the General Assembly after he had a lifetime of accomplishments. And to just add to his mantle an additional accomplishment. So, I want to give him a round of applause, I want them to hear it all the way in East Saint Louis, how much we appreciated his contribution to this state. Thank you, and round of applause to my colleague and friend Eddie Lee Jackson."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Representative. Thank you for those fine comments. Senate Bills-Second Reading page 3 of the Calendar. Senate Bill 586, Representative Flowers. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 586, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

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

Speaker Lang: "Third Reading, please read the Bill"

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 586, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, of the House, Senate Bill 586 amends the Illinois Lottery by extending the Carolyn Adams Ticket for the Cure scratch off 'til December 30 of 2026. And I would appreciate an 'aye' vote on Senate Bill 586."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Demmer."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor Yields."

Demmer: "Representative, just for clarification. This scratch off, what does it benefit? Where does the money go? What's the source that benefits from it?"

Flowers: "There's various organizations that work with cancer patients, cancer patient's families, help send their kids to school, help the patient get back and forth to the hospital, do counseling for the children. There's multitude of things that this fund does."

Demmer: "So, it benefits a variety of organizations who provide..."

Flowers: "Yes it does."

Demmer: "...Services like that..."

Flowers: "Absolutely."

Demmer: "Okay. Thank you, Representative."

Flowers: "My pleasure."

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. There are 118 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is here by declared passed. Page 5 of the Calendar. Constitutional Amendments-Third Reading. HJRCA 62. Mr. Clerk, please read the Constitutional Amendment for a third time."

Clerk Bolin: "House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #62.

RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-NINTH

GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE SENATE

CONCURRING HEREIN, that there shall be submitted to the

electors of the State for adoption or rejection at the general

election next occurring at least 6 months after the adoption

of this resolution a proposition to add Section 8.5 to Article

IV of the Illinois Constitution as follows:

#### ARTICLE IV

#### THE LEGISLATURE

#### SECTION 8.5. PASSAGE OF REVENUE BILLS

A bill passed on or after the date of a general election but on or before the second Wednesday of January following the general election that would result in the increase of revenue to the State by an increase of a tax on or measured by income or the selling price of any item of tangible personal property or any service may become law only with the concurrence of three-fifths of the members elected to each house of the General Assembly.

#### SCHEDULE

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

This Constitutional Amendment takes effect upon being declared adopted in accordance with Section 7 of the Illinois Constitutional Amendment Act. This has been Third Reading in full of House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #62."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the Assembly. We bring to you House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 62, which is a logical extension of existing law that requires a supermajority of votes for legislative action outside the regularly scheduled Legislative Session. Presently, any votes and any measure after May 31st, with an immediate effective date requires a super majority. This Constitutional Amendment seeks to extend those same procedural protections during any lame duck Legislative Session, which by definition, outside the regularly schedule Legislative Session, to votes dealing with tax increases. It's only fair that those people who will face the voters be the ones to make the decisions in the regular Legislative Session. Lame duck Sessions should not be used for 11th hour tax increases, with a lower vote standard than a Veto Session. Now, when the Quinn tax increase was approved my colleagues on the Republican side on the aisle correctly criticized the actions of those lame legislators. They mentioned yesterday on Representative McSweeney's Resolution, my friends Jim Durkin, Representatives Pritchard and Kay, even filed legislation to this measure to halt this practice. David Harris is not here today, also filed a Bill, his even went farther. His Bill said that there would always be a 3/5 vote for a tax increase. That's not what this Bill is though. It

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

says if you're going to have tax increase during a lame duck, that you would require a 3/5ths. Yesterday, taxpayer advocacy groups like the Illinois Policy Institute, American's For Tax Reform, American's For Prosperity, and The Illinois Chamber testified in committee and wrote letters opposing the practice of lame duck tax increases without a heightened vote. We passed this Bill out of committee, yesterday, unanimously and we have many cosponsors. Presently, there are 16 of us in the General Assembly who are lame duck members and if you do the math that's more than 25 percent necessary to pass a tax hike under the present rules. So, this legislation provides a more responsive representative government by limiting the ability of lame duck unaccountable legislators to force a tax hike on to our citizens. This change is long overdue and necessary to protect the integrity of our elections and to insure accountability to the voters. I am one of those 16 lame duck legislators. What we really could be though is the zombie apocalypse if we're not stopped, because we're the walking dead. We don't have to ... we don't have to respond to the voters. I know you like that, Mr. Sullivan. But you look back and it's rare to see, we only have to look back five years in our history for a verdict on policy choices. Let's really hear what happened a few years ago, when economic recovery in earnest and the rest of the country began to accelerate, a tax hike here born out of political expediency and patronage choked it off in Illinois. We can't allow that to happen again. I'd be happy to answer any questions, we talked briefly yesterday about how we witnessed the 11th hour tax increase during the 96th Legislative Assembly, when the

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

Governor huddled right under... right back here at the back of the chamber in the shadows cutting... cutting those deals. Our citizens deserve much more and this Constitutional Amendment will give it to them. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. McSweeney."

McSweeney: "Mr. Speaker, to the Constitutional Amendment. I strongly support the Constitutional Amendment. Thank you, Representative Franks, for bring this to the floor. As I said yesterday, raising taxes is the wrong answer for Illinois. It will kill jobs, it'll hurt families in this state. This is a commonsense piece of Legislation. I have sponsored similar legislation before. I am glad that Representative Franks has brought it this far. I want to thank you and tell you I'm going to miss your efforts in fighting for the tax payers, fighting against tax increases, and I am counting on you as your first act of the County Board Chairman to cut property taxes in McHenry County by 10 percent. So, this is a great piece of legislation and I firmly support it."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Demmer."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsors yields."

Demmer: "Representative, I appreciate many of the things you are looking to accomplish with this. I want to understand a little bit better, though the nature of this being Constitutional Amendment, what the timeline looks like. This is very different than a Bill that could have immediate effect and take effect right now or in the next couple of days. So, help me understand. We've got HJRCA 62, it's on Third Reading here today. If we vote on it, it passes, what happens next?"

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

Franks: "Well this wouldn't take effect until 2018 at the earliest, that's the next time it can be on the ballot so..."

Demmer: "But first, we've pass it here, it goes over across the Capitol, the Senate has to read it on three..."

Frank: "Right."

Demmer: "...individual days, you can't use Perfunctory days. So, they've got, the Senate doesn't have three days scheduled right?"

Franks: "We don't know, I haven't seen the schedule. I don't think the schedule's come out. But let's assume for the sake of argument that we pass it here."

Demmer: "Okay."

Franks: "I think that we've sent a very strong message and hopefully, one of you remaining guys will file it if it doesn't pass in the Senate before the end, that you will file it for the next General Assembly, the 100th General Assembly, and get it going right away. But I think once we..."

Demmer: "But even if the Senate... even if the Senate passes this, let's say they schedule three days they read it, they pass it, it goes to the Governor, let say he signs it..."

Franks: "Right."

Demmer: "Actually that doesn't happen. The Governor doesn't have to sign it."

Franks: "Right it goes right to the Citizens."

Demmer: "It goes to the ballot."

Franks: "Correct."

Demmer: "And when's the earliest it could be on the ballot?"

Franks: "2018."

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

Demmer: "2018 November or 2018 two years from now, and then it would take effect..."

Franks: "Going..."

Demmer: "...what January the following year..."

Franks: "Correct."

Demmer: "...or whatever."

Franks: "Right."

Demmer: "Okay, so were still taking about something that's a couple years off here. I mean this is a... this is a very long term play and doesn't really have any effect on what's happening oven the next month."

Franks: "That's exactly what I said in Committee yesterday. You're right, but I think we need to change going forward in order to continue to protect the taxpayers. And I think the Resolution that Mr. McSweeney passed yesterday is effectively taken care of it for this General Assembly. But I think this will protect tax payers going forward."

Demmer: So, one of the comments you made was we kind of have this peculiar way that the Calendar is structured in which after you get January 1st of a new year, you still have a lame duck legislature but the vote threshold drops from 71 to 60. And you chosen here to extend that 71 threshold but only for Revenue Bills. Right?"

Franks: "Correct."

Demmer: "So, doesn't that loophole still exist then for every other Bill that we could consider? Many of those Bills could have even larger fiscal impacts on the State of Illinois. But you're only choosing Revenue."

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

Franks: "I think that this is the most important part. Perhaps you'd like..."

Demmer: "A spending Bill, for example. You can pass a spending Bill with 60 votes on January 1st."

Franks: "Well, spending Bills already happen. Doesn't mean they're going to be appropriated..."

Demmer: "Right."

Franks: "As we've seen, we passed a lot of spending Bills that's doesn't mean much."

Demmer: "The 71 threshold would only apply to Revenue and not...

Franks: "Correct."

Demmer: "...to a whole host of other issues that could be of considerable concern."

Franks: "Correct."

Demmer: "Did you consider just saying, look this 71 threshold continues the New Year for everything?"

Franks: "I thought about it long and hard, and I thought this made sense. I also thought it was the thing that would be most passable. I think if we put everything in it would make it more difficult to pass. I think it makes... I think it's difficult to vote against this because it's... it's the right public policy. I think the other one would bring a lot more... a lot more opposition and we have to understand that compromise is important in our work here and our job and we have to understand what can and can't be done. This is what can be done and what should be done. Actually what must be done."

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

Demmer: "So, when you define Revenue Bills as what this Constitutional Amendment would apply to, would this include... it would include tax increases for sure..."

Franks: "Absolutely."

Demmer: "What about fee increases?"

Franks: "We can look at the language together."

Demmer: "Okay."

Franks: "It's the increase of Revenue to the state by an increase of a tax or measured by income or the selling price of any item of tangible personal property or any service may become law. We're dealing with taxes."

Demmer: "Okay, so this... the state could still pass, even if this passes you could have 60 votes that would pass a fee increase...

Franks: "Sure."

Demmer: "...or Revenue for the state that was just structured in a different way..."

Franks: "Well, this is for taxes."

Demmer: "...where this narrow exemption is."

Franks: "This is for taxes."

Demmer: "Okay. So I think it's just worth looking at, you know, as we talk about a pretty narrow definition here. There still exist a large loophole for many other Bills. For Bills that are structured in a little bit different way and..."

Franks: "I don't think..."

Demmer: "...I like where you're going with it..."

Franks: "Yeah."

Demmer: "...I like where you going with it, I just think we got to keep in mind that what we're dealing with here is something that's at least two years off on your best case scenario and

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

has a very narrow definition. You know, we had many opportunities and you cited several of the Bills that have been proposed by folks on our side of the aisle, one by Leader Durkin that would have moved up Inauguration that would take care..."

Franks: "I like..."

Demmer: "...of many of these issues..."

Franks: "...I like that one."

Demmer: "...all together. That, you know, get stuck in the Rules Committee. So, it's just, you got to take a look at how, in this last week of veto session right after an election where we could have had a measure like this on the ballot, suddenly, these things get fast tracked, they come to the floor after, you know, other Bills, other proposals that you mentioned as good proposals languish in the Rules Committee for years on end."

Franks: "You know we can say that about everything. We can talk about the Governor saying that he won't do a budget unless we have tax... property tax freeze. Well, this body passed a property tax freeze, correct? It over in the Senate right now. He also says he wants to have term limits. I agree with the Governor there. So, to say... to criticize, that we're doing this after an election when the Governor is saying we need to do things after the election I believe is a bit disingenuous."

Demmer: "Well, you cited... you cited serval Bills as examples of what's good about this initiative because it mirrors so many Republican proposals. Well, those Republican proposals never get this kind of fast track to the floor at a moment that even though it's on the floor right now can't take effect for

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

two years. You know, we need to focus on trying to make these policies and bring them into fruition and not just sending a message..."

Franks: "Look, don't you think we need good policy?"

Demmer: "Not just having opportunity to talk about these issues on the floor."

Franks: "We could argue about it on every Bill. But I think the idea is to create a structure and a frame work going forward that will work. I think we can agree that the State of Illinois is broke, it's broken, and it's dysfunctional. One of the ways to help fix our dysfunction is to change the structure. This will do that"

Demmer: "I agree. And thank you, to the Constitutional Amendment. I certainly agree. We need to look for proactive opportunities for reform. But we need to make sure they're not empty gestures. So, let's take this opportunity to try to move the ball forward. But let's also be open to the other proposals that are often cited in defense of these proposals. Let's get those out of the Rules Committee, let's bring those into a place where we can act on them, and let's do so at a time when that action can be meaningful and not something that's in many years off in the future. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Cassidy."

Cassidy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Constitutional Amendment. Frankly, the exchange that we just heard tells us exactly what's going here. This is not about establishing good public policy for the State of Illinois. This is not about making real change, this is a gimmick. This is a thing to make folks say they did something to make people feel better.

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

Fundamentally, this can't get done. The exchange between the last two speakers showed us this isn't going to get done and even if we could pass it through both chambers nothing would happen until at least after the 2018 Election. At its core though, what you're trying to do with this Constitutional Amendment is strip, your constituents and the constituents of all of the other 16, you called yourselves the walking dead. Was that the word you used? The zombie apocalypse. Yes. You're trying to strip them of representation for the period from Election Day until the new person is sworn in. And I just think that that's not fair and not right. You were elected to serve two full years, your term is two years long, your constituents deserve your vote for that full two years. I urge a 'no' vote on this gimmick. If we want to make real change let's do it in a sincere and thoughtful way. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Amendment. I act... Jack, I actually support this Amendment. I probably support it for a different reason than you would want me to support it for. But I was among those who supported the tax increase in 2011 and it was among the most empty feelings that night walking out of this chamber because it was a one party Roll Call. And that tax increase, respectfully, was talked about by yourself and by others as being damaging to the State of Illinois and something that should not have happened. When in all reality, that tax... tax increase rescued us from the brink of disaster. It allowed us to make our pension payment, it allowed us to pay social service providers, it allowed us to pay vendors,

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

it allowed us to do budgets, it allowed us to do everything a functioning State Government was supposed to do. And it was villainized, called destructive, called a job killer, called everything in the book in an effort to show that we can't be responsible when we raise taxes. Well, the reason I like your Resolution is because, going forward, if we're going to do a post January 1, Revenue increase it's going to be bipartisan. It's going to require bipartisan support. And to me that's valuable from the perspective of those Members who've continued to take tough votes and been demonized for it. So, I urge support of the Gentleman's Resol... the Amendment. I think it's a good thing. It does hit people's guts wrong. But from those of us who taken tough votes and been demonized for it and been villainized for it, it's time to change the dynamic. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Kay."

Kay: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Kay: "Thank you. Jack, I think this is excellent piece of legislation. I've heard a couple of comments about well it's not real change or we need to wait longer for real change. I've waited 6 years for real change and haven't seen it. I also heard the comment that we need to wait 'til everyone's here for a functioning body to make decisions. I haven't seen that for 6 years either. So, I guess, the truth of the matter is we're going to see two Bills today, I believe, that are going to come before us at the eleventh hour and I'm stepping out a little bit here that maybe we shouldn't be hearing today. So, to criticize something as common sense as this is

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

simply ridiculous. And, I think everyone in this chamber should be voting 'aye' on this Resolution. Thanks, Jack."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mitchell."

Mitchell, C.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Constitutional Amendment. This is different than the Resolution we voted on yesterday. I was one of a few people that voted against that Resolution. I voted against that Resolution because I believe that State Representatives are elected for 24 months. That's my read of the Constitution. My understanding is that we are elected to represent our 108 thousand Constituents, for the fullness of our term. If those Constituents don't want us to vote for Revenue increase they should call our offices, they should send us a letter, they should make sure that they come to speak to us in person but ultimately we are elected to do job. Now, this Amendment is a little different and if you want to vote for it I think you should be able to because it's not about whether or not you can do something, it's about raising a vote threshold. But, to say that those who may or not vote against this Bill are doing so because they're ridiculous as was sort of asserted by the last speaker, is itself ridiculous. There are some folks here, who come here to do a job, and sometimes that job is unpopular, and sometimes that job means taking difficult votes. But they come here to do a job for the entire time they are elected for. So, vote your conscience, vote your district, but understand that there are reasonable people who will probably vote against this. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang. "Mr. Franks, to close."

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members. I want to reply to one of the comments. We're not stripping any rights from any of the Members. And I appreciate the two speakers who were concerned about that because as the last speaker rightly said you're still going to be able to vote. But, what we're going to be doing is changing the threshold because the actions of unaccountable legislatures has been allowed to unchecked for too long. So, it's really time to end the practice of clandestine government, which is deal making behind closed doors to raise tax... raise taxes. legislation will stop those backroom deals that cost the taxpayers literally billions of dollars. So, if there's going to be a tax hike let it be out in front, let it at least have, at least, the same requirement that we need to pass the Bill in Veto Session. That's all this Bill does, it doesn't prohibit a vote, it doesn't prohibit a tax increase. All I'm saying is that something this important should at least be as treated as well as something in Veto. I'd ask for your support on this... on this Amendment."

Speaker Lang: Those in favor of the Constitutional Amendment will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 84 voting 'yes', 18 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'. And the Resolution is adopted. Page 5 on the Calendar. Senate Bills-Second Reading. Senate Bill 2950, Mr. Harris. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2950, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2950, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

- Harris G.: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentleman of the House. This legislation is an initiative of the Pollution Control Board. It cleans up some of the statutes under which they operate. It conforms them with the Open Meetings Act, it also changes some references in their statute that deal with transmission of notices by U.S. Postal Mail to allow electronic notification when the party would wish to have electronic notification over the internet versus US Mail, and several other clean up items. I'd be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Jones, Sims, Wallace. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 108 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is here by declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Rules Report."
- Clerk Hollman: "Committee Report. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on December 01, 2016:

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

- recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is Floor Amendments 5, 6 and 7 to Senate Bill 2814."
- Speaker Lang: "Page 4 of the Calendar. Senate Bill 1941, Mr. Hoffman. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1941, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendments 2, 3, 4, and 5 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #2, is offered by Representative Hoffman."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hoffman."
- Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, I believe that we... we want to go to Amendment #5."
- Speaker Lang: "Are you withdrawing Amendments 2, 3, and 4, Sir." Hoffman: "Yes."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, please withdraw Amendments 2, 3, and 4 and proceed."
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #5 is offered by Representative Hoffman."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hoffman"
- Hoffman: "Yes, I would just ask permission to debate this on Third Reading."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1941, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hoffman."

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is an agreement between labor and business regarding the unemployment insurance benefits for individuals who are laid off by steel manufacture between April 1, 2015 and the effective day of this Bill. This would extend their unemployment benefits by 26 weeks. As you know, US Steel in Granite City laid off nearly 2,000 workers as a result of the illegal dumping of foreign steel into the markets here in the United States. The Trade Associa... the Trade Administration, federally is investigating that and I believe eventually will find that China and other countries have illegally dumped foreign steel. This would simply extend those benefits. Again, it is an agreement between business and labor and I ask for a favor roll call."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Kay."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields"

Kay: "Jay, just a point of clarification. As you know, I'm very supportive of your Bill. Nobody in Granite City should suffer for poor performance and the inability to negotiate a good contract in Washington D.C. and that's just exactly what happened. However, I want the Body to understand, as well as those who may be listening in, that there are some complexities to calculating what will be disbursed for the additional time period that this Bill would cover. So, checks aren't going to go out today. But they will be going out within a reasonable period of time. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

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

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

- wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Chapa LaVia, Gabel. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. There are 102 voting 'yes', 0 voting... Excuse me 107 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is here by declared passed. Chair recognizes Mr. Morrison. For what reason do you rise, Sir?"
- Morrison: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On that last Bill, Senate Bill 1941, it was my intention to vote 'no'."
- Speaker Lang: "The record will reflect your intentions, Sir. Under the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading, there appears Senate Bill 1751, Mr. Guzzardi. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1751, 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, 2, and 3 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Currie."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Guzzardi, are you going to handle this Amendment for Leader Currie?"
- Guzzardi: "I hope to. Yes, Sir."
- Speaker Lang: "Go right ahead, Sir."
- Guzzardi: "The Amendment simply addresses a drafting error. I'm hoping that we can move it to third reading and discuss it then."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #2, is offered by Representative Guzzardi."

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Guzzardi."

Guzzardi: "If we could just actually move right to Floor Amendment 3, Mr. Chair. That will be ideal.

Speaker Lang: "Do you withdrawal Amendment 2, Sir?"

Guzzardi: "I do. Yes, Sir."

Speaker Lang: "Does Amendment 3 become the Bill?"

Guzzardi: "Indeed it does, Sir."

Speaker Lang: "Amendment 2 is withdrawn. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #3, is offered by Representative Guzzardi."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Guzzardi on Amendment 3."

Guzzardi: "This Amendment becomes the Bill. I look forward to discussing on Third Reading.

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

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

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1751, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Guzzardi."

Guzzardi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Chamber. This Bill is a Bill I've discussed with many of you involving the border wall. So, I'd like to take just a moment before I address the specifics of the Bill to talk about walls. Walls have never, throughout history, been terribly effective means of keeping people in or out. You look back from the Great Wall of China, the Berlin Wall, to the border wall that we already have with Mexico. You know, in San Diego we have 14

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

miles of border wall with Mexico. And that wall as many of you may have seen in the news it was recently discovered that there is a vast intricate network of tunnels under this wall. People are traveling freely back and forth. So, walls aren't good at securing borders. They never have been. Walls are symbols. Walls are messages that the people on the other side of the wall are dangerous and that by keeping those people out, we're going to solve the problems on our side. I don't believe that those are the values of the people of Illinois as pertains to the country of Mexico. I don't believe that we think that keeping those people out is going to solve our problems. In fact, I think that Illinois is a welcoming state. I think that this is a state that embraces diversity. I think it's a state that knows the value of immigrants. And I think that in these scary times for many immigrants in this state and in this country, if walls are symbols, if walls are messages, I think it's important that we send our own message to the people of Illinois. That we are standing up on the side of the immigrant community in this state. So, Senate Bill 1751 would divest Illinois' public investments and pension funds from any company that accepts a Federal contract to build a border wall with Mexico. This operates exactly like Senate Bill 1761, which we passed in this General Assembly involving a boycott of transactions with companies boycott, excuse me, involving prohibition transactions with companies that boycott the State of Israel. That Bill 1761 passed this chamber 102 to 0. This Bill operates in an identical fashion, simply refers to a different type of investment. And again, I think this is an opportunity

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

for us as a chamber and as the people of Illinois to send a message about what our values are. That we stand with the immigrant community in this state and that we are a welcoming state that embraces people who wish to come here. I think that it's an important moment for us to send a message about our values. And I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davidsmeyer."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Davidsmeyer: "So, in a time when our pensions need all the income they could possibly get, if that investment is a better investment than other companies you're saying they can't invest in that?"

Guzzardi: "So, Representative Davidsmeyer, we already have on the books several types of companies that we don't invest in.

Because we don't agree with their values, right? Whether it's Iran or Sudan or this Israel boycott that we talked about earlier this year. This is a decision we've already made. The Illinois Investment Policy Board already does this. So, this type of decision that we make all time as a General Assembly. And I think this is a particular important moment for us to do it."

Davidsmeyer: "So, a company that is part of building a wall, we cannot invest in?"

Guzzardi: "A company that takes a federal contract to build a border wall with Mexico, we would not invest in that company.

That's correct."

Davidsmeyer: "What is the value that we are saying there?"

Guzzardi: "Pardon me?"

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

Davidsmeyer: "What is the value that we as a state are saying?"

Guzzardi: "Well again, you know, I believe that the construction

of this wall, first of all I don't think it's going to happen

to be honest with you."

Davidsmeyer: "I agree."

Guzzardi: "Yeah. So, I think talking about the wall..."

Davidsmeyer: "So, this is purely political Bill?"

Guzzardi: "Well, the wall is a charged issue right and..."

Davidsmeyer: "It is."

Guzzardi: "...so hear me out...

Davidsmeyer: "Yeah."

Guzzardi: "...talking about the wall is a way of sending a message to a group of people in this country about what we think the problems in this country are. Right? So, the wall is a message. I think we should be really clear about that. And it's a message that people are unwelcome in this country. We think they're the problem. And so, the values of this Bill are in refuting that message with a message of our own. That's not what we think the problems facing this country are."

Davidsmeyer: "So, do you think we have a problem with illegal immigration?"

Guzzardi: "Representative Davidsmeyer..."

Davidsmeyer: "I'm not saying the wall will stop that...

Guzzardi: "Right."

Davidsmeyer: "...I'm just asking."

Guzzardi: "Immigration from... net migration from Mexico, we have more people going back to Mexico than coming in. There was a big influx of people coming from Mexico 20 years ago. But the Boogie Man of illegal immigrants taking our jobs and

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

destroying our communities is simply a false myth that we need to refute as a General Assembly."

Davidsmeyer: "And I understand that but somebody doing something illegally, you're supporting that?"

Guzzardi: "Let me tell you. Let me tell you."

Davidsmeyer: "Because the system needs to be fixed. Don't get me wrong..."

Guzzardi: "I agree completely."

Davidsmeyer: "This system needs to be fixed. But there are... there is something illegal going on there. They're not..."

Guzzardi: "Yeah."

Davidsmeyer: "...following proper procedure. And what we do...

Guzzardi: "That absolutely true."

Davidsmeyer: "...and what we do here, right, if there's something wrong, we fix it. We file a Bill, we fix the law, we've done it yesterday. Right we did it yesterday..."

Guzzardi: "Yeah. That's absolutely true. And here's the thing is that oftentimes people say, well why don't they just do it the legal way? Why don't they just get in line like everybody else? The fact of the matter is legal immigration from Mexico is an enormously difficult, costly, and extremely time intensive process it takes..."

Davidsmeyer: "Not just for Mexico."

Guzzardi: "...Years. That's true. Not just from Mexico."

Davidsmeyer: "Yeah."

Guzzardi: "It takes years and years and years. And a lot of the people who come to this country simply can't wait that long. They're escaping violence, they're escaping abuse, they're escaping poverty. Right, they're coming to this country for

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

opportunity and they simply can't afford to wait. So, they're willing to take desperate measures to engage in activity that is illicit in order to come to this country and make a better life.

Davidsmeyer: "We have laws that allow for asylum and things like that for those specific cases."

Guzzardi: "But those are very ineffective and only apply in a extremely small minority of cases."

Davidsmeyer: "So, why wouldn't we work on a Resolution to encourage the Federal Government to..."

Guzzardi: "To undertake comprehensive immigration reform? I would look forward to co-sponsoring that with you Representative Davidsmeyer."

Davidsmeyer: "Or specifically those issues of violence and you know fleeing those... those specific issues."

Guzzardi: "Absolutely. Well, I look forward to those conversations. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Demmer."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Demmer: "Representative, I think it's important that we look at the issue that we're debating here today. And the issue we're debating is not should we build a wall or should we not build a wall."

Guzzardi: "Correct."

Demmer: "That's a decision that not going to happen in the Illinois General Assembly. It's a decision that happens in Washington among both elected and appointed policymakers. So, let's just sort of address that and say what we're talking

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

about today is how Illinois is going to deal with an investment strategy."

Guzzardi: "Correct."

Demmer: "So, I think that this Bill begs a lot of questions. First, how do you identify companies? So, you say these boards are going to make their best efforts to identify companies who have a contract. How are the boards going to do that? Are they going to try to get FOIA's to contracts that exist? I mean, where do they find this information?"

Guzzardi: "So, the Bills lays out specific procedures that the IIPB can undertake, which include reviewing and relying on publicly available information, contacting asset managers, contacting institutional investors. So, there's procedures laid out in the Bill for how this works. And I will remind you that we already do this in a number of other areas, right around Iran and related investments, Sudan related investments..."

Demmer: "So, but we're looking at specifically at this case. So, there is contract that exists between somebody providing services and the Federal Government I assume. Does the State of Illinois... the investment boards State of Illinois have a right to access those contracts and understand the nature of those contracts? Or will they simply at the leisure of hey, do you have a contract here and would you disclose it to me? Does the state have any way to force that information to come public?"

Guzzardi: "Representative Demmer, this is the kind of work the IIPB is regularly engaged in at present. The statute before us contains a number of specific ways in which the IIPB is to

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

make these determinations. And again, we passed something on it as nebulous a concept as boycotting the State of Israel that we assigned to the IIPB, which I believe you voted for Representative as did everyone in this chamber. So, I think that we are all comfortable assigning the IIPB this kind of task.

Demmer: "So, how would you identify a company if they decided not to make their contracts available? Would you assume that company has a contract and they're hiding something? Would you assume they don't have one..."

Guzzardi: "Representative..."

Demmer: "...If the company says they don't wish to disclose that information?"

Guzzardi: "So again, I will direct you to the language of the proposed statute here, which says that the IIPB will makes it best effort to identify these companies and it lists a number of specific ways in which they could make that effort. And again, this is the..."

Demmer: "If company going to..."

Guzzardi: "...kind of work that you have told them do already in other areas."

Demmer: "If a company has been identified and they feel they've been wrongly identified, is there and appeal process or some way that the company can say look you've mistakenly identified us as having a contract?"

Guzzardi: "I am quite certain that they could make that they could make that information available to the IIPB and that they would review their list. According to this Bill..."

Demmer: "There's no procedure for that, though?"

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

- Guzzardi: "They review the list every quarter. Yes."
- Demmer: "Hoping. So, there's no appeal process, though?"
- Guzzardi: "Representative Demmer, this kind of work is what the IIPB does. We're instructing them to do their job. We're telling them how to do it. This... and again, as I've repeated before, this is the kind of work that you have previously tasked them with doing. So, you clearly are comfortable as is everyone in this chamber tasking them to do this kind of work..."
- Demmer: "Does this apply to a master contract or also to sub contracts?"
- Guzzardi: "Simply to master contracts and I think that language is pretty clear. Subcontractors aren't mentioned in the statute at all."
- Demmer: "Doesn't. So, we're okay with somebody subcontracting to provide these services but not contracting to provide them?"
- Guzzardi: "Well yeah, Representative Demmer, I think that the potential snowball effect of including subcontractors might be a little too grave for what we're trying to accomplish here."
- Demmer: "Would this apply to people who furnish equipment? So, Caterpillar has got earth movers that are working on this. Do we have to divest from Caterpillar?"
- Guzzardi: "No, again that's the language in this statute is quite clear. That does not apply to them."
- Demmer: "If they have a contract to provide those services though."
- Guzzardi: "If they contract to build a border wall with Mexico then the IIPB will take that into account and make its

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

investment decisions accordingly. And again, I'll point out that this won't have any effect on Illinois jobs or Illinois workers. Should Caterpillar receive this contract, they'll get the contract and they'll go do the work and they'll make the money for it, that we simply won't be owning shares."

Demmer: "And the state would divest from Caterpillar."

Guzzardi: "Again here, let make this point also. And I didn't make it earlier. There have been times in recent history in this country when states like Indiana and North Carolina have engaged in activities that have been widely viewed as... as unethical, right? Have passed legislation that was targeting specific groups that a lot of people thought this is a bad idea. And you know what, a whole lot of responsible companies in this country got together and said we're not going do business with that state while they're participating in these activities, right? And that had a huge impact and historically throughout time, targeted investment strategies and decisions by responsible corporations have had a major impact on public policy."

Demmer: "We're not talking about corporations who... we're talking about the State of Illinois' investments in corporations..."

Guzzardi: "Correct. My point in saying this is..."

Demmer: "...so it's Government decision."

Guzzardi: "...my point in saying this is that I trust that good and responsible companies will not participate in this. I have faith in those companies."

Demmer: "If a corporate parent were to have some sort of contract would the state be required to divest from all of subsidiaries?"

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

Guzzardi: "Any company that takes a contract to build a wall, the company that takes the contract, we won't be investing in...

Demmer: "And all it's subsidiaries."

Guzzardi: "...the company its self that takes the contract, Representative."

Demmer: "And if the company has an ownership stake in multiple companies we have to divest from not just the company doing the specific contract but all those corporate subsidiaries."

Guzzardi: "So, it does not apply to what are called indirect holdings or private funds. So, it's specifically the companies that are taking the contracts to build. I don't know how to be more clear about this than I've already been, Representative."

Demmer: "I think it's important for us to understand the nature of relationships between publicly traded entities, entities in which the state is investing. There are many companies who share corporate governance structures, who share ownership structures, I think we're opening up a lot of..."

Guzzardi: "Representative."

Demmer: "...of past here. Let me ask you..."

Guzzardi: "Go ahead, Sir."

Demmer: "...in addition. I find it interesting that this... that this Bill has an expiration date on it."

Guzzardi: "Yeah."

Demmer: "Is it your assertion that it's okay to build wall on January 21, of 2021?"

Guzzardi: "No. We have sunset dates on Bills all the time and this one provides a great opportunity to reconsider this venture in 2 years."

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

- Demmer: "How did you choose this sunset date?"
- Guzzardi: "You know Representative Demmer, it was chosen... I know what you're getting at. It was chosen as a reference to the end of the 1st term of the current President-Elect of the United States."
- Demmer: "But this is not a political initiative."
- Guzzardi: "Representative, this is a moral initiative. This is an initiative about what are values are. And yes, that's connected to politics. I think morals and politics are often intricately bound, right?"
- Demmer: "If it's truly a moral issues, why have an expiration date?"
- Guzzardi: "I haven't heard you question any other legislation we've ever passed that has a sunset date of why it should have one. And frankly, I haven't heard you question, ask any of these same question about..."
- Demmer: "Most Bills that come before us aren't illustrated as moral imperatives."
- Guzzardi: "Well Representative, I appreciate your questions.

  Thank you for asking them. I'll simply say this. We had a
  Bill that did this exact same thing about companies that
  boycott Israel. And I heard none of these questions about the
  mechanics of how that Bill would operate when that came before
  us. So, I can only assume that the reason you're asking these
  questions now is about the substance of this Bill and not
  about its mechanics so..."
- Demmer: "I appreciate that. Thank you, Representative. To the Bill. I am questioning the substance of this Bill. We make a bunch of claims about how the state's going to divest from

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

companies. We might divest ourselves from companies who we have many other relationships with. Pension Boards now have through corporate governance structures look understand that there may or may not be a contract in place for services for a wall that's being built. Again, we're not debating the fact of whether a wall should be built or not. But we're here in Springfield in the Illinois State Capitol talking about an issue of what pension funds can and can't invest in. The decision about the wall is not happening right now, it's happening in Washington. It doesn't happen here. So, we need to understand the substance of this Bill, the restrictions that it would place on Pension Boards, the nebulous nature of many of these claims that are being made about who was contracts and who has business relationships. We're biting off far more than we can chew with this Bill. There are so many unanswered questions. So many things that we don't understand how it would impact our already imperiled pension systems. Please take a very, very close look at this legislation and vote 'no'. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

Ives: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

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

Guzzardi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll simply say this. I think any comments about from the previous speaker who spoke to the so many unanswered questions and how could we possibly know how the policy board could make these investment decisions. We had this exact same Bill about these companies that boycott

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

Israel in this same General Assembly. And not a single one of those questions was raised. So, I think those questions are simply a thin excuse for not wanting to address the values question that is at the core of this Bill. What kind of values do we reflect as the General Assembly of the State of Illinois? And I trust, I really trust that we will show the people of this state, particularly the immigrant community of this state, that we don't believe they're the problem. We don't want to build a wall and keep the boogie man out. We believe in welcoming people from all backgrounds to the State of Illinois and providing economic opportunity for those people in our state. I urge an 'aye' vote. I think this is a critical message for us to send to immigrants in this state and to people around this country about what our values are. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves Members. Please record yourselves. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 56 voting 'yes', 47 voting 'no'. The Gentleman requested the Bill put on the Order of Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Hernandez is recognized."

Hernandez: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "State your point."

Hernandez: "I just want to thank Representative Guzzardi for having the courage to build bridges and not build walls. Thank you." Speaker Lang: "Chair recognizes Representative Chapa LaVia. For what reason do you rise?"

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

Chapa LaVia: "Point of personal privilege if I may."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Chapa LaVia: "Thank you, Speaker. You look mighty nice today. I know we're at a lull and I'd like to just take a opportunity to congratulate and thank the Members that are going to be leaving us. Because there such a plethora of people leaving us. But I wanted to make sure especially my seatmate over here Mr. Jack Franks, that I honor him. He has sat next to me unfortunately for 14 years. And he does smell, and both of these Gentleman make me feel like I'm at home with my brothers. But honestly Jack, you have always gone above and beyond being a seatmate. You've always made sure that you've pushed my button or I've pushed yours red all the time. But I've learned a lot from you, you are a phenomenal debater. I was going to say another word but I won't say that. And... and whenever I wasn't watching what Bills I was going to be on, you made sure that I was on Bills that I needed in my district. Because you knew my district. And I'm going to really, really, really, miss you. And I don't know how many people here can say that. But I... I have loved having a Republican on this side to represent that half of the chamber. Last time I did that I got in trouble on national news, but he's Caucasian. Part anyway, whatever the other side is, right? But seriously Jack, your family is like my family. I know you're going to be around, I know you're going be able to help us whenever we need it. And then you're going to come back for votes and a lot of our Members over here are going to say no. So, but from the bottom of my heart, I love you to death. I wish you only success. I know you have big foot steps to come into

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

that seat but I know you're going to do great. Also, for all the Members, Mr. Sullivan I came in with you, you've been a great asset and I'm not going to go down litany of everybody. Tryon, I hope in the future that we're still working together on great stuff, Tryon. I know you're going to do great stuff. For the Members, the other 9... 17 Members, I adore each and every one of you, and I hope that you understand, you've been a big part of who we are and what will continue to be. This institution is a fine institution. 99 percent of the time we do agree on a lot of stuff. I just wish the media would cover that. Because these are all my brothers and sisters. These are all my GA brothers and sisters and if anything happens to you I'll be there in a heartbeat. And I just want let you know, and I'm sure some of our colleagues will get up and acknowledge other people but I'm going to miss all of you. Godspeed. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Mayfield is recognized. For what reason do you rise?"

Mayfield: "Personal privilege. Since we're talking about Members that are leaving, I just want to acknowledge a strong leader within the Black Caucus that is going to be leaving us, Representative Eddie Jackson, who is by far the best dressed man in the chamber every Session day. He is extremely humble but he is so bright and so sharp. If you've ever had an opportunity to be in his committee, he knows his facts and nothing gets out of that committee that has any type of garbage in it. He is just an excellent man, a wonderful Representative. We are going to miss you, Representative. And

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

I just want everybody just to congratulate him and thank him for all his service to us."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Kifowit is recognized. For what purpose do you rise?"

Kifowit: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the same vain being a fellow class of the freshman '98. I want to wish Godspeed to my good friend, fabulous singer, wonderful extraordinaire individual Kate Cloonen. She... as we all remember when we used to do freshman hazing, she was the one that belted it out. And I think put Dennis Reboletti on call for when they... when she sang God Bless America on this House Floor. And we will never forget all her wisdom, all her insight, and her experience. I am personally blessed to call her a friend and a colleague. So, thank you Kate and have a lot of fun."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hays."

Hays: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to take a moment to acknowledge my friend Mike Tryon, who has been here for well over a decade and most of you have had the opportunity to work with Representative Tryon over the years. And I'm sure you have found him like I have found him to be a thoughtful legislator, somebody who does his homework, somebody who is willing to engage, somebody who is an absolute expert on environmental issues, somebody who seeks the common ground. I certainly will miss my friend here in the General Assembly, maybe the most asked question is: what happens to the Boat Drink Caucus when Mr. Tryon leaves and the answer is, he's out of the band. I told him he could be a roadie going forward. No, the truth is, you know, even that in conjunction with Senator Harmon, has brought some bipartisan good-natured fun.

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

Representative Martwick and others have also participated. Mike Tryon, you will be missed. You did an extraordinary job as your County Board Chair before coming to Springfield, and your leadership, your cooperative nature will be sorely missed here. Godspeed."

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

Evans: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Proceed"

Evans: "Ladies and Gentleman, we have another colleague who's not physically here, and she's not here because of some of the challenges that life presents to us. But she came in at very challenging period in which we needed stability representing the west side of Chicago in the 10th District. We needed a strong voice that we could trust, we got that individual in Pamela Reaves-Harris. She served and we've been talking about the amount of time you serve, she served and she is continuing to serve all the way through. She only did one term. I'm in my fourth, she did one but she served with dignity, with pride. Reminding me of the great women in my community, beautifully educated black woman. She pushed for human services, she pushed for criminal justice. Her short record was one that you could be proud of, that she should be proud of, and we all should thank her. Because again she came in, in a period, in which we needed a Representative to represent us all with a particular level of trust and class. She did that, she did not run for reelection, will be replaced by another, dynamic woman. But she deserves our thoughts, she deserves are prayers as she goes through a tumultuous period. And send her an email, call if you can, because her one term

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

was impactful to our community and this Assembly. So, Pamela Reaves-Harris give her a round of applause. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Williams is recognized."

Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege." Speaker Lang: "Please Proceed."

Williams: "You know, people sometimes say that Springfield and the world in and around the Capitol is kind of like a family. Albeit a very dysfunctional family, and I would agree. I was talking with a colleague of mine on the other side of the aisle, Representative McAuliffe, and we were noting that we've both been hanging around here over 20 years now. But I think it's important for all the Members that are leaving us to remember how many of us you've touched, in so many ways, the years. And we are somewhat of а Representative Acevedo, you've been a great person to have in my row. But I remember as 27 year old staffer being terrified of you. Not as scared of you now but will miss you being here around the Capitol. I've know you've made such an impact on so many of us. Jen, Bradley, and I have worked on some crazy negotiations over the years. Both in my role as a Legislator, as well as a staffer, and some crazy, crazy Bills that have come out of that. Mike Tryon, what an amazing person you are. I look forward with you even beyond your time here. Linda Chapa LaVia, always a smile for all of us. Thank you for your remarks as well, even though you're not quite leaving us yet, but I appreciate your comments about Jack. And I will say, I did work on Jack's first election so I do take some responsibility for the last 18 years. And finally, just a shout out to Don Moffitt. We had some interesting times when

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

we first started to regulate the Sudafedrin when I was working at the AG's office. And I'm not trying go through my own personal history but just to make the point that so many of you have touched so many of us in so many ways over the years. And we're all thinking of it as you move on to the next chapter in your lives. And we hope you come back and see us soon."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Hernandez."

Hernandez: "Thank you, Speaker. Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Go right ahead."

Hernandez: "I just... I want to start off... it is bittersweet to say farewell to our friend, Majority Leader Representative Ed Acevedo. There's been a lot of history that's been made especially under the leadership of Representative Acevedo. He's really taken this state forward in terms of, especially the immigrant communities, taking the lead in passing instate tuition, the temporary driver's license, The Illinois Dream Act. Working very hard to hold back secure communities from being implemented in the State of Illinois. He has really... he really has a record of working hard on behalf of his community. He's been a friend to me, he's been my seatmate from the very get go. I've been here over 10 years. Often times I do have to mention that, that button right next to me, often times I thought was mine at times. All in kidding. Eddie we're going to really miss you. I really respect the leadership and how you have lead Illinois. Our communities have really just gained and benefit from the hard work that you have accomplished here. I want to thank you, we all want

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

to thank you, Illinois wants to thank you for your work. Thank you my friend."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mitchell."

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

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Mitchell, B.: "Since were doing this unexpected my seatmate, my friend, Representative Adam Brown is retiring. He's doing what he does best right now, he's up in my office eating chicken. But Representative Brown started as a volunteer in my office then he had an upset against a popular incumbent, worked very very hard. He's a modern day Cincinnatus so to speak. He dropped the plowed shared farmer to come serve here for a short period of time: 6 years. Now he's going back to the farm. So, I wish he and his family all the best."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Soto."

Soto: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege." Speaker Lang: "Proceed please."

Soto: "I, too, want to congratulate everybody for being here. I just want to tell you it's been a great experience. I want to also remind you to thank your wife for allowing you to be here. Not in bad way, I'm just saying that you know, we take a sacrifice when we're away from home so they miss us. So, always remember to thank them because we wouldn't be here without them. I want to thank Representative Acevedo, our Leader. Thank you for all you've done. We're going to miss you very much. But I know where you live. And Representative Tryon, thank you for being here in the General Assembly. You are a good friend. Representative Bradley, another good

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

friend that I want to congratulate. Representative Franks, we're going to miss you, Representative Franks but we know where to find you too. Mr. Moffitt, Representative Moffitt, I can't forget you. You have been wonderful, you're a very good friend. So, I really appreciate you all. And I just want to wish you the very best and also wish you Happy Holidays if we don't see each other. So, thank you again for serving in this state. We really appreciate it. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Hammond."

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

Speaker Lang: "Proceed please."

Hammond: "I would like to pay tribute to our friend and colleague, Representative Don Moffitt. Don, has been here for a year or two. And he has chosen to go out on his own terms and God bless him for that. He has done an amazing job in his tenure here in the General Assembly. He has seen a lot of Members come and go. But, he has certainly left a mark here that we will not soon forget. I want to thank him for all of his hard work on all of your committees but especially to mention two items. One is in the field of Agriculture. Don is a farmer, he does know agriculture, and he knows good legislation, and I thank him for that. And also for all of his efforts on Amtrak. Don, you have done an amazing, amazing job. I know that Carolyn is anxious to get you back at home, and the children, and grandchildren are as well. But thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Ford."

Ford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise for personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Please go ahead."

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

Ford: "Mr. Speaker, I rise to also congratulate all those that are leaving and moving on with their lives. Leaving us with the begged to bail out the state and find a solution. But I really want to rise in support of Ken Dunkin. He's a friend of mine. And I think that we just have to remember that people make their own decisions and they have to live with their decisions. But we can never forget about the good work that people have done to make this state a better place. And as a Member of the General Assembly, I must say that Ken Dunkin may have made some decisions that he felt was good for him and for the state. But I do know that the overwhelming majority of the work that Ken Dunkin did in this Body was for the good of the State of Illinois and for the community that he served. And for that I rise and ask everyone to give Ken Dunkin a round of applause for the good work that he did as he led the Higher Ed Committee. And I think he did that gracefully and the work that he did to change the Tourist Committee, and the tourism in Illinois. He did great work, and I think that he went out on his own terms. And I think that the state is better as a result of Dunkin serving and the House is better that he's gone."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Durkin is recognized."

Durkin: "Well, why not? Everybody's doing it so I'm going to jump in to. You know, I'm glad you brought up Ken Dunkin because I had a lot of things to say to him. I wish he was here, I wanted to talk about his career, and he's got some interesting things that he's done over the past few years. One thing that I found that was quite interesting is that I was at an Illinois Coalition for Infrastructure Renewal Annual

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

Legislative Banquet and they gave me my card and it said Representative Kenneth Durkin. So, there has been confusion over the years. So, I'm going to send this to Representative Duncan, so when he makes one of his trips down to the Dominican Republic he can use this and he can now then be legitimate. I think you know what we're talking about. In any event, I want to be able to say a few words about my colleagues who are leaving. Six of them who have brought 92 years of service and talent to the legislature. And all of them are fine men and I know they've said some things be ... people have said some things already, but I want to add to it. David Leitch, first and foremost, David has been the Dean of our Caucus and I would say for the chamber for so many years. Whenever there's a problem you need to go back and look at history about how certain issues have been handled, that's who you go to. I know he's done that with both sides of the aisle. David has just been such an amazing friend but a great resource. He came to the House in 1989 after serving a few months in the Senate. David was... has been very active with legislation requiring insurance coverage for mammograms, he worked on government reform, agricultural issues, and also has been a strong advocate for the mentally ill developmentally disabled. He became an assistant Leader in 1993 and the Deputy Republican Leader since 2011. I want to wish him the best with his children; Sarah, Ben, Elizabeth, and his 4 grandchildren. I know he's looking forward to spending a lot of time with them. But more importantly for those of you who go to Peoria, take a walk along the River Walk, take an experience over there. It's beautiful, they've

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

done amazing work there but it's accomplished and the reason they got that River Walk developed was because of one person, that's because of David Leitch. A man who is committed but also his passion for Peoria is something which I think is commendable but it's something for the history books. Thank you, David. Representative Don Moffitt joined the House of Representatives in 1993. Don has been a true champion of the fire service and our first responders. He's cochaired the EMS taskforce, the Fire Funding taskforce, the General Assembly's Fire Caucus. And Don, I can say you probably a member of many Legislative Caucus's. As a matter of fact, I think you suggested another one the other night at our retirement party with myself and Representative Bennett. I forgot the name of that Caucus, but I think that your still continuing to work on developing more Caucus's, bringing people together. I think that's great but when it comes to support of First Responders, Representative Moffitt is leaving enormous... enormous shoes to fill. But his list of legislative of accomplishment don't stop there. We know Don has been a true advocate for labor, agricultural community, and also for local government. He comes as executive from the ... back in Galesburg, serving in the County Board. Don, you will be missed. We want to think you and your family, his wife Carolyn, your children Londa, Justin, Amanda, their 8 grandchildren. Don, thank you for your service to the State of Illinois. Ed Sullivan, right here, there he is. Ed served the House since 2003. He's achieved distinction in his efforts to improve public safety. He passed the Illinois Anti-Gang Initiative in 2009. And was the lead Republican negotiator as

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

he reworked to develop the Illinois Carry Conceal Law in 2013. That was a lot of fun, wasn't it Ed. Representative Sullivan, Ed, is respected by both sides on the aisle for his bipartisan work. And he's the founding member of a group called the Sullivan Caucus, which is a rather plucky group of Irish Revelers. So Ed, congratulations for that. If you're remembered for anything it will probably be that. He's been also a very valuable member of our floor team. Ed is going to go back to ... back to Lake County, spend time with his family, and I know we'll see more of you Ed. But thank you so much for what you've done. Mike Tryon came to the House in 2005... in 2005 representing McHenry and Kane Counties. He's a former County Chairman in McHenry County. Another champion of local government. Mike passed changes to the property tax law in his first term. It's helped change... that change has closed loopholes and saved tax payers millions of dollars. He created the Illinois transparency portal to bring greater sunshine on the way our tax dollars are spent. He wrote legislation that created one of the first Veteran's Court Systems to help Veterans' dealing with PTSD and other service related issues. He's also one of the cofounders of something very personal to me, the Diabetes Caucus in the General Assembly. Mike has been the assistant Republican Leader since 2013. Mike and we will miss Mike and the sessions that he has periodically with a band called the Boat Drink Caucus at the Butternut Hut. Mike, we wish you the best, with you and your wife Cathy, your son Jared, daughters Lauren and Lindsay, and your granddaughter. Representative Adam Brown is retiring after three terms in the House We know he has a bright future ahead

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

of him. He started out his public... public career in 2009 as the youngest member of the Decatur City Counsel, and was one of the youngest members ever to serve in House Republican Leadership. Adam has worked hard to create jobs and create transparency in State Government. In 2013, he worked across the aisle to pass an incentive package to bring the Cronus Chemicals Facility to Tuscola, which will bring about 2000 jobs and about half a billion construction investments to that part of the state. A fifth generation family farmer, Adam Brown is retiring to lead B&B Farms, and to have more time with his family, Stephanie and their kids Elise and Kenton. Adam, thank you. We're also losing Representative Dwight Kay, who says he's not retiring yet. Correct, Dwight? Thank you. Representative Kay has served the people of the Metro East for 6 years. He has been a consistent, unwavering, strong voice of the Illinois Business community. In that role, he has been a Republican spokesman on the Labor and Commerce and the Business Growth and Incentives Committee. Dwight is a passionate and direct legislator. And I thank you for that. It's refreshing, Dwight. Thank you. Representative Kay is the Vice-President of Cassens Transport in Edwardsville, the nation's largest privately held transport company, where he's worked since 1973. We will miss Representative Kay and wish him the best with his wife Nancy, 2 children and grandchildren. Gentleman, collectively, thank you for your support in... more importantly thank you for your friendship over these years. Illinois is better because of you. Each one of you I've had the opportunity to know personally, day in and day out for so

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

many years. And the jobs that we have are not easy but you address the jobs and the challenges as true champions, as true champions of Illinois and also for your districts. And again, I want to thank you for your dedicated service that you have given to the House of Representatives, to your districts, and to the State of Illinois. Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "You may proceed."

Martwick: "So, thank you Leader Durkin for those kind words on behalf of your colleagues. You know, I think it's wonderful the outgoing... the things... the final remarks we have to say to our colleagues and I think it's important that we recognize that no matter how contentious it gets here, that all of us come here from... with different viewpoints and different background but we come here not to corrupt the system, not to get personal benefits but to do go things. Clearly, you know, we didn't hear anybody stand up and say, boy am I glad you're leaving, right? And it's not because we're being gentlemanly and kind and civil but because we truly appreciate the service of our Members. So, I would especially implore the new Members that are coming in to keep in mind that there is always room to work across the aisle. And as I listen to Leader Durkin extol the virtues of his Members, I think about each... working with each one those Members in my four short years here, across the aisle on different Bills. And they're good people, all of them, good people on this side. I thank you all for

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

your service and I wish you well. You know Mike, I love our conversations, I'm going to miss playing with you. I hope you'll come down. What an amazing guitarist. It's amazing for those of you who don't play music I tell you, when you're a bad musician, you play with somebody like him, it's like all of a sudden you become really good. He makes it easy so it's a lot of fun. Dwight, I've enjoyed our conversations over the years. Although, I will tell you, I don't know how I'm going to park in my parking spot without half your car in it. I'm not sure how to do that yet. So, yeah, I'll actually be able to bring the big car now, I guess. I don't know. So many good Members here, so many good memories. Eddie Jackson, I'm going to miss. Every time I come down this aisle, a smile on your face, a warm handshake, letting us know that every day is worth coming to work here, and doing the good work of the people. And finally, one last word for a colleague of mine who I have a personal affection for, Representative Mike Smiddy. Who... I have so much affection for him because he came down here and really with a rare approach to legislating and that was he wasn't going to do what was politically expedient or what other people said would be best for his reelection purposes. He was going to do what he thought was right and he took some very, very, controversial votes. I've often referred to him as the most courageous Member in the House. Whether you agreed with him or you didn't disagree with him, he made come votes that made his reelection very, very difficult but he did it because he thought it was the right thing. And if more of us acted in that manner, we might get more solutions done. But thank you all for your service.

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

You're all good people. I look forward to work with in the future."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Meier."

"Yes. I, too, want to thank several people. All of our retiring Members of the House that have made me feel welcome here and work with me. But my seatmate, Don Moffitt, has become a very good friend, like a brother to me. He took this farm boy that came up here with nothing to know about politics and helped me become a legislator. He's always gracious to everybody you see. What he's done for our fireman are know from the top to the bottom of the state. Where ever I go in my district to a fire department, they ask me how Don is doing. He's been there for everybody, he's great. Now, don't worry about Don. He'll be all right. I offered him a job to come down and help drive tractor. And Jack Franks, I want you to know, since you're a farmer too, wheat harvest starts about the 10th of June. And you can come down and drive tractor too. It will be okay. They're going to be green though, I just want you to know that. But I want to wish all of our retiring Members the best. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Butler."

Butler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege." Speaker Lang: "You may go right ahead."

Butler: "I don't know how many colleagues have had the opportunity to actually vote for someone they serve with, but I've had the opportunity to vote for my seatmate David Leitch, as a native of Peoria that I was. So, I actually have helped Dave get elected by voting for him. And when our friend Raymond Poe, who was here a few days ago, I actually voted for him.

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

So when he was here, I've actually voted for two Members of this Body. Which is a cool thing. But David, when I was sworn in and I found out I was going to be sitting next to David, I couldn't think of a better person to sit next to. I've known David Leitch for many years and have worked with him in my previous life. And being a native of Peoria, I couldn't imagine anyone better to sit next to. What I didn't know was how funny he would be to talk about all of you under his breath. And that has been one of the greatest things of sitting next to David is his running commentary when each and every one of you gets up to speak. And I wish I would have kept a notebook on it but I didn't so. David Leitch is a wonderful individual, a wonderful man, and a true champion for the City of Peoria and central Illinois. Many of you probably don't know, he got his start as a journalist. He was a journalist at one time for the Peoria Journal Star. But I think you made the right decision by coming on this side of the fence instead of going on the other side of the fence with journalism. David is known throughout the country really for his leadership on mental health issues. He has been a real champion for mental health issues and those of you I know that who have worked on... worked with him in this Body know that he's a true champion for mental health issues. He's done some great things in our community of Peoria, including the acquisition of ICC Peoria North after the Zeller Mental Health Facility was closed which is now ICC North. David was instrumental in that. He led the area delegation, including when I worked for Congressman LaHood, to help save Keystone Wire, with a \$10 million loan from the state which helped

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

Keystone stay in business. And he helped not only once but twice redevelop the Pere Marquette in Peoria with his leadership. And he was honored this past September, and I know many of you were there in Peoria, at the Peoria Historical Society, honored him with the de Tonti Award. David, you will be missed. You will be missed by me. Ryan Spain has big shoes to fill but I know he's going to do great. You've been a great mentor to him. And I would be remiss not to say we also miss, Linda Daley. I know she's going to work with Ryan Spain a little bit but his district staff person, Linda Daley, who many of you might know as well has been great person as well. So David, thank you. Thank you for your friendship and your mentorship, and best of luck my friend."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Beiser"

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

Speaker Lang: "Proceed please."

Beiser: "I rise today to talk about a couple of my colleagues that are on their way out. First of all, Eddie Jackson. Eddie I've got to know you through the legislative process being here in the House. And also one of the legislators that stay at the same hotel and you couldn't ask for a better, better, individual than Eddie Jackson. So, thank you, for when we come down here, one of the things we don't really anticipate is forming new friendships and what that will mean. And Eddie, I consider you a good friend and one of the good assets that I've taken from my time here in the Legislature. The other person I would like to mention is my aisle seatmate Pat Verschoore. Pat doesn't know how much of a good person he is to all of us, I don't believe. When we come down here as a

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

brand new Legislator, it's somewhat intimidating because of all the issues that are there, the process itself, and just the sheer magnitude of all the people. Whether it's the fellow people that representing Legislators, organizations, lobbyist, etc. So, it can be intimidating. And I don't know if Pat realizes that as a brand new Legislator, he was the one that reached out to me and invited me to become part of the Caucus that he chairs in our wing of the Stratton Building. And that meant the world because you always know you're going to form relationships but you don't know just when they're going to happen or how they're going to happen. And when he reached out to me, I felt like I was part of this Body. So Pat, that meant the world and I want to say publically thank you so much for becoming such a very, very good friend. I know there are other Members of the downstate that aren't able be here today and hopefully if we're here in January before the new General Assembly they'll have an opportunity. But we did informally speak and Pat is the Chairman of the 4:00 Caucus in our wing. A very important caucus that decides many events, many ideas and very deep thinking caucus. And we have just made him a permanent member of the 4:00 Caucus who with all the rights and privileges that come with that. And I think he'll enjoy that and maybe that'll help bring him down to Springfield when he's not here in the Legislature. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "He may never leave now. Mr... Representative McAsey. McAsey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I rise and I find this a little bit more difficult than I thought it would be. I apologize. The landscape of the backrow here is

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

certainly changing. I just wanted to take moment to wish a fond farewell to my seatmates Kate Cloonen, Mike Smiddy, Andy Skoog, and from the first day that I served my seatmate John Bradley, who has often been absent and at this moment I hope that he can hear me wish him Godspeed. I wish he, his family, his wife Michelle, his wonderful boys, who it's been an honor to watch them grow over these last years, Gabriel, Jackson, and Austin. Wish all of you Godspeed. It's been an honor to serve with you. And look forward to seeing all of your smiling faces as we move forward. Thank you"

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Acevedo."

Acevedo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise point of personal privilege"

Speaker Lang: "Ahead, Sir."

Acevedo: "It's been a long 20 years and you know, as I look around the room, I can count on one hand how many Members were in my class when I first came in. I believe it was Representative Bellock, Representative McAuliffe. Things have changed in the past 20 years. I remember when we can be here 'til 2:00 at night, have our arguments amongst on the House floor, go out and have dinner and have a beer, and still come back as friends. Somehow that has changed. I know Lisa had mentioned about me passing all these legislation, as far as undocumented. Thank you Lisa so much, who's been my seatmate, Ann Williams, Cynthia Soto, Danny Burke. The rest of the Latino Caucus and the Black Caucus and the Downstate Caucus, thank you all for all your hard work you've done here. I'm not going to say goodbye to the people who are leaving because I'm sure I'll see you around in Springfield again. But I'll

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

tell you one thing, people have come and gone in this chamber in the past 20 years I've been here. Some have gone on their own, some have gone on and passed away but do you know what? In the past 20 years, I've met some of the most incredible individuals, the most caring individuals, that I've ever met in my life. I want to thank my constituents from the 2nd Legislative District for giving me the honor, the honor for coming down here for 20 years to represent them. And that's one thing, please don't ever forget, when you're in this chamber, it's an honor that is bestowed on you by the people you represent. It's not about one person passing a Bill. It's about people coming together, it's about people working together across the aisle. I have friends on both sides of the aisle, we can work together. But more importantly, we have to put our political differences aside. We have to work for the people who we came down here to represent. We have to make this state what it once was. And still going to be the greatest state in this country. And I know with the people who are going to be here and the people that are coming in, that can happen. Change can happen. I want to thank the staff because they never get a chance for people to say thank you but you know what, you've done a tremendous... you've done a tremendous job. Our job wouldn't be as easy as it was if it wasn't for you. So, I want to thank you all. I want to thank the organizations who came down and fought for what they believe in. But I leave you with this, please just remember, in these chambers, we are all as equal as one another. And we are all here to fight for our people. I'll miss you all. I'll

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

be around here in Springfield more often but thank you so much for the opportunity. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Sente is recognized."

"Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Before we get started I... I'd like to maybe conclude some of the remarks regarding people who are leaving. I, too, would like to add my best wishes to everyone who has served. I've had the pleasure of serving with. I've had many jobs in lifetime but I would say for me, truly, this is one of the hardest I have ever had. And so, I appreciate that and in this time when many people are looking to this position we hold as politicians and why are we doing it, I look around and I would tell you that I've been working with people who are true public servants. And I would like to say thank you and a fond fare well to them. There are 3 individuals that I've probably spent most time with that are leaving that I'd just like to talk about briefly. And I feel like their background embodies a non-partisan role and cared not at all if an idea was good, it didn't matter where it came from and if an idea was bad, it didn't matter what side of the aisle it came from. I'll start with someone up in my county which was Ed Sullivan. We worked on countless pieces of legislation together. He was great for advice. And I think as I stand here on the House floor and he would get up and he would really explain pieces of legislation, it should help me make decision and would sometimes sway me in terms of how I would make a decision. So, I truly appreciate you for that Ed. And I will miss you very much when you leave. The other individual is Mike Tryon. I served with him for many years on the Environment Committee and I would tell you I don't think

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

there's anyone on that committee that I voted with more frequently or with more similar views. But with his vast background he really taught me a lot. And again, was one of those really non-partisan people who was down here to do good. And the last will probably be no surprise to you guys, would be my very good friend Jack Franks. The first time I met Jack he was in a ski cap and on the other side of the street with Shaw Decremer on the other side and they we're teaching me how to go up to talk to doors and rushing me because they had a live body on one side of the street or the other and I was running back and forth. Jack taught me everything I know frankly about campaigning and legislating and being a good legislator. He taught me to be bold, a true Representative. He is of transparency in the tax payer. And we hosted new Member dinners together, teaching new Members to be bipartisan and work together. And I will miss every single person leaving and has served. And I wish you all the best but I will perhaps miss Jack the most of all. So, thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Burke is recognized."

Burke, D.: "Thank you, Speaker. As we await some very important legislation, I think it might be appropriate that I ask that our colleague Kate Cloonen share one last song with us before she departs this chamber. I'm certainly going to be missing our duets but I know and I suggested to her and certainly to all the Members and I hope I've extended my best wishes to you personally, wishing you nothing but the best of health and good luck in your future endeavors. But I think it would be very appropriate if we had Representative Kate Cloonen do one last song for us. And, I for one would request the song

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

- God Bless America that she's performed on this House floor previously. If the Body would receive Kate, I think we all would appreciate it. Thank you so much."
- Speaker Lang: "Seeing no objection if the Representative wishes, but the Representative doesn't have to."
- Cloonen: "I'll sing if everyone will join me. Sings: God Bless

  America."
- Speaker Lang: "The Chair recognizes Mr. Brady. Is this a round of O'Suzanna? Why are you standing, Sir? The Long Road Home?"
- Brady: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman of the House, with the song and the tributes it just makes me feel like I'm back at work. So, can we liven it up a little bit and make things a little happy around here. Good luck to all those who are leaving us. God Bless you."
- Speaker Lang: "Chair recognizes Mr. DeLuca on a point of personal privilege."
- DeLuca: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like the record to reflect on Senate Bill 250, my intentions were to vote 'yes'."
- Speaker Lang: "The record will reflect you intentions, Sir. Senate Bills- Second Reading. Senate Bill 2437, Leader Currie. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2437, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. This Bill was read a second time previous day. Amendment 3 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendments 4 and 6 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment 4 is offered by Representative Currie."
- Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie on Amendment 4."
- Currie: "Thank you. I would like to withdraw Amendment 4."
- Speaker Lang: "Amendment 4 is withdrawn. Mr. Clerk."

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #6 had been offered by Representative Currie."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, #6 becomes the Bill. And I would be grateful if we can go ahead and adopt the Amendment then discuss the Bill on Third Reading."

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

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

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

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2437, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this Senate Bill." Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This measure represents an effort by the City of Chicago to solve its own pension problems without relying upon the state for a single penny. But they do need to rely upon the state to help make changes in the statutory, regulatory scheme for the Laborer and Municipal Pension Funds in the City of Chicago. Both of those funds are in deep financial trouble. The Municipal Fund is expected to go broke in 2025, the Laborers Fund in 2027. What this measure does is put those systems on an actuarially required contribution schedule. Today under state statute, they operate merely by the multiplier. The multiplier isn't anywhere near adequate to make those systems financially stable. This measure would, by virtue of moving to an ARC, would give the city a five-year ramp to go to a system that, over 35 years, will mean the systems are both 90 percent

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

funded. The program would require significant new money from the city and for people hired after the effective date of this Act, there would likely be an increase in the contribution from the workers but it seems to be fair to say that the city taxpayers should be on the hook and workers should do their share as well. I would be happy to answer your questions. This, as I say is, an effort on the part of the city and its taxpayers to step up to the plate, to keep these systems from falling into the ocean, to make sure that our workers have the security they deserve and to show the city rating agencies and everybody else that we are prepared to behave responsibly. We do need your support to change the regulatory scheme but we are not, under this Bill, asking the State of Illinois taxpayers to put one penny into our systems. I'd be grateful to answer your questions. And I'd grateful for your support."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wehrli."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Wehrli: "Leader Currie, I've been with you up to Amendment 5. And quite honestly, with the activity around here this morning I was unable to attend our committee on Amendment 6. Could you briefly describe to me what Amendment 6 actually does?"

Currie: "Right. Amendment 6 actually incorporates Amendment 3, I believe. 2 and 3 as well. And Amendment 6 says that for the new hires, those in Tier 3, those hired after the effective date of the Bill, the required employee contribution would be at 11 and a half percent or normal cost, whichever is lower. Now, earlier changes in Amendments 2 and 3 said, unlike the

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

original Bill that you heard in committee two weeks ago, did say that there would not be the opportunity for anyone to go to court with a mandamus action against the city and secondly, didn't change the Amendment. Took out changes to the management of the Municipal Fund. So, that's gone. The Municipal Fund would be the same trustee membership that we have today. There is no mandamus language and then there is the change in the 11 percent... 11 and a half percent contribution to say that it would be that or normal cost whichever is lower."

Wehrli: "Thank you, Leader. And there was labor opposed to this Bill. Where are they now?"

Currie: "Well, in fact, what happened was that under this last measure 11 and a half percent or normal cost, whichever is lower, the determination of normal cost at the behest of the labor groups would be determined by an actuary, mutually agreed upon, by the city and the Municipal Fund."

Wehrli: "Okay. Thank you. To the Bill. This language in this Bill is not perfect. It is not what I would call the model of pension reform. We're not quite there yet. However, without these... without these steps, this fund or these funds will simply run out of money, I believe, the year is 2020 or within a short period of time. So, I stand ready to work with anyone on pension reform. This is a step in the right direction. Like I said, it's not perfect but I will be supporting this Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Morrison."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

- Morrison: "Leader Currie, do you know what the assumed rate of return is for these funds?"
- Currie: "I believe it's 7 and a half percent and as we know, that number can change as it did, for example, with our own Teacher Retirement System this year. But the whole business of pensions and future payments, future benefit levels, future contributions has all been a matter of estimates and certainly that rate could be... could change over time. But at this point I think the assumption is 7 and a half percent."
- Morrison: "Okay. And so, the employee contributions are going to go up, which I support. I think that's a necessary reform, that's a good reform. But what happens if normal cost exceeds 11 and a half percent?"
- Currie: "Well, under this legislation, 11 and a half percent is the cap. So, even if normal costs go higher, we would still be at 11 and a half percent.

Morrison: "Okay."

- Currie: "I don't think any of the actuaries who've looked at the issue thinks that it's likely the cost would go above 11 and a half percent. And remember, the reason that we said 11 and a half percent or normal cost is because there were many who felt that 11 and a half percent was too high a price to pay for the actual benefits that would be available to those hired after the effective date of the Bill. If, of course, it turns out that that's not right, well, then we... then we'll have another problem and the city will have to, again, find a way to ask the taxpayers to step up to the plate."
- Morrison: "Okay. Thank you. You just said what I was hoping that you would say, that if the rate of return isn't what it needs

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

to be, if normal costs exceed 11 and a half percent then the taxpayers are going to have to kick in more. On my desk this week, on all of our desks, I think, we got a report from the Office of the Auditor General. And there was an audit done regarding the Chicago Transit Authority Pension plan. Their investment return assumption is 8 and a quarter percent, 8 and a quarter percent. And I thought that this language was interesting... quoting here... that that assumption remains at the upper end of investment return assumptions used by other plans. Which is kind of interesting language because, if you flip a couple of pages, you can see that the 10-year historical rate of return is only 5.9 percent. So, since the Great Recession we have had a huge recovery within the equity markets. And yet, even with that huge, huge recovery, record stock prices, the 10 year historical rate of return has only been 5.9 percent for this other Chicago-based pension fund. So, I think it's a very real concern that we have that even 7 and a half percent is an unreasonably high assumption. And so..."

Currie: "Yeah. Except that... could I just respond to that point?" Morrison: "Sure."

Currie: "Because right now, they're not even on an actuarially required contribution formula. Right now, it doesn't matter what the investment returns actually are, they're on a multiplier and that means that not nearly enough city money is going into the system in order to make it actuarially sound. So, this is certainly an improvement over what we have today. And, in fact, if this additional money goes into the system, that money, too, can be invested and at whatever rate

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

of return, that return will come into the system itself, making it rather more than less solvent."

Morrison: "Okay. Thank you, Leader Currie. To the Bill. What we established in committee is that the city, right now, could contribute more. They have, for a variety of reasons, chosen not to, but there's a lot of ... their problems they could fix on their own. They don't necessarily need the General Assembly for all of what they're trying to do. To Representative Wehrli's point, it probably is a marginal step in the right direction but we still have grave concerns. And probably the biggest concern is this: you know, we know that this Body, the majority of the Members of this Body... well, let me just say this, a significant portion of the Members of this Body come from the City of Chicago. And so, a lot of the Bills deal with the City of Chicago. Yes, there are pension problems in the City of Chicago. We have pension problems throughout the state, throughout our local units of government. Palatine is the major village in my district and our village manager was discussing next year's budget and he is, again, our Mayor, who's just pleading for pension reform for our other pension plans, police pensions, fire pensions. If we do not do that, we're looking at layoffs for current employees, we're looking at dramatically higher taxes or cuts in services or other cuts in order to make budgets work at the local level. What we would like to see, what we need, is a much grander vision for pension reform. We need comprehensive pension reform. This Bill that we're about to vote on creates a Tier 3. That's something that I would support for statewide. What if we had a Tier 3 and had a defined contribution type of system just

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

as the rest of the world has gone to, as other units of government have gone to in other states. So, that's why... you know, if this Bill passes, this probably will be a small Band-Aid for the City of Chicago. There are still major, major problems for these funds. Very, very hard decisions yet remain for Chicago, for Cook County. And I would just like to see a larger pension proposal brought up. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I rise in support of this legislation. And for many years on this side of the aisle, we've been asking for the City of Chicago to take care of their own problems. This Bill does that. You, back home, have municipalities where, if they don't make their pension payments, the Comptroller redirects funds to make sure that you do make the pension payments. Well, guess what? We are now going to make sure that the City of Chicago uses certain funds to cover their pension payments. We allow them to go into different funds. If those are not enough to actually pay the system, we now have the Comptroller that will order them to pay and to raise their property tax levy to cover it. We're giving them relief to go into other funds, to not hit the property taxpayers, but there's a guarantee that they're going to pay it. And so, for that reason alone we should be ... all of us should be voting for it. I understand there's certain people that might not and I get that. But also, we got to start somewhere on pensions. And I believe this is a good start for us to come together, vote for something and start the discussion so we can move on to our systems that are in terrible shape. But we're going to start here. We are

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

going to with this Bill. And I certainly would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ives: "Just a couple questions concerning this. First of all, what happens if the city runs out of or uses all... up all the alternative revenue for something else? For example, what we know is that the Governor, just today, vetoed the Bill that would have given the \$215 million to CPS for their pensions. So, your Chicago citizens are going to be on the hook to make that pension payment now. So, if you're having to use other revenue for other things, what happens to this Bill? What does the city do then?"

Currie: "Yeah. There would be an intercept, I would think and just remember what this Bill does is to say, that the amount that the city has to pay will be significantly increased over the regulatory structure that the state has imposed that now brings in. So, the city would be required to meet this actuarially required contribution and if they find that the water and sewer taxes that the City Council just imposed are not adequate to fund the Bill, they'll have to find another way to fund it."

Ives: "So, essentially, what this does is it makes the… us, as Legislators, we're now the enforcers to ensure that the City of Chicago does raise sufficient revenue to meet the pension payment. Is that correct?"

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

Currie: "At this point, there is a requirement but the requirement amounts to relatively little funding for these pension systems."

Ives: "Yes. I understand there's a five-year ramp up to the ARC."
Currie: "So, for example, in 2022, the current formula, the
 multiplier, would require them to put in \$164 million. Under
 this proposal, it's closer to 600 million."

Ives: "Yeah."

Currie: "That's a very significant difference."

Ives: "You know, you're right."

Currie: "The difference would be required by state statute."

Ives: "So, why couldn't the funds themselves or the City Council themselves self-impose this sort of ramp in an ARC? Why do you have to come to us, except for the enhanced employee contribution, why are we actually acting as the enforcement mechanism when they can raise that money themselves and put it towards their pensions right now?"

Currie: "We believe they cannot. We believe that the state pensions as the City of the Chicago itself is a creature of State Law. We believe State Law says this is what you must spend under the current law that says it will be not the actuarially required amount but merely the multiplier. We believe that State Law governs in this case as it does in many others. We don't believe the city has the authority to go above or below what State Law now contemplates. They're not asking for money from us..."

Ives: "I know."

Currie: "...but they are asking for a change in the regulatory system that means that city taxpayers and future hires will

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

be responsible for a larger share of funding so as to avoid bankruptcy."

Ives: "Well, since you've been here a little bit longer than I have, I mean, I'll just let the Body understand that in 2000 both of these funds that we are now trying to do a fix for 'cause they are literally headed to bankruptcy, both of these funds were over 90 percent funded, well over 90 percent funded. So, in 2000 they were whole at which point the city themselves decided to lower the multiplier. Do you know whether or not they came to the state for approval to lower the multiplier?"

Currie: "I don't know the answer to that question, but I can tell you even if you are right that they were very well-funded in 2000..."

Ives: "They were."

Currie: "We've since have experienced the greatest recession since the Great Depression and that played havoc with pension funds in the City of Chicago as well as pension funds across the State of Illinois."

Ives: "And right now, we're at record stock market levels. So, we have more than recovered from that however; these funds... these funds are at a decline. In fact, the Body should know that this is a... this situation is actually something that you should really pay attention to because these funds may be the first funds not... unable to pay out the retirees. In fact, they are... they are actually said in committee that they are thinking of withholding current employee contributions from being dispersed to retirees. That's how bad these funds are. That said though, it doesn't mean that we have to sit here

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

and pass a Bill to help Chicago. Chicago can help themselves already. They could actually increase these contributions to these funds; they could come up with another way. And so, what you're asking for today is you're asking... you're asking for a Tier 3, right?"

Currie: "Well, most importantly we are asking for the ability of the City of Chicago to step up to the plate and avoid the disaster you have just described. You described a serious problem and I'll tell you, the solution to that serious problem is the substance of Senate Bill 2437."

Ives: "And while I partly agree with you, I have to disagree to this point. I think it's a marginal solution to a very big problem. And in fact, you're asking for a Tier 3... a Tier 3 for two of the pension funds just for Chicago when the entire rest of the state needs municipal pension reform right now. It's been the biggest issue between the mayors and managers that I speak to all the time. And so today, we're going to give you a Tier 3 pension reform Bill that is actually wholly inadequate because it continues to have taxpayers fund pensions that they will never see and meanwhile the rest of the state is going to sit here and suffer under a state-controlled pension system and get nothing in return. Chicago gets what it wants. We get nothing for reform that we need."

Currie: "Chicago, under this measure, is significantly stepping up to the plate. Chicago gets what it wants. Chicago gets the opportunity to tax its citizens at major levels in order to be able to stabilize, to safeguard the funds and to make sure retiree benefits will be available."

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

- Ives: "If you're a Chicagoan, you need to understand that this Bill is going to raise your taxes significantly and it's going to put those taxes into a system... a pension system that is still very generous and is still apt to fail. Speaking to which, can you... have you showed us any actuarial analysis on the entire fund over the system of the life where you're going to get up to 90 percent funding for 2058. Do you have that analysis? And can I have a copy of it?"
- Currie: "The city did have that data available and I thought they'd planned to share it with you. If they didn't, I will see to it that they... they do."
- Ives: "They have not shared that analysis."
- Currie: "And just one other point. You talk about the other systems and I don't disagree we need to do some work there but these systems are not even on an ARC, not even on an actuarially required contribution program when the other systems all are. So..."
- Ives: "Do you think your leadership then... in Chicago, do you think leadership in Chicago has figured that out? That they can't be gaming these pension systems? That they're the ones who put in this multiplier system. And they're the ones who backed off of a more generous multiplier and have created this system? They have created a deficit in 15 years."
- Currie: "We're talking about the state system, the state regulation, the state requirements, Representative, not something that the city used to game anybody. The city has said let us safeguard the pensions, let us stabilize the city finances and the pension systems as well. That's what this measure does and I would appreciate your support. It's not

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

going to cost your taxpayers a penny. I'm a taxpayer in Chicago. It'll cost me a pretty penny, but that money will be well spent because we will then be able to stabilize to make financially-sound pension systems that are on the brink of failure."

Ives: "Okay. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. So, the problem with the Pension Reform Bill here is that, in the end, after they go through this ramp-up of five years, they're approaching nearly a billion dollar payment to these two funds for... and that's out of an \$8.2 billion budget. There's no way the taxpayers in Chicago can afford it, nor should they have to pay more into a system that is completely broken without doing a very significant and real Tier 3. A Tier 3 that gives actual employees more control over their investment and their retirement. So, when you vote on this Bill, understand that you are becoming the enforcement mechanism to tell... so Chicago Aldermen can say, well, the state made us raise your taxes to pay for these pensions. They could solve this themselves, they could do a real Tier 3. They could actually work with the rest of us who need a Tier 3 for municipal pensions as well, and they refuse to do so. So, I mean, I appreciate that these funds are going bankrupt, but you created this problem. Chicago leadership created this problem when the funds were whole in 2000, only 15 years ago. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Martwick."

Martwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I'll go directly to the Bill. I rise in support of the Bill. And I'm not usually one who stands up to support pension Bills... reform Bills, but I think there's some critical factors here. Number

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

1, much of this talk about the city could voluntarily contribute more money on its own is really sort of a false argument. They've been following the law. They've never not contributed what they were legally required to do. And what this administration is doing is making the bold step of changing the law to ensure that their required contributions match the actual cost to the system. That's a good thing and that, sort of, measures something that we should all be supporting. Responsible payment structure for the pensions to make sure they match the costs. Number 2, the employees that are affected by the changes in this pension program all had a legitimate seat at the bargaining table to discuss these changes and by and large, have approved or not opposed the changes that have been proposed. How much more fair can you be? This mayor has taken the bold step of his administration to do very, very difficult decisions. Yes, they have raised taxes, which no one wants to do, to pay for ... to ensure that the fiscal structure of these pensions is secured for years to come, to take this as one less burden off of the minds of the taxpayers in the City of Chicago. There is security here. This is a good Bill. There's nothing about it and for all the people that think we need some sort of Tier 3 or some sort of similar vehicle for the suburbs and the rest of the state, by all means, you support my Bill, I'll be happy to support yours. Please vote 'yes'."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Nekritz."

Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I think that the statement that the City of Chicago can fix this on their own without coming here is a... shows a real lack of understanding

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

of the Illinois Compiled Statutes and the way the state operates vis-a-vis the entities that it creates, the municipalities and the pension systems. The city cannot go in and do something different than what the statutes require or allow them to do. If that were the case, all of our suburban municipalities that would like to see something done, who are Home Rule, would do that themselves. But instead, they're coming here asking us to do something and we have not taken action yet and I would like to think that we will with whatever room we have left on the Supreme Court, but... but again, I just... there's just no way that the City of Chicago has different rights and responsibilities vis-a-vis State Government than do the other municipalities. They cannot violate State Law. This is the only path they have to making this happen. And I urge your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie to close."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. The people in the City of Chicago have decided to fix their pension problem. We can't do it without your help but we aren't doing it with your money. We are asking you to change the statutory structure that will make it possible for the City of Chicago to safeguard, to stabilize these pension funds, to avert bankruptcy, to make sure that the recipients of benefits under these programs will not go out empty-handed. The workers are helping. The taxpayers of the city are helping financially and now it's time for us to help just from a regulatory perspective. I appreciate your 'aye' votes."

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

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 91 voting 'yes', 16 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Wehrli is recognized."

Wehrli: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We had a little switch malfunction. I'd like the record to reflect I was a 'yes' on that last vote. I was hitting..."

Speaker Lang: "Record will reflect your intentions, Sir."

Wehrli: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Drury is recognized."

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

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Sir."

Drury: "With respect to that last Bill, it was really good to see that the bipartisan support we had seeing that when a system was on the brink of bankruptcy, the brink of going broke, that we could come together and we do something. I just want to bring it to the Speaker's attention, to the House's attention, that we have another system on the brink of completely failing in the State of Illinois, not in 10 years but in 8 years. It's called College Illinois. It's a college savings plan where we take money from families... and we're still doing it ... and we tell them, you pay a lump sum fee and your kid will go to college for 4 years in the State of Illinois for whatever that fee is. That system is set to go bankrupt in, I think, 2020 or 2022 and I would just ask that the 90 people who came together to help the City of Chicago, including myself, come together to help all of these parents who have invested to send their children to school, and make

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

sure that we keep the promise that Illinois has made to them and save that system whatever it takes. Because right now, the system is still marketing and I know that. I got on my desk a few weeks ago from ISAC a book promoting College Illinois. But what College Illinois has reverted to... as opposed to, it used to market to wealthy families in my district... as the wealthy families stopped investing in this, seeing that it was a broken ship, they started targeting minority districts and started saying just pay \$10 a month and your kid can go to college without truly disclosing that that system is bankrupt. I think it's morally wrong and I think we have a duty as the State of Illinois to provide these families the promise that we made to them. So, I just hope in the upcoming 100th General Assembly, the hundredth Session, that we can come together and work on that issue. Thank you."

- Clerk Hollman: "Attention Members, the Rules Committee will meet immediately. The Rules Committee will meet immediately."
- Speaker Lang: "The House will be back in order. Mr. Clerk, Rules Report."
- Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on December 1, 2016: recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is Floor Amendments 8, 9, and 10 to Senate Bill 2814."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, Adjournment Resolution."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Joint Resolution 169, offered by Representative Currie.
  - RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-NINTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE SENATE

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

- CONCURRING HEREIN, that when the House of Representatives adjourns on Thursday, December 1, 2016, it stands adjourned until Monday, January 9, 2017 at 12:00 o'clock noon, or until the call of the Speaker; and when the Senate adjourns on Thursday, December 1, 2016, it stands adjourned until Monday, January 9, 2017 at 12:00 o'clock noon, or until the call of the President."
- Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie, on a Motion."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. I move that we suspend all applicable rules so that we can give immediate consid..."
- Speaker Lang: "Sorry. Leader Currie moves the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Adjournment Resolution is adopted. Now, Leader Currie, for another Motion."
- Currie: "Now, a Motion to suspend all applicable rules so that we may give immediate consideration to House Amendments 8,9 and 10 to Senate Bill 2814."
- Speaker Lang: "Seeing no objection, is there leave? Leave is granted. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2814, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. This Bill was read a second time a previous day.

  Amendment #1 was adopted previously. Floor Amendments 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Rita."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Rita. Mr. Rita, please hold. Leader Currie for an excused absence."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please add Representative Mayfield to the list of excused absences today."

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

- Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Representative. Mr. Rita, let's proceed on Amendment 2, Sir. Thank you very much."
- Rita: "I'd like to withdraw Amendment #2."
- Speaker Lang: "Amendment 2 is withdrawn. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #3 is offered by Representative Rita."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Rita on Amendment 3."
- Rita: "So, I'd like to move that we adopt Amendment 3 and then debate it on Third Reading."
- Speaker Lang: "Seeing no objection, those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #4 is offered by Representative Rita."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Rita, on Amendment 4."
- Rita: "I'd like to adopt Amendment #4 and then debate that Amendment on Third Reading."
- Speaker Lang: "Seeing no objection, those in favor of Amendment 4 will say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And Amendment 4 is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #5 is offered by Representative Rita."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Rita on Amendment 5."
- Rita: "Again, I'd like to adopt Amendment #5 and debate that on Third Reading. It's a request of the Governor."
- Speaker Lang: "Seeing no objection, those in favor of Amendment 5 shall say, 'yes'; opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And Amendment 5 is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #6 is offered by Representative Rita."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Rita on Amendment 6."

Rita: "I'd like to withdraw Amendment #6."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, withdraw Amendment #6. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #7 is offered by Representative Rita."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Rita on Amendment 7."

Rita: "I'd like to withdraw Amendment #7."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, withdraw Amendment 7. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #8 is offered by Representative Rita."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Rita on Amendment 8."

Rita: "I'd like to adopt Amendment #8. That's a request of the Governor. And de... you know debate that on Third Reading."

Speaker Lang: "Seeing no objection, those in favor of Amendment 8 will say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And Amendment 8 is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #9 is offered by Representative Rita."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Rita on Amendment 9."

Rita: "I'd like to adopt Amendment #9. This one's also a request of the Governor and debate that on Third."

Speaker Lang: "Seeing no objection, those in favor of Amendment 9 shall say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And Amendment #9 is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #10 is offered by Representative Rita."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Rita on Amendment 10."

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

Rita: "I'd like to adopt Amendment #10."

Speaker Lang: "Seeing no objection, those in favor of Amendment 10 shall say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And Amendment #10 is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments but notes have been requested and not filed at this time."

Speaker Lang: "The Chair recognizes Mr. Batinick."

Batinick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to make a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Sir."

Batinick: "I'm one of the people that has notes on the Bill. And I... I'm going to withdraw them but I would like to say some words about the Bill, the process. You know, I think the Sponsor's worked the Bill pretty hard. I think the Chair, Chapa LaVia has done an excellent job in committee. But I don't know if three days is enough to jam through a Bill that's this important. What's more upsetting to me about this whole process is I did a point of personal privilege two weeks ago about a small company in my district that's been owed a million dollars because they did work for the DNR, that's pass-through money from the feds and his business is crippled. Yet, we can have a large company come in here, when we don't have a budget, when we haven't been working on pension reform, when social services aren't being paid and all the energy, pun intended, is sucked out of the room for this Bill that does not need to be done right now. You know, I'm going to walk through what happens with the Clinton plant. The Clinton plant files intent to close; they can't just close it. The grid operator has to determine whether that they can afford

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

that plant to close or not. The grid operator... if the grid operator determines they need that plant open, the whole grid pays for it, not the State of Illinois. So, what we're doing right now is we're bailing out a company where the State of Illinois is standing on line. I don't even know how you can call it a bailout it's not a bailout. They're a profitable company. We're asking the taxpayers, the rate-users of the State of Illinois, to jump in line in front of the whole grid. Do you know how big that grid is? It goes from Texas, to Louisiana up to Manitoba. So, we're going to subsidize a company so that they could sell their power out of state. So that out-of-state users can enjoy lower... lower rates on their electricity. And that's important. That's supposed to be more important than social services, than higher education, than the budget and everything else? More important than Blocker Construction, who's been waiting over a year, who's crippled ... whose family is crippled? They're not a big profitable company. It's pass-through money. We can't even get that simple pass-through Bill done so that they can get paid. And they're accruing interest on that and they don't get when their money comes, that they're not eligible for the bonus money we have. So, I mean, I look at this... We had a note come back on Corrections that says there is no fiscal impact to Corrections. I didn't know the Department of Corrections doesn't use electricity. The cost of electricity affects everybody. There's a billion dollar plant that was announced in January to create 1100 megawatts in the district next to mine. That plant might be in jeopardy. That's a lot of jobs there. I know there's jobs in Clinton; I know there's jobs in

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

the Quad Cities. Those are important, so are the other 40-plus thousand jobs that may be lost because of this Bill passing. We have to do things like this more slowly. So, it's... it's going strongly against, you know, what my gut is telling me to do. I'm frankly disappointed in myself right now because I should be doing every last thing to stop this kind of garbage from happening in this chamber. Jamming a Bill like this in three days? How many Amendments do we have today: 6, 7, 8? I don't know. So, I'm withdrawing but I'm requesting that everybody think about what they're doing right now before they make the vote on this Bill. Think hard about what we did in three days and think hard about what we didn't do the last three days. And vote your conscience. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, please withdraw all of Mr. Batinick's note requests. Mr. Kay for what reason do you rise, Sir?"

Kay: "A point of personal privilege and more so a question."
Speaker Lang: "Go right ahead, Sir."

Kay: "Thank you. I assume that we're going to be taking up 2814,
 very soon. Is that correct?"

Speaker Lang: "That is our hope, Sir."

Kay: "I have the Bill on my desk here in its original form but missing a number of amendments. And I can't seem to get those in writing, nor have I been able to read the 500 or 600 pages that are in front of me. I'm wondering if someone could provide me the Amendments so I could at least read the Amendments and bring myself up to speed through the back door."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Kay, it appears that the Amendments are on the LIS system."

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

- Kay: "I know. I was just checking to see if we would have the availability of something in writing so that I didn't have to print these all out like I had to do this. But that's okay, considering that its only 600 pages. I'll get it done. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Sir. Mr. Clerk, regarding the fiscal notes."
- Clerk Hollman: "All notes that have been requested have been filed at this time."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2814, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Rita."

Rita: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's been a long day and I bring to you 28... Senate Bill 2814. It's been a long road since we started this and I know in our previous comments Bills were filed in early of 2015. Today's package is a combination of 3 Bills that were originally filed. One by Representative Larry Walsh, one by Representative Elaine Nekritz and one by myself. And through many hours of negotiation we had a number of hearings hour... hours spent in these hearings. Hearing the pros and cons from the original Bills to what we are presenting here today to you is been reduced from what it was originally filed. It's about jobs and about alternate resources in energy and energy efficiency for the future of Illinois. So, when I hear that in 3 days things were brought forth, these were all technical Amendments. And the Amendments that were filed today were at the request of the Governor in the final hours of negotiation to meet all the

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

needs of the different parties. So that we could have a Bill that is agreed... is agreed to as it's going to get. Be happy to answer any questions as we move forward."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Morrison."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Morrison: "How many... how many... with all the Amendments attached, how many pages is this Bill?"

Rita: "500... 500."

Morrison: "Have you had a chance to read all 500 pages?"

Rita: "I've been part of all the integral parts of the negotiation, so these last Amendments that were filed today,

Amendments 5, 8, 9 and 10 were all at the request of the Governor's office."

Morrison: "Mr. Speaker, I'm just going to go to the Bill. I know we've all been waiting a long day for this and I had filed some of those fiscal notes as well. To find that there's no fiscal impact on the State or on the Correctional Budget, on our local units of government, on state debt, frankly, it's... it's a farce and we all know that. The fact that we have the lights on right here, the fact that we have our laptops on. The Department of Corrections to say that they don't use electricity or that there'll be no impact for them, it's a farce. I appreciate the comments of my colleague, Representative Batinick. I agree with many of them. I'd like to add to them. I was not on the Energy Committee but I listened to many many hours of the testimony. Right before the Thanksgiving Break, afterward, yesterday and this Bill has so many problems and I think... I think we all know that.

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

There are a handful of Members on our side, on their side, who I think feel very good about their 'yes' vote. They have either... their reason is because of their district being directly impacted or because they feel very strongly about certain components of this Bill. But for us as a state, this is absolutely the wrong policy. And I suspect that there are some of you who plan to vote 'yes' and you don't feel very good about it and you shouldn't feel very good about it. In some of the testimony, both in the House and the Senate, we heard from other industries. It's not just the nuclear power industry. It's not just solar and wind that are affected by this. Every single one of us, every single industry is touched by the price of electricity. And what I heard time and time again is that over the past 20 years, Illinois has benefited deregulation, from having a competitive energy marketplace. Nearly 20 years ago we were one of the most expensive energy markets, now we're one of the 10 lowest. This is a huge advantage for us, both as consumers and for our businesses large, medium and small. It's a huge benefit for our local units of government and for not-for-profits because they all use electricity too. Even with coal plants coming offline, even with nuclear plants in other... in within this... the energy marketplace coming offline we've still seen electricity prices drop by nominal amounts. Supply continues to exceed demand. We have been blessed with the natural gas boom. The fact that we have hundreds of years... just in the recent... in recent history that we have access now to hundreds of years' worth of clean natural gas is a huge benefit for us as a state and for our country. And yet, we're going to

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

undermine that natural advantage by passing this. I want you to think about how quickly markets can move, how quickly the ... the dynamics can change. When I first got elected 6 years ago and I remember we were routinely paying for... for example \$4 a gallon for gasoline. On my way down to Springfield this week, \$1.92. That's something that benefits me as a consumer, benefits you, it benefits our ... our communities, it helps people in every single income bracket. It helps businesses who have to fuel their fleets and that is, again, tied to a free and open energy market. And what we're doing is handcuffing ourselves for up to the next 10 years. It's bad policy. Many of the assumptions in this Bill have to do with a soc... so-called social cost of carbon. Again, this is something that is based upon wild assumptions, many of which have come grossly untrue. We are told, you know, due to the effects of ... of increases in the earth's temperature, we'd see massive storms, we'd... we'd see turmoil and we haven't seen that. So, that takes out that reason for voting for the Bill, if you think that's a reason to vote for this Bill. Two of the proponents, ComEd and Exelon, were down here Springfield arguing against the Tenaska project because they said it's not fair to put a guaranteed rate of return for an energy competitor. Where are they now? Exelon, last year, made over \$2 billion in profits and I'm... I'm all for businesses making money. We all should be for that. But when you take one business, Exelon, and a handful of other businesses that are going benefit this Bill and hurt every other business. And I know that the Amendments have maybe mitigated some of those costs and there are so-called

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

protections in there, but it's going to cost money. We know for certain that passing this Bill is going to cost us all more. It's going to handcuff our economy. It's going to make us less competitive. And so, while there have been jobs mentioned for two communities we have hundreds of thousands of other jobs that would be put at greater risk in my community, in your community, all across this state. There are businesses that are considering making a move to Illinois because of our current competitive electric market. Are they going to look elsewhere now because when they have all their inputs, property taxes, worker's comp costs, energy prices, access to educated workforce, all these inputs businesses small, medium and large are considering. And now, we as a Body are going to take away that natural advantage that we have. Very short-sided. And as we have talked about, you know, this came up in both the Senate and the House testimony, we're talking about improving our worker's compensation system, making it less costly for our employers, making it less costly for local units of government. The added electricity cost that will result from this are going to wash away any potential benefits we get from a reform within the next weeks or months or ever. Many businesses, the electricity they use it is their largest overhead cost and now we're dramatically increasing that if we pass this Bill. We have a model. Germany, another highly industrialized nation, decided that they were going to head down a road like this, to mandate that they were going to get their electricity from very specific energy producers. They're now reversing course because they saw that it resulted in a dramatic spike in their

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

electricity cost for their residential customers, their business customers. And as a result some of their businesses said, you know, what we're going to move over to the United States because it's less costly for us to do business. We have to make a profit and we're moving to the U.S. At a state level, we're now eroding our strategic position if we pass this. I've talked to some Members who say, you know, I'm going to get, you know, this little thing for my district or I've been promised job training or I've been promised some temporary positions. We're handcuffing ourselves for 10 years, minimum. It's very short sided thinking. We are far better off if we have a free and open energy market. And Representative Batinick brought... brought up the point about our social service providers. The fact that we continue to ignore them, to continue to the ... to ignore the other needs of the state, when we say the fiscal notes, that they'll be no impact, it's a farce. The last thing I would say is, we saw a dramatic change in what this country wants in terms of energy policy on Election Day. We are very, very likely to see dramatic changes in federal energy policy and policy that will affect us as states. Why on Earth would we tie ourselves, would we handcuff ourselves when we're likely to see those major changes underway that will benefit us as a state that will benefit every one of our districts? We're going to isolate ourselves in a harmful way. And I would urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Durkin."

Durkin: "Thank you. I just want to say I respect the comments that my colleagues have made over the last few minutes,

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

particularly about process. This is anything but a perfect or a good process and I'll be the first one to complain about that and be... say that I'm not satisfied with it. Amendments being dropped left and right, language in it that no one even understood or at times, I believe was suspicious, some language that was put into it. So, it's caused us to be here this late. It's unfortunate but I've seen it before. I've been here many of years and unfortunately this is the world we live in. So, we have to deal with the issue at hand. I do appreciate the comments that were made by my colleagues. We will have differences of opinions at times. Today, we will but I think we'll have a good, healthy debate on the merits of this Bill. I do know that people will continue to ask ... talk about rates, rates, rates and this is probably not the best way of going about business. But I will say this, if we fail to take action I am firmly convinced that Illinois and Illinois consumers will suffer and that rates will get dramatically, dramatically out of hand. Now, two years ago ... I'm going to cite a study, you know there's a lot of studies flying around, you know pick your... pick your study, but two years ago the Speaker and I Co-sponsored House Resolution 1146. It was adopted in May of 2014. In which, we requested that the Illinois Commerce Commission, the Illinois Power Agency, the Illinois EPA and the Illinois Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity to prepare addressing issues related to the premature closure of nuclear power plants in Illinois. Here's the summary of those findings. The agencies found that depending on the number of closings, the effects would be as follows: electric prices

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

would increase overall, with increases climbing as high as 11.9 percent during times of normal energy demand and as high as 26.6 percent in certain regions during stress events. Grid reliability and capacity would decrease significantly, situations with producing possible inadequate production in some regions for certain stress scenarios such as a polar vortex or in the event of parallel coal plant retirements. And also, Illinois could lose up to 7800 jobs and \$1.8 billion in economic activity with the premature closure of plants. I can't ignore the impact that what's going to happen in Clinton or possibly even in the Quad Cities. It's unfortunate. It would be terrible. We can't not consider that in the overall scheme of things but when I look at this report they were not paid money to prepare this report, this is not an expert or professional report by a hired gun. These are by the professionals who work in our agencies and I trust their input and what they've done. Let me just say that, at the end of the day the consequences of not passing this Bill are worse than what people are stating would happen if there is... if this Bill does go into effect. And I hope you understand that. But I also believe that it's imperative that we maintain a diverse and reliable energy portfolio because I do believe in the long run, Illinois and its citizens will lose if this Bill fails. For that reason, I will be voting 'yes' today."

Speaker Lang: "Chair recognizes Mr. Rita for a comment."

Rita: "I'd like to make a point here because we're talking the process. Through this process, in these last few hours I've been working with the Governor's office and the Republican

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

staff and each one of these Amendments that were filed that we are waiting on came from the Governor's office. These weren't... weren't Amendments that they didn't see and they weren't part of the process of filing. And it was put on the Bill to remove the Governor's opposition that he came out a couple weeks ago or a week and a half ago after we had our long hearing in terms of what we had in Amendment #3 is why we came back with Amendment #4. It removed the ... the demand rates and removed a bunch of provisions and reduced this Bill. So... so if we want to talk about the process, the process was myself working with all the stakeholders with both sides of the aisle. And to the ... to the point of the notes, they were filed on Amendments, not on the whole Bill so it was what... if you're were coming back to saying no impact it was impacted on the actual Amendment that you filed. I believe the process worked here. I believe we have a good Bill. Everybody didn't get what... what everybody wanted in this but we have environmental community working with the utility community in support of this. We have a number of stakeholders all in support of this from labor, the environmental community, the ... business. We've taken parts of each stakeholder and put it in this package. We have a Bill here that I believe is going to be... or I believe is going to be agreed upon as it's going to be. Now, there are some opponents to this Bill but I believe they will never ever be proponents to this and I believe it was the process that took place here and why we are here today to hearing this Senate Bill. So, keep that in mind."

Speaker Lang: "Ladies and Gentlemen, we have fifteen people who wish to speak on this Bill. I'm going to use the 5 minute

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

timer and I'm going to strictly enforce the 5 minute timer. The first speaker is Mr. Breen."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Breen: "Representative, what is your understanding about whether the support or non-support of the Governor for this measure as amended?"

Rita: "My... my understanding and I was told he's going to sign this Bill as long as them... them Amendments were adopted, which we adopted and they were part of this Bill, that the Governor's going to sign this Bill."

Breen: "Thank you. To the Bill. You know, I was the lone 'no' vote in committee on the original Bill. That Bill was way too large. It was lit up like a Christmas tree and was falling over of its own weight. We have vigorously and carefully negotiated these Amendments. Has it been quick? Absolutely. Has it been so quick that folks can't... couldn't read the Bill? No. Every single person in this chamber can have read every single Amendment and every page of every Amendment. We have been here for days. Does that mean you got to read quickly? Sure. But it's nothing worse than what you have to face whether you're in court or wherever else. Or that we have to face on this House Floor in other circumstances. You know, I think we need... we need to remember why this Bill is in its current form. We've got caps in place to protect folks and the idea was, we've got three independent studies. One by this House, which was represented by the Leader, looking at hundreds of millions of dollars in rate increases. You've got one... Ameren has issued the opinion that they're going to see

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

large rate hikes based on the closure of these plants. And then the third and really for me the most compelling is from the Illinois Retail Merchants. They don't have an axe to grind. They pay electric rates the same as residents will pay, small and mid-size businesses and I believe their number was over \$360 million rate increase, guaranteed if we shut these plants down. Now there's a.m. there's a disagreement, there's a range, couple hundred million up to three hundred and sixty or more, but everybody agrees, everybody whose put a study together, put their name on the study and shown their work agrees the rates are going way, way up. Now, here... here's the problem we're all politicians. Sorry if that's an insult to anybody, but we are. And as politicians, it's easiest to do nothing. But folks, we've seen it, the storm's coming. The storm's coming and we can say, well, you know, maybe my house isn't going to get hit too hard, maybe it won't destroy it. But what we've got here today is the opportunity to purchase an insurance policy to protect us from the storm. And so, as I... as I read this Bill and I understand the Bill, we have capped these zero emissions credits at a level that is lower than any of the studies estimated rates of increase. Those two studies that we've got. The one that we commissioned, the in... a totally independent agency an IRMA commissioned. So, we can guarantee our folks that to the best level of certainty that we have, we are holding their rates down. You know, there's another thing too, you know, we've got the... there are some ... some issues that we haven't talked about, the renewable portfolio standard. We're spending hundreds of millions of dollars right now and we are sending

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

that money out to finance Iowa windfarms. Now, am I the biggest fan of renewable portfolio standard? I, you know, whatever. And I know my good conservative Republican colleagues, you know, are not ... not for it all. Problem is, what I'm less for is wasting my money and this Bill will take those hundreds of millions of dollars we're spending out of state and bring it back to Illinois and that will necessarily bring economic development to our state. It will be those clean jobs and I hate the term, I don't like all the, you know, the name... the euphemisms we use, but for heavens sakes a couple hundred million dollars now being spent in Illinois that was being spent in Iowa is going to help us. And it's not... I mean we're diminishing the waste there. So folks, I ... I look at it and you know we can... we can make all sorts of analogies and I was trying to think of homespun analogies. It's kind of like saying, well... well I can buy gas for \$1.92, the problem is the nearest station's 50 miles away. That's what's happening here if you take 10% of the state's energy capacity offline. The next polar vortex you run into, we're going to be paying folks in Texas premium rates to try to somehow keep our lights on. I know other speakers will talk about that down the road, but again we know the rates are going up. It is tough to say to folks, hey those rates are going up but we are going to lock in this insurance policy and protect our people. Please vote 'aye'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andersson."

Andersson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll speak directly to the Bill. I... I rise in full support of this Bill. I respect the opponent's position. I understand this is a complicated Bill

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

but I in no way feel distressed about voting 'yes' on this Bill. The opponent's arguments that I've heard today are that this will cause rates to go up and I won't disagree with that. I don't think you can disagree with that. Rates will go up based on this. However, due to the effect of negotiation, particularly on the Governor's side, those increases are capped. But the implicit assumption in the opponent's argument is that rates won't go up if we do nothing and there's no evidence to support that. If we do nothing, the rates will go up. So, the argument that we're going to lose jobs because rates go up, that's going to happen. I mean, I hope not but if that's going to happen because rates go up, it's going to happen regardless. So, the choice is between doing something and creating caps and protecting our economy or doing nothing and letting the ... letting things happen as they will. To me, that's very easy to support a... a way of controlling, capping and insuring the ... the future of our state's economy. Number 2, there's a lot to be talked about with regard to the nuclear power plants, and some would characterize this as a bailout. I can't disagree more, it's not a bailout. It's an inducement to keep those plants open. Look, if I'm Exelon, the company that owns those plants and those plants are a losing asset, they're losing money, as a business man my choice is simple, close the plants. I'll make more money. So, this isn't about ComEd making more money indirectly, they could do it simply by closing the plants. They'd be great. But as a State Legislator, my concern is about our power, the type of power we use and our future. And quite frankly the nuclear power plants are a green energy

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

source. They're zero carbon emissions and they deserve to be kept in service and they ensure the security of our overall grid. That's not a bailout folks, that's a choice on our part to ensure how our electrical system operates and that we operate it with the type of energy that is more sustainable than other types that would have to replace it. And #3, and this is my last point. Number 3, there's a lot of great positives here and these have to do with the... the green aspect, the environmental aspect. And make no mistake it is possible to be a Republican and an environmentalist at the same time and that's what you're seeing right now is that when we do this and we update our renewable portfolio standards, which right now are effectively defunct, we will create those clean jobs. I was one of the original co-sponsors on the Clean Jobs Bill. This incorporates that concept. So, let's not look to the past. Let's not look to old ways of doing things. Let's look to the future. Let's create new jobs in new fields and for once instead of Illinois being 48th or 49th or 50th in every given category, why don't we be first? Why don't we be cutting edge on clean energy, clean jobs. I fully support this Bill. Representative Rita, I thank you for bringing it and your hard work on it and I particularly thank the Governor's office for their work on it because they really held everyone's feet to the fire to protect the... the interests of all citizens of the State of Illinois. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

Ives: "Oh Reis? Okay. Ives or Reis?"

Speaker Lang: "Ives."

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ives: "Representative Rita, has the Illinois Commerce Commission
 verified the numbers in this Bill?"

Rita: "They were at the table at committee yesterday."

Ives: "Have they verified the numbers in the Bill?"

Rita: "They've been... they... they've been in part of all the negotiations."

Ives: "Okay..."

Rita: "So I'd... I'd have to say yes."

Ives: "...but have they verified the numbers?"

Rita: "Yes."

Ives: "Every number? The 25 percent average cost increase in ComEd areas? The... you're not going to have more than 1.3 percent on average? Have they verified all those numbers, even the ones that just came up this morning?"

Rita: "Are you talking about the ones in the last Amendment?"

Ives: "Yes."

Rita: "You'd have to verify that through the Governor's office because these... these last Amendments came from them."

Ives: "Okay. So, in totality though the Illinois Commerce
Commission has not completely looked at this Bill
holistically and decided whether or not rate payers are
actually going to pay what's in the Bill?"

Rita: "I... I'm going to defer that to the ICC and the Governor's office on that."

Ives: "Okay. All right. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill then. You are by
 voting for this Bill, you're bailing out the largest producer

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

of nuclear power in the entire country. These policy proposals, they're not market driven solutions to energy production and instead there's costly to all classes of rate payers and they should be rejected. This Bill requires rate payers to fund huge profitable companies in favor of green energy companies. Exelon's net income last year was \$2.25 billion. You're bailing out a billion dollar company. What's more, prior to them beginning the negotiations on this electrical Bill, which started in 2015, prior to that Crain's reported in late December of 2014 that Exelon argued in Ohio for its competitors to not get a state subsidy but to let the market determine prices. In fact, Chicago based Exelon, this is straight from the article, which it said it will lobby Illinois lawmakers next year for legislation to boost revenues at its nuclear plants, has petitioned utility regulators in Ohio to block attempts by generators based in that state to prop up their plants courtesy of rate payers there. Exelon... Exelon issued a strongly worded filing with the Ohio Public Utilities Commission in opposition to First Energy's proposal to require electricity consumers at its Ohio utilities to pay extra for power generated by a 900 megawatt nuclear plant and a 2200 megawatt coal fire plant owned by a separate First Energy unit. So, they're arguing for a subsidy here and arguing against a subsidy in Ohio because it didn't benefit them and as Rep. Morrison pointed out, they argued against subsidizing a clean coal carbon sequestration plant in 2011. So, they're... don't... make no doubt about it, this company's in there to make money, I understand that, I want nuclear power to make money. But they're also in

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

it for themselves at the cost of every other supplier of energy, particularly coal and natural gas. So, you know, I recognize that nuclear power's essential, there's no doubt in 2014 during... during the polar vortex that it... Exelon's nuclear power plants maintained a 96 percent production reliability when other sources of energy could not ramp up production due to severe weather. That includes the gas and the coal industries, I get it. But that capability should be preserved not on the backs of Illinois rate payers alone, but that ... it should be conserved when you look at and you bid against the capacity market for the entire PGM (sic-PJM) territory. That's where they should be getting their benefit and their money being made, against all rate payers and not just Illinois rate payers. Make no doubt about it, compared to natural gas, nuclear power is already, already at the federal levels four times more subsidized and wind is subsidized eighteen times more than nuclear. So, we're building subsidy upon subsidy for these... this sourcing of energy... of energy and subsidizing only leads to inefficiencies in the market. Look, wind and solar they... it's been around since the beginning of time and it's been subsidized in modern years now for decades. And so, Exelon should be arguing as they did in Ohio for no state energy subsidies and let the market determine it. Instead, they've gotten in bed with renewables, which we know cannot fuel a modern economy."

Speaker Lang: "Representative your time has expired. Mr. Thapedi."

Thapedi: "Inquiry of the Chair, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "State your inquiry, Sir."

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

Thapedi: "What is the voting requirement and why for this piece of legislation?"

Speaker Lang: "The final Amendment reduced the voting requirement to 60 votes, Sir."

Thapedi: "For what reason?"

Speaker Lang: "Effective date was changed."

Thapedi: "And what is the effective date?"

Speaker Lang: "There is no effective date in the Bill so it would be June 1st."

Thapedi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Yingling for 5 minutes."

Yingling: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. What are we doing you guys? What... what are we doing listening to this Bill right now? I mean, we don't have a budget and our so-called stopgap budget is just weeks away from expiring and after that we're back to no budget and we've been through that. We've been through about a year without a budget and how quickly we forget that. You know, but instead we're talking about a multi-billion dollar corporate bailout for one of the most profitable energy companies in the state. And how are we going to finance this? This is going to be financed on the backs of the rate payers and make no mistake about it, the rates are going to go up and I'm highly skeptical about the information that we've been provided as to exactly how much those rates are going to go up. So, everyone living on a fixed income, people are already having a hard time making ends meet, their electric bills are going up. Businesses, their electric bills are going up and all so we can increase the profits of an already very profitable company. The question was also raised

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

about the effective date. If the effective date was moved to June, why are we ramrodding this Bill through in the 11th hour on the final day of Veto Session? We have plenty of time in the upcoming Legislature to review this Bill. There's been dates scheduled in January that we're going to be here. So, why are we ramrodding this through now? There is also another component of this, for years we've also had the ... the Clean Jobs Bill... the Clean Jobs Bill which supports renewables, supports green technology and it has sixty six sponsors. We could run that Bill right now and that would fly out of this chamber because there's already enough sponsors on it. So, why are we sacrificing the expansion of renewable clean new technologies so a massive corporation can make more money? It makes no sense to me. This is... this is a very poor... this is... this is... a poorly thought out Bill. It only goes to raise rates at the expense of those people who cannot afford to pay those rates so a multibillion dollar company can make even more money. I strongly urge a 'no' vote on this. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Fortner for 5 minutes."

Fortner: "Thank you, Speaker. To the Bill. It was about 10 years ago, the beginning of 2007 when I became a Member of the House and was thrown into the issue of electric power and rates in a bit of a trial by fire. That year, for those who weren't here and certainly and I'm sure will be remembered by those who were Members during the year of 2007, was a period of huge rate spikes. We had deregulated power but because of the way we did our power auction in 2006 we saw, particularly in the Ameren territory, some bills triple in rates. We had to act, we had a 13 hour hearing in this chamber in committee of

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

the whole and in the end did a Bill that created the Illinois Power Agency, created the renewable portfolio standard, created the energy efficient programs to try and bring things together. During that time I served as a Member, I was assigned to the Least Cost Power Procurement Committee which did a lot of the hearings during that year. And one of my takeaways was how complex the energy market is here in Illinois. Particularly here in Illinois because of the work we've done to deregulate power. We still regulate the transmission charges, the distribution charges and we open up the price of energy. That creates a lot of complexity and a lot of decisions that we have to make to try to balance the parts that are regulated with the parts that aren't regulated. One thing I did to take advantage of that in 2009 was pass, as the sponsor of the Municipal Aggregation Bill. It allowed us to take advantage of some of the parts where we could get cheap energy. 2011, again trying to wrestle with the different parts of it, one of ... we passed a major piece of legislation, often called the Smart Grid Bill. Its job was to, among other things, help set formula rates to direct the ICC how to navigate through this deregulated and regulated components of the market. One of the other things that one should be aware of in dealing with power is that, that electric power, the part that we are... we're trying to keep deregulated, when we make a purchase, whether it be a windfarm in North Dakota, a gas turbine plant in Texas, if you're buying through third party sources, the actual current that comes from your house very little of it, if any, comes from that plant. The nature of electricity is that it will flow primarily from the nearest

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

power sources through the wires to get to your house. So, there is value in making sure there is strong reliable power in the areas near where it's going to be needed. Because interruptions in the grid will otherwise reduce that. Making sure the investments in wind and solar are directed better towards Illinois when we first did in 2007; that didn't happen. This corrects that. That will help towards reliability. Providing value for our nuclear fleet, keeping it in the state where it's needed has value. Because in the end, whether it's the projected risk of the rate increases that've been described based on the studies that we've seen, or the value of having power near our major metropolitan area and elsewhere throughout the state, those are risks, that they might go away, they might go up, they're not predictable. What this Bill does in many ways is that it hedges that risk. It provides a clear pathway saying okay here's how we're going to manage the rates going forward in a way to hedge that risk. That's a decision whether you are a household or a business, you have to make. You have to decide is that risk worth undertaking, or is there value in hedging that risk. I, for one, will be supporting the Bill. I think the value is hedging that risk making sure that we have reliable power in the area near the population for the people of Illinois. And for that reason, I do support this Bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Gabel for five minutes."

Gabel: "Th... thank you, Mr. Speaker... To the Bill. So, this is the most important green energy Bill that has ever come before the General Assembly. And I know you've heard a little bit of history about the Bill. I just want to reiterate that in... on

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

February of 2015 environmental, consumer, labor, business and faith voices formed the Illinois Clean Jobs Coalition. Through that work, and I was a cosponsor of that Bill, we had 66 cosponsors. In May, the legislative leadership directed the Clean Jobs Coalition, Exelon and ComEd to work to reach a compromise energy package. So, when people say that they haven't seen the Bill or they don't know what's going on, this has been going on for quite a while. As part of that legislative package that we see today, we've been able to achieve major, major victories in the green energy field. It would jumpstart Illinois renewable energy industry, save everyone money through a nationally leading energy efficiency effort and create tens of thousands of jobs. Everyone who is a cosponsor of that clean energy jobs Bill should be on board for this one. Over the past five years, without a working renewable energy portfolio, the RPS, very little wind or solar was started in this state and other states are now poised to surpass us. This Bill fixes the RPS and keeps the existing percent targets and cost cap on rates. At a minimum, it will lead to 3,000 megawatts of solar development and 1,300 megawatts of wind development. Fifty percent of the solar projects will come from projects on the roofs of homes and businesses and in the community. This Bill creates the state's first community solar program which enables those who are not able to build solar on their roofs, to subscribe to a shared project in their community. And the energy efficiency provisions in this Bill will make Illinois one of the top states for energy efficiency in the country. This will lower bills for everyone. This Bill stimulates innovation and

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

entrepreneurship by requiring funding to be set aside for competitive third party run efficiency programs other than the utilities. And it requires 25 million per year spending on programs to help low-income homes become more efficient among many, many other requirements. Seventy percent of this Bill will help energy efficiency and renewable energy. Thirty percent of the Bill helps Exelon and ComEd. So, I am for 70 percent of this Bill and I... you know, I'm not crazy about nuclear energy. I... I once picketed against nuclear power plants. I think that nuclear energy is a little extreme, that we don't need to split atoms to boil water. But this is the Bill, this is the Bill that's in front of us today. And for me, the 70 percent that helps us have renewable energy here in the state and energy efficiency which is the cheapest, best form of green energy, is just too important to pass up. I feel an urgency to pass this Bill now, failing to pass this Bill means that we lose out on renewable energy and energy efficiency jobs to other states. As a compromise Bill, as I said, there are things I don't like about this Bill, there may be things you don't like about this Bill, but the positives far outweigh the negatives. I urge you to vote 'yes' on this Bill, to jump start a whole new job sector in Illinois, help our economy and create a lower carbon mix of energy."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Nekritz for five minutes."

Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First I'd like to thank the Sponsor of this Bill and Representative Walsh who were... as Representative Rita indicated, were the main Sponsors of the two underlying Bills for this and I'd also like to thank the

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

Clean Jobs Coalition that I think has done a fabulous job of pushing this issue and making sure that Il... Illinois moves into a 21st century energy environment. The Clean Jobs Coalition was exactly that, it was about the clean jobs in Illinois. In the energy sector here in this state creates a lot of jobs, the clean energy sector ... the clean energy sector in Illinois has already... already created more than 100 thousand new jobs in Illinois. But there's a lot of opportunity to do better. As the previous speaker indicated, we have been waiting for seven years to fix the... our broken renewable portfolio standard, seven years. Energy efficiency jobs are created in this legislation in every part of the state. Every one of our districts will see weatherizing and insulating our homes and our businesses, installing solar on our rooftops and erecting turbines. So, those jobs will be spread out throughout the state and we are anticipating thousands, if not tens of thousands of new jobs from this legislation. And that's not to mention the jobs that we are saving in Clinton and the Quad Cities. But speaking of those ... you know, I know there's a lot of concern, it's been expressed on the floor today about giving dollars to an already profitable company. I share those concerns and I've really wrestled with that issue when it comes to how I'm going sup... how I'm going to ... vote on this Bill. But I think the question is, if we do nothing is there a price to be paid? And what, is in fact I... and what, in fact, is the price of doing nothing? Several of my colleagues have spoken more eloquently than I could about that price and the... the various studies that have been out there that would indicate that there's a very

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

significant price for rate payers if we do nothing. But if you don't trust the consultants, you don't want the reports, you need look no further than the market. Because the capacity markets that set that the price for electricity are already paying the highest prices to generators in Illinois because of where... th... the amount of power that we're... that... that we're generating and the demand on that power. Those high rates indicate that Illinois needs the power from these power plants in order to keep rates from going even higher. So, obviously, if they close down, the capacity markets will say we're going to have to pay even higher rates in order to... to be able to keep the lights on. On the environmental benefits, my colleagues have already spoken to those... I want to reiterate we have been waiting seven very long, difficult years in order to get ourselves back on track for renewable energy in this state. The energy efficiency provisions will put us in the forefront in the nation on energy eff... on edu... on the most effective kind of energy out there which is, in fact, energy efficiency. But I want to come back to the first point I made and this is on the jobs. This Bill, at its core, is about creating and maintaining jobs for Illinoisans and if for no other reason than that, we should all be supporting it, thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bill Mitchell for five minutes."

Mitchell, B. "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. First off, I would like to thank Representative Rita, you've done a great job on this Bill, you've had a lot of patience. I sit on that House Energy Committee and I would like thank the Chairwoman Representative Chapa LaVia, she did a great job. Thank you,

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

I appreciate that. I'd especially like to thank, of course, our staff, as well as my Leader, Representative Durkin. Jim kept his word and worked hard. And lastly, I would like to thank Governor Rauner. Governor Rauner was indeed a friend of DeWitt County, a friend of Clinton, Illinois. When they needed the help, the Governor was there. The Governor told us when this Bill gets to his desk, he will sign it. And I very much appreciate that from Governor Rauner and his staff. The advocates of this legislation, I don't want to be repetitive, they've done an excellent job of saying the merits of the issue, the cost of inaction to the businesses and residential people of the State of Illinois. I would like to put a personal face on this: there's two power plants involved, nuke plants, one represented by a democrat, one by a republican. Both good plants. I happen to have the good fortune to represent Clinton and DeWitt County. A little bit about DeWitt County. It's an agricultural community, a county of about 17 thousand people. It has agriculture... a mix of agriculture and manufacture. It makes stuff. And it makes not only things, products, but energy. The people of DeWitt County would prefer not to be here today. The county of that 17,000 people have 700 good paying jobs. The median income is about \$90,000 a year. There's over 1,500 tradespeople that come in there several times a year on the maintenance, good-paying jobs. They want those to continue. I happen, if I can boast a little bit about the Clinton Power Plant, it's been rated one of the most efficient nuclear power plants in the country, it's very good. In the last several decades... for the last six months rather, people of DeWitt County, and indeed all the

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

counties that I represent and every county that is neighboring the people of Central Illinois because those 700 folks work in all of... around Central Illinois. But the people of DeWitt County just in the last, I called up... and see, just the last couple of decades typical of, unfortunately typical of manufacturing economies in Illinois or in the nation, they've lost jobs. We used to have Revere Ware, little county like I just described, seven hundred jobs lost. Thrall Rail, a hundred jobs, Kenny Fray a hundred jobs, Imperial China, seventy jobs. R. R. Donnelly, they're still there, but they drastically reduced. The people of DeWitt County have been put through hell for the last six months, wondering will they have a job. The school system, the school system of Clinton, Illinois. Clinton, Illinois population is 7500 hundred, they get nearly half of their revenue from the power plant. DeWitt County, gets a sizeable. In Macon County, the community college, which we've cut community college funding, Richland Community College gets over a million dollars from this power plant. In a few years, that would all go away. What will the people do without it? So, I'm pleading with the Members of the General Assembly for an 'aye' vote. I certainly respect the opponents, every single opponent. Several of you folks have come up to me saying they disagree on the merits of the issue and I appreciate their courtesy, I very much do. But on behalf of the people of DeWitt County, I'm begging you for an 'aye' vote, thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davis, for five minutes."

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

Speaker: "Sponsor yields."

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

- Davis, W.: "Representative Rita, over the last couple of days I've had the pleasure of attending hearings on this Bill and while understand and respect kind of the impetus for this Bill for nuclear plants and other parts of the state, I've been asking and talking about how this really impacts, and I even use the example of a woman named Beverly Johnson, call her Sister Beverly, explaining how this Bill helps a Sister Beverly or what the impact on such a Bill is on Sister Beverly. So, if you could at least, for the record, for those that are listening, walk through to the best of your ability how this Bill helps low-income communities, how this Bill work... helps minority contractors, you know, what are the takeaways from this Bill with regard to some of those areas?"

  Rita: "Well, there's a number of provisions. One in particular,
- Rita: "Well, there's a number of provisions. One in particular, the 750 million in low-income programs including 50 million in the care funding for eligible customers for active duty or deployed servicemen, those with disabilities and nonprofit organizations. Along with money for job creation and job training into the new sector, into the new clean jobs... portion of this Bill with fixing the RPS. There's energy efficiency dollars that are provided in there. So, there's a number of programs, a number of initiatives that will help constituents like yours and mine in my district. To the amount of 750 million."
- Davis, W.: "Okay. Also, I understand that they are creating not just the… the opportunities for our contractors because there will… there will be work to… move some of these initiatives forward. Like, for the solar energy side… I mean… I need you

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

to really dive deep into some of these things and talk about them so... so people understand."

Rita: "So, there's also initiatives for the solar for low income, those that would... like to have solar and alternate sources of power. That... that's part of this. In the overall... in... in job training and installing and putting these alternate sources of... of power are all a part of that."

Davis, W.: "Okay, thank you. So... and I'll just speak to the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I know for many of you this is going to be a difficult vote and I can appreciate those that've said that this is not necessary or don't need it. But one of the previous speakers talked about the idea that this offers a few jobs for some of us here or there if you will. And... and I can appreciate the reason why he said that. But what I want that individual to understand is that, you know, here are the opportunities that I must take advantage of to bring jobs and opportunity to the districts and communities like the ones that I represent because that particular Representative, represents areas that are a lot wealthier than mine. It's where the jobs are already are. So, my community is already traveling one, two hours to get to those jobs. What kind of quality of life can we expect them to have? So, when we have opportunities like this, I must try to take advantage and advocate for increased minority opportunities contractors, specific jobs for, as ... as I've read in one of the Amendments for those that are incarcerated making their transition back to communities. We have to provide those opportunities for them and it's fortunate that we have companies like Exelon, like ComEd, like Ameren who are willing

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

to listen to many of us who want those opportunities because those businesses that exist in many of your districts, they don't care, they're not listening. They're not interested in their numbers on minority hires, they're not interested in how many people that they have working for them that are of color or anything like that. And what do they care whether somebody wants to travel two hours to get to that job. So, if I have an opportunity to work with these companies, to talk about increased goals for minority participation, specific goals for individuals who are incarcerated or have been incarcerated, specific goals for some of the people in some of these low income communities, I have to stand up and advocate for that. And the reality is that when we do that kind of work, not only does my community get better but all of your communities get better as well. We always talk about adding more to the tax-base here in the State of Illinois but when people are working that is what adds to this tax base. When people work they spend money. And people in my communities, they love to spend money but they need a job in order to make that happen. So, that's why I stand in support of this piece of legislation, encouraging others to do so and hopefully you will recognize. We'll recognize that what we need is opportunities like that to make all of our communities better. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Smiddy: "Like Representative Mitchell... I repre... represent one of these plants as well in Rock Island County. And I do want to

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

talk about the impact that it's going to have to my community. 800 jobs lost, at a median income of 80 to 90 thousand dollars. 2,000 to 2500 jobs shut down for maintenance. Again, high paying jobs. \$8 million lost in property taxes to Rock Island County and to Whiteside County which goes to our schools, to our roads, and to fund things that we need in our communities. If we do nothing and these two plants close, yes we will have rate increases. No doubt about it, it's a proven fact. Ten percent of Illinois's energy will be lost. Again, because of these plants closing down. Over a billion dollars lost to our economy because these plants close down. Illinois might not have a budget, that is correct, but what does that mean? That means local governments will continue maybe not getting payments on time from the State of Illinois. That will be devastating to these communities when they lose these jobs and \$8 million of property taxes in my community. We've already lost several jobs. We've lost North West Steel and Wire, we've lost the Savanna Army Depo, we've had layoffs at John Deere and the closure of case IH. Our communities have already been devastated, not beyond repair yet, but if this goes down, it could be beyond repair. We have to do everything we can to try to ensure that jobs that pay good... good paying... salaries are here in Illinois to stay. And that's why I'm supporting this Bill and I encourage that all my colleagues support this Bill as well. Thank you."

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

Tryon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If the Sponsor would yield, I'd like to speak directly to the Bill."

Speaker: "Sponsor yields."

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

Tryon: "Thank you. Today in Illinois, our citizens enjoy, if not the lowest utility rates in the nation, one of the lowest utility rates in the nation. And the reason that is, is because of the energy platform that we've been able to integrate to let them take them take care... participate in a market place where we supply enough energy to meet their voltage requirements. The Bill that we have before us today didn't just fall out of the sky. Exelon came to us two years ago and said if we didn't do something to stabilize the energy platform, they would be faced with having to close 2 to 3 of their generating units. We've known this for a long time and we've worked on it and tonight we're going to vote on a Bill that I think is a Bill that puts together the pieces to be able to sta... stabilize our energy platform. This isn't a bailout. This is a stabilization of our supply. We seem to hear from the objectors and we're focused on what happens if this Bill passes. We're not asking ourselves what happens if this Bill doesn't pass. According to the numbers that were given by one of the opponents, this is represents the closure of these two plants would represent a reduction in 12 percent of our energy. While some of the opponents are saying it's okay because we generate 40 percent more energy than we use. They would like you to believe that every minute of every hour of every day we are generating 40 percent more energy than we use, but we're not. In July, in the heat of the summer when there's no wind being generated, when... when demand is at its highest, at noon, we may be utilizing 105 percent of what we're generating. Take out 12 percent of the energy generation and ask yourself if you don't think rates are going to go up

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

substantially. We have some insight on what rates will go up. Because a year ago, two years ago, we asked the Illinois Commerce Commission to look at what would happen if any of the nuclear facilities were ... closed. One of those scenarios would indicate that the price could go up as much as 26 percent for some of our largest users of electric utility. I would tell you that in East Central Illinois, if you want to know what the rates are going to be look towards Indiana because that's probably where they're going to be purchasing their electricity. You see, because of our policies, because we have created this energy platform to... watch two of these plants close prematurely would be, I think, a tremendous mistake on our part as the Legislative Body of Illinois. You see, I could make the case that Exelon is subsidizing the energy platform to a tune of \$400 million a year because they don't have the option of modulating their energy. They can't turn off a nuclear power plant. No? At 2:00 in the morning, if the wind is generating and the demand is low, they have to find people, they have to pay people to take their energy because they don't have the luxury of modulating down to a lower voltage level that they might be able to go through that time period. So, it's important that, I think, we keep a healthy integrated energy platform for the future. Because while this may be an... an easy vote today to make, it won't be so easy in two years to explain to a constituency group why the energy cost is going up possibly as much as 20 percent maybe 10 percent. We know it's going to go up. You can't remove 12 percent from the energy platform and not seen an increase in energy rates. The Governor has ensured through

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

some controls that consumer pricing is protected and we're all concerned about that. That there's a way to reopen any subsidies that are there if the goals aren't met. So, what we have today, I think is bringing people together to try to go through the net... the future with a supply that will meet and exceed the demands of Illinois. We are second to no one. We're not second to Kentucky, we're not second to Indiana, we're not second to Missouri when it comes to the amount of electricity that we generate for our constituents. But we are the envy of many states because of the integrated energy... energy platform we have. I would urge that we take this step today, to stabilize that energy platform so that we can continue to compete and offer anybody that would like to locate a business here in Illinois some of the cheapest energy in the nation. I support this Bill and I urge to you to support it too, thank you."

Speaker: "Representative Williams for five minutes."

Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Long before my election to the Illinois House, I was a supporter of clean and sustainable energy sources. As Chair of the Green Caucus my commitment to making Illinois a leader in the development of wind and solar has been a cornerstone of my legislative agenda. But like everyone else, I had concerns about this Bill. How would it impact consumers and rate payers? Why do we care if the nuclear plants close? And what about our budget? But after a lot of analysis, review of the final Bill, I've determined that the benefits of the Bill far... far outweigh its costs. And, in fact, the Bill provides Illinois with several wins: jobs, saving consumers money, and

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

environment. First, this Bill protecting our incredible benefits in terms of spurring economic development in the wind and solar sectors. We've lagged behind as some of my colleagues have already mentioned in terms of building these... these sources up in Illinois other states have surged far ahead of us. But passage of the Bill will mean real, tangible benefits in terms of economic development and bring thousands of jobs. Yes, Representative Breen, green jobs to Illinois. And who cares what we call them, they're jobs and we need jobs. Second, and on all of our minds, is the impact to rate payers. But in at least... in at least three areas, rate payers will benefit from this Bill. First of all, like it or not, Illinois relies on a mix of energy sources to provide its energy including nuclear. If these plants go offline, we stand to lose 10 percent of our energy mix. We have to pay for that loss, consumers would pay for that loss. This cost of inaction in this Bill far outweighs the cost of action. Secondly, energy efficiency. The latest report I said... saw shows that for every dollar you invest for energy efficiency, consumers save three dollars. That's a pretty big deal. Finally, rate caps. This Bill contains significant and real rate caps which are strong and enforceable. And finally, the benefits to our environment. We can't underestimate the significance of these benefits. The air we breathe, the water we drink. As we face a Trump presidency, many of us are very concerned that we'll roll back many of the advances we made for the environment. It's critical even more than ever now that we do what we can to make Illinois a leader in the development of wind and solar energy. Yes, Illinois has no

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

budget, the Governor refuses to negotiate the budget until his political agenda is passed and every day that passes without a budget we do more damage to our state. But this doesn't mean we shouldn't move forward where we can. We were not elected to make a point, we were not elected to make some kind of statement. We were elected to take action and today we can take action and move forward with the most important and significant piece of legislation to help the environment in Illinois' history. Today, I'll be voting 'yes' to move Illinois forward."

Speaker Lang: "Representative McDermed for five minutes."

McDermed: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Should this Bill get the requisite number of 'yes' votes, I request verification."

Speaker Lang: "Your request will be acknowledged."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

McDermed: "Thank you. Representative Rita."

Rita: "Yes?"

McDermed: "Many Amendments ago, I read an analysis of this Bill that said more than 40 thousand jobs would be lost by ratepayers who have to pay higher rates. Do we know what the number of jobs that would be lost under the current 6 Amendment later version of this Bill is?"

Rita: "The... the cost impact is much less now. I don't know where you read that from... but it's much less now.

McDermed: "One of the analysis that were distributed two weeks ago when we were here the last time and we thought we might hear this again..."

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

- Rita: "And... and I'd like to point out that the Amendments that were filed and done today only deal with effective dates, drafting changes, they've pulled out the prevailing wage portion... and an issue with the Farm Bureau so they were all technical in natural..."
- McDermed: "So, perhaps the number of jobs effected hasn't... been... hasn't changed"
- Rita: "Now... when you were talking about as Amended from what you want, but it's been reduced from the original from what was put down. This Bill has been reduced dramatically."
- McDermed: "Is the Illinois Attorney General approving of this Bill?"
- Rita: "I believe she is opposed."
- McDermed: "Yeah. Didn't she say something to the effect of she can't verify any of the numbers whether they're true or not?"
- Rita: "I didn't hear that part. I know they were passing around a pamphlet but that wasn't clearly accurate though."
- McDermed: "To the Bill. I'm being asked today, we're all being asked today to vote on a Bill, the effects of which are unknown. Because we're in such a rush, we don't have the time to avail ourselves of the resources of the Illinois Attorney General to verify whether or not this will be a benefit or a...damage our ratepayers. We don't know what the effects of the jobs are going to be. I'm particularly concerned about all of us in the middle. All of my constituents in the middle class and all of our medium-sized businesses who will have to spend money in order to avail themselves of the lower rates promised by the caps. So, we're asking people to spend money in order to possibly avail themselves of these caps. We know

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

that many of our businesses can't pass their cost increases onto their customers and are going be in the position of having to lay off people because they have to pay more for their electric bills. 20 years ago, the number 1 proponent of deregulation in this state was Commonwealth Edison and Exelon was created. Competition was a success, Exelon vigorously opposed all efforts up 'til now to interfere with their competitive market. Before we passed deregulation there were a year in a half of meetings and committee hearings. Now, we're being asked to vote on a Bill who was... that was evolving up until 90 minutes ago. If we're going to get into the rate making business, I'm going to suggest that we spend more time and that we understand the consequences of what we're doing. We don't have any idea. We're being... told, we're being frightened with the boogey man of rate... rate hikes are coming whether if we don't vote for the Bill. I quess I'd like to say that we need to trust in the competitive market. Up until now, competition in the Illinois energy field has been very, very strong and we've had the benefit of low rates. Why do we think that's not going to happen in the future, just because Exelon doesn't want to supply energy anymore at the rates that we have. What's to say other people aren't going to do it? In fact, we have someone that's investing and will come online in the near future. Why are we in the business of picking winners and losers in the Illinois competitive market? We need to not be the ones picking winners and losers. Let's not... it's not good public policy to interfere in the competitive market. We don't know what the consequences of that are going to be. Let's not find out the hard way. Let's

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

take some time, let's analyze what we're doing, let's not play favorites and let's not hurt our commercial and industrial and residential rate payers in the State of Illinois. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Sente for five minutes."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I've been thinking about this Bill thoughtfully for many weeks and trying to wrestle with the pros and cons on this issue which is very important and I'd like to just share with you some of the reasons that are leading me to my current decision to support this Bill. Number 1, Illinois is a leader in green energy and with this Bill, we would remain so and probably even advance Illinois to a leading edge position. We continually speak about wanting Illinois to be a leader in something and not place... and not last place in x, y, or z. And so, when we have an opportunity to do something impressive and bold that allows Illinois to really shine, then I want to be the first in line to consider that. Secondly, green energy creates jobs. We are always talking in this Assembly about creating jobs and stimulating the economy. And these are jobs that will have a long shelflife and we have to create new jobs to replace jobs that are drying up in outdated industries. The two Illinois nuclear plants in Clinton and the Quad Cities directly employ approximately 2,000 workers. But it is countless more when we look to include the construction workers and the suppliers that are associated with this industry. So, if you do not care about Exelon, as Illinois public servants, we need to care about the entire state and not just our constituency. These are families, they are ... these are workers that care and

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

need these jobs. This legislation, and we don't have many like this, is bipartisan. We need more bipartisanship. It is supported by the Governor, it is a Bill that has had the engagement of all five leaders. Business, labor environment are all in support of this. We do not get this very often. Illinois' electric rates are among the lowest in the region and country because of prior bold and thoughtful actions like the one we are taking today. Like when we took that action on deregulation and the same dooms day scenarios were discussed. But the fact is, when we look at Illinois' energy rates and where they're currently at, the following data is a combination of both consumer, commercial, and industrial electric rates based on cents per kilowatt hour, expressed over an 8 year period. And from 2008 to 2016, that comp... comparison Illinois' electric rates have decreased .5 percent compared to the U.S. where it's 5.5 percent and none of our mid... midwestern states surrounding us can come anywhere near to competing. They are at 6.3 percent all the way up to 42.2 percent increase over that same time period. Why are we getting those low rates? Because we're taking bold action. Lastly, I just want to address the ... the comment about why aren't we working on a budget and that's more important and I couldn't agree more. We should absolutely be working on a full-year budget with the most sincere urgency possible and yet, we can't all multitask. And addressing a large economic issue and green portfolio is an enormous undertaking where we can be proud that this body is addressing this. And I hope that the momentum of coming together to solve this issue rolls

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

into equally sincere efforts to obtaining a bipartisan budget solution. Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Of course, the Sponsor will yield."

Kay: "Thank you very much. Bob what did we do for the coal industry when they started to go under?"

Rita: "In terms of what? In terms of this Bill?"

Kay: "No. In terms of a subsidy."

Rita: "I... I..."

Kay: "We did nothing..."

Rita: "...I don't know."

Kay: "Do you know how many jobs were lost?"

Rita: "How many..."

Kay: "Do you know how many jobs were lost?"

Rita: "No."

Kay: "Around 6 thousand over... over a period. Nobody cared... nobody
cared."

Rita: "Well, I know we... we added a part for the... the... in one of the Amendments that we heard testimony on for the coal industry but it had overwhelming... opposition to this..."

Kay: "Well, my point is, nobody cared, nobody cared..."

Rita: "So..."

Kay: "...nobody cared."

Rita: "...so, I know we looked at all the different parts and we had extensive hearings..."

Kay: "...nobody cared."

Rita: "...no... we did go through extensive hearings..."

Kay: "Secondly... secondly"

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

- Rita: "...in terms of the coal in Dynegy in Southern Illinois in terms of... of..."
- Kay: "Well... what about Tenaska, Bob? What did we do to help Tenaska to get started and break ground?"
- Rita: "I believe there was a couple Bills that were passed..."
- Kay: "No. Tenaska's out of the picture. We... we lost a lot of jobs because Wayne Rosenthal couldn't get Tenaska in somebody's district. What did we do for that? Absolutely nothing. So, my question today is, is ComEd more important and their workers than those people who could have been working in Tenaska or coal mines in Southern Illinois?"
- Rita: "Again, we started out with three bills in early 2015. We're faced in... actually today's the deadline date for... for a letter to get sent for... Clinton to shut down. We're faced with two... two generation plants to shut down. The process has already started for Quad Cities. And these are thousands of jobs..."
- Kay: "...they're going to send out a war notice? Are they... did they send out a war notice yet? Excuse me, did they send out a war notice yet?"
- Rita: "It was going to be sent out today. I don't know if it was sent out already of if it's going to be sent out. December 1st was a... a date to start the process of shutting down Clinton."
- Kay: "So, my point is... we... we..."
- Rita: "So, not only... not only with these two, two, two..."
- Kay: "Well, excuse me, I'm answering... I'm asking the questions, pardon me. So, my point is, we don't care about coal, we don't care about Central and Southern Illinois but when it comes to a power plant, they're different. And when I hear the argument

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

that, well that's going to bring jobs to Illinois, I run big business. No one ever even talked to me about this. And you say we can read it, well, good luck. Nobody in here has read this Bill. You haven't read this Bill."

Rita: "With all due respect, we had the coal industry at the table, kay? And they were at the hearings, I don't know if you were at the six and a half, seven hour hearing where we heard about the coal industry. There's been commitments to... to members of the committee on... that were interested in the... in Southern Illinois and MISO and that 70 percent of that energy is through coal through there, that they're going to work on solutions and work on the future of Southern Illinois and how they're powered..."

Kay: "How are you going to do that... never mind, I'll come back..."
Rita: "So, I don't know if you were in that committee... I don't
you were in that committee..."

Kay: "Well, no, I wasn't in that committee..."

Rita: "...when we... when those commitments were made..."

Kay: "...but I hear a lot of people talking about what it's going to do and they're not business people. They don't know anything about business. Now, that's fine... that's fine. You own a business? Have you ever had to sign the front of a check?"

Rita: "Yes."

Kay: "Have you ever had to look at an income statement and make
 a pay..."

Rita: "Yes."

Kay: "Really?"

Rita: "Yes I have."

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

Kay: "Okay, about a \$3 billion business I imagine. I'm curious...
I'm curious. Tell me about this rate cap and how it's calculated."

Rita: "There's multiple rate caps. There's caps within the Bill, there's caps on the overall of the Bill. So, there's... there's a number of checks and balances that the ICC will monitor. So that... so that if they hit them points where the... the effi... that we hit like on residentials the 25 cents and the 1.3 percent on the... the medium and middle class business and the large business. So, there's all caps in there that are to... that will have the check and balance."

Kay: "Is there an individual rate cap?"

Rita: "It's done through the residential class 'cause there's three classes in... how they do billing. There... there was a number of initiatives, too, for the... the large users would... enjoy their own efficiency program pulling them completely out. So, they did get some things that... that they were interested in and been working and that were..."

Kay: "I'd like to ask some questions..."

Rita: "...wanted for a number of times... So... so..."

Kay: "that's not... I don't need to know that."

Rita: "Well, you were talking about business."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Kay, your time is expired. You already told me someone was yielding their time to you. Is someone doing that?

Rep. Bourne is yielding 5 minutes to Mr. Kay."

Kay: "I'm going to make it... I'm just going to make it brief. It's... it's pretty obvious that process doesn't matter here, and this is not your fault Bob. Process doesn't matter because this has happened time in and time out and that's why the

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

State of Illinois is what is today: broke and broken. You don't bring a Bill, and I know it's not your fault, please. You don't bring a Bill like this the last day that we're here, you don't do that. A responsible business man doesn't do that and we're running the business of a state for people who are very concerned. So, I... I'm just say ... I say ... you know, we talk about process and that it matters and this is the best we can do, it's not the best we can do. It's not the best we can do and if it is, we're in sorry shape. Mr. Speaker, let me close on this note. I had to write this down because I didn't remember it all but... This work, this work is exclusively of politicians. A set of men and women who have interest aside from the interest of people. And who to say, the mass then, or the most than taking as a mass at least one long step removed from the honest men. We are one step removed from honest men and you can laugh as much as you want, you can find it funny, but it's true. And I can say it because we have freedom in here to say pretty much what we want, although there's been some recent exceptions. But because I'm a politician and you're politician, I just want to say I hope you don't take offense to what I have said, but I do want to make it clear that this is not the work of the people. This is the work of politicians. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Kifowit for five minutes."

Kifowit: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I... I came into this discussion undecided and I want to appreciate both sides of the discussion on this matter. I... I wanted to point out a couple of things that I have seen over my few years that I've been here. These Bills seem to come out a lot, at the last

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

minute, and just in the last couple days we went from Amendment 3 to Amendment 10. And I... I want to point out that I am, for lack of a better word, in awe that if a Democratic Bill would come out at the last minute there's gnashing of teeth and throwing of hands from the other side of the aisle on how horrible it is to have a process that's at the last minute. I think that this Bill coming out at the last minute is not the way it should have gone. I think our Governor should have been negotiating this for the two years that it's been here, but because the Governor waited 'til the last minute now it's okay and that everybody should get on board with it. It's a failure of the Governor that should have addressed this situation two years ago, negotiated a plan in committee in the public so that everybody knows what the rates are going to be, how the people are going to be affected, and what is the true outcome of this Bill. I'm also a bit appalled that for years we have tried to be a leader in green energy and now we are a leader in green energy just when it's convenient for the Governor to get a Bill through. This... this is not right. We should've passed green energy, green jobs years ago to be a true pioneer in this area. I think... I believe that nuclear is fine. I believe that we need to have stratified sources of energy including green including green jobs. But I think the process that this has been on the table for two years, and that now it comes up at the last minute of the 11th hour with... on... on Amendment 10 is... is a... a point of nee... that needs to be pointed out that the Governor should've been negotiating this instead of tweeting on Twitter about M&Ms being his favorite chocolate

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

for National Chocolate Day. We need to be engaged, this should've been out in the public beforehand and I just want to point out that while I am still very appreciative of the discussion of the merits and I am very sensitive to our tax payers and I'm very sensitive to our green jobs. And we have a little bit of everything in here that we need to start having leadership in the state so that this stops from both sides of the aisle and the Governor should have been a leader and should now have a comprehensive energy plan. This plan is only for 10 years. What are we going to do then? What are the rates going to be then? In 10 years? If they're going to spike if these plants close now, how much higher are they going to spike in 10 years on top of this rate increase today? We need a comprehensive energy plan. We need a comprehensive jobs plans. We need a comprehensive renewal energy plan. We need to start being responsible to the people of the State of Illinois and we need the Governor to put as much energy as he put into this Bill into a responsible and balanced budget. A budget is what we need, a budget is what he should have been working on these past two years and that is where we need to be. So, Mr. Speaker I needed to point out that we need responsible governments from this governor, we need a responsible Bill, a balanced budget and we need to have now a plan assuming this passes to be crafted in 10 years on how the rate payers won't be doubly taxed when these plans are set to be expired. Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sullivan for 5 minutes."

Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Many of my colleagues have already talked about what's in this Bill and

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

so, we are fairly well versed. I want to talk a little bit about the process and it's... interesting to say it right now ... This process isn't pretty, at times. This idea is a culmination of years of work, years of work, years prior to this governor actually being here. So, I don't know how it's his fault that we haven't been able to get comprehensive energy policy. But we've had multiple Bills that have come together and here we are today on a final product. Now, our Governor and his staff worked diligently. He came to the table with some ideas that were met by all the stake holders. And here we are. With those ideas, what he has done, is he has protected the rate payer. We know what's going to happen if we do nothing. We have a study from the ICC and others that was done two years ago. And I know that there was a question asked beforehand about whether the ICC has ruled or has looked at the numbers. Yes, they have. This governor would not have agreed to sign a Bill, which he has done, without the ICC's approval. So, for those that think that this has been done in haste, that the process is broken, you weren't sitting there with Representative Nekritz and a lot of others that had been working on this idea for many, many, many years. And so, here we are today. Folks, it's time to do this right. It's time to pass this Bill. We know that if we do nothing, on an average day should these nuclear power plants close, the average increase on an average day would be an 11 and a half percent increase. Those are ICC's numbers. If we have a... some type of thermal effect, some type of really hot period or cold period, we would have up to 26 percent increase in your rates. So, by the Governor actively engaging on this process, he has been

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

able to cap those. He has been able to keep rates lower than what they otherwise would have been done. So, Ladies and Gentlemen, please vote 'aye'."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie is recognized for an excused absence."

Currie: "Thank you. Please let the record show that Representative Lilly is excused for the remainder of the day."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Leader. Mr. Davidsmeyer for five minutes."

Davidsmeyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As the Minority Spokesperson on Energy, I just want to thank the Sponsor for all his work. He has, actually, with all this last minute stuff, he has been doing a great job keeping me up to speed on what's going on. I want to thank Chairperson Chapa LaVia for ... for running a great committee. We did start probably 2 years ago discussing what's going on in energy policy. We set out to find a comprehensive energy policy. I've been a little bit outspoken in committee about my concerns on this Bill. But I ... I really want to start out with a couple things that I think are good about the Bill. I know you may be surprised so I actually like the fact that were extending formula rate extension. I think that's a good thing. I think that's a good thing for consumers in the Ameren territory. I like the fact that the renewable por... portfolio standard is going to be supplied by jobs right here in the State of Illinois. With regards to the renewable portfolio standard, I am pro green technology. But I believe a false number that was put in the renewable portfolio standard has put nuclear power in the situation that it is in today. I think we have actually

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

created this mess with that. When we set out two weeks ago, when we set out to do this we, kind of started out with a little bit of a Christmas Tree Bill. It was a little bit of you know, who wants this and who wants that, and we'll start out and we'll get going. I voted 'yes' to keep the conversation going because I thought there was a lot more movement that could be made. And we've gone a long way. And I appreciate your work on this Leader Rita. My main concern, one of my main concerns on this Bill, is we have a state that almost 50 percent of our energy is nuclear. Almost 40 percent of our energy legislation shouldn't almost 40 percent of our energy be included in a comprehensive Bill? That one was a question.

Rita: "Repeat that just a..."

Davidsmeyer: "I said if..."

Rita: "...about. Go ahead."

Davidsmeyer: "So, I said, 50 percent of our energy comes from nuclear and almost 40 percent comes coal. If we're going to do comprehensive energy legislation, shouldn't we include almost 40 percent of our energy generation?"

Rita: "In... In as you know, in Amendment 3 I believe it was, we hit some with the FRAP, and we were addressing the coal and coal for energy. And it drew a lot of opposition as you heard."

Davidsmeyer: "Yeah."

Rita: "In... there was a portion that we took out but I know it was stated in committee and it was stated by yourself, the importance of Central and Southern Illinois in terms of coal

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

and what coal does. That they were going to continue to work on some solutions as we move forward...

Davidsmeyer: "And..."

Rita: "But in particular the way that the FRAP was drafted, and the FRAP was included, it drew a number of opposition. Not just from one or two. Including 1, being the Governor's office, 2 being I believe it was the Illinois Coal...Coal Association was in opposition if I'm remembering that correctly..."

Davidsmeyer: "To the overall Bill..."

Rita: "To the overall..."

Davidsmeyer: "Not for that portion of the Bill..."

Rita: "And it was mentioned. And there was a commitment by those that were at the table, a commitment by myself. That is something that we need to look at as we move in the future.

Davidsmeyer: "I'm going to runout of time here. If I can get some time yielded from Representative Jesiel."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Jesiel yields her 5 minutes of her time to Mr. Davidsmeyer. Please proceed, Sir."

Davidsmeyer: "I'm planning to keep...trying to keep this short. So, when... when that portion was completely taken out my understanding was that it was the environmental side that was going in opposition to 40 percent of our coal generation, or 40 percent of our energy generation being involved in it. And I understand that they actually came back with a reduced amount just like Exelon, just like ComEd, just like Ameren, just like all these others groups. And they weren't... weren't kept in."

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

Rita: "So... so, it wasn't just the... the one portion. There was business groups. There was a number of people in opposition. But what... what happens in this complex of a Bill, when you move one part, it could move 2 or 3 other parts. And by adding the FRAP, it actually moved, instead of moving towards an agreed Bill, and as we reduce this, it was starting to move the Bill in opposite directions like it was when all the 3 different Bills were...were put in place. So, it was through the negotiations and through compromise on all the parties of why that portion was removed."

Davidsmeyer: "Yeah so... so, when I say 40 percent of the State of Illinois is coal, let me just say that down state, we're almost 70 percent coal generation. So, when I walk into my house and flip on my light switch, I know where my energy comes from. It's very important to me. I think often down state feels left out. And I think we're definitely left out on this energy legislation. I... I think it's very important. I think nuclear is an important source of energy. I definitely do. And I think that... I think that something needs to be done. But as coal generation has gone off line with regards to where rates are today, what has happened to rates as coal generation's gone off line? Over the past few years? 5 years?"

Rita: "I believe they've went up a little bit is that?"

Davidsmeyer: "No."

Rita: "No. Down."

Davidsmeyer: "Yeah."

Rita: "Historically low."

Davidsmeyer: "We're at historically low rates. And that's lost generation."

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

Rita: "But is that do to the natural gas?"

Davidsmeyer: "Natural gas generation in the State of Illinois is actually fairly low. It's in the maybe 10-20 percent at most. And actually renewables is only in the two percent which why I was excited about more coming online to actually be generated here. But that's... that's the markets... that's the markets doing what the markets do. This is a tough one because I think nuclear is very important, it's very important. But I also think the markets are important. I've been... I've been... like I said, I've been fairly outspoken on this. I want to keep it fairly calm. I know there's a lot of people who have different beliefs on where the markets going to take us. And we are speculating on behalf of the State of Illinois. And I know where I'm at on this legislation, I know where number of other people are. I do want to thank you for the work you've done on this. I hope that you'll work with me to hold those people that were sitting at the table saying we'll work with coal. 40 percent of our generation will work with them to make sure we come up something, to make sure they can continue to provide reliable educa... reliable electricity. Because it was the environmentals, it was all the people involved in this Bill that said they would be there to negotiate something. So, I hope you'll help hold those feet to the fire."

Rita: "I share you concern. And I will... will do that because at the time, I mean, if we could put a portion of coal in here, I would. And the idea was to bring all the parties to try to figure out what we could do and how we could do this to get

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

this passed with them plants closing. But I will work with you and work with them that made that commitment to you.

Davidsmeyer: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andrade for 5 minutes."

Andrade: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

"Representative, I am very happy that his Bill has come Andrade: to its day because I was a little worried about your health. Saw you smoking a little bit more than usual. But this here debate makes me very proud to be a Member of this House. I did not take, I didn't participate in the freshman orientation last year but this time I... I'm participating right now in the freshman orientation of the 100th class. So, I can't remember which Representative told but we live in Illinois which is basically almost made up of 5 states within. And I have a lot of friends here that I've grown to become in the last 3 years. A lot of Republicans, a lot of Democrats and this is...this here is incredible because we have actually Democrats who are upset, we have Republicans who are upset. Every caucus has spoke. And so, maybe Mr. Speaker, maybe the Rules Committee can actually send our Budget Bill through the Energy Committee because I have a lot of respect for her. And so, but what I do feel might be missing why... the reason why we don't have a budget is, Representative Rita, I have one request for you please..."

Rita: "Yes."

Andrade: "...one request. There's been all these lobbyists up here and all Exelon, ComEd, and we've helped a lot of people, probably make a lot of money this last year or two. So, maybe

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

can you request them just not to break up the band just... just yet? Maybe they can do some pro-bono work and help us get a budget. On behalf of the citizen's maybe they can do some pro-bono work. On behalf of citizens of Illinois can they please stay together and do some pro-bono work? I mean we go the Governor in agreement, we got Republican leadership, we got all our, every Caucus is upset and happy. So, that's all Mr. Rita. On behalf of the State of Illinois, on behalf of the residents, please keep the band together. Maybe until January 9th because were available. So, maybe all the lobbyist, ComEd, Exelon, because their budget on this lobbying must have been pretty... pretty extensive. So, all I ask they do some pro-bono work..."

Rita: "I've heard your request and one day I may call upon you for a request."

Andrade: "Absolutely. As some people mistake me for you sometimes and I will answer all the time. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for indulgence. And... and I just want to say I'm proud to be a Member of this House and this is... this is how every debate should be. Thank you very much.

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Ford for 5 minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ford: "Representative Rita, just a few questions. Where would you say most of the jobs will be created as a result of this Bill?

Rita: "There's 2 parts. Two in the job creation comes through the... most of them through the energy efficiency, which would be a result in jobs in the communities like you represent, or I represent, or what Representative Davis represented. Part

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

of that low assistance, low income assistance program and income job training."

Ford: "Are those permanent jobs?"

Rita: "Yes."

Ford: "Are those jobs like the plant that may close down?"

Rita: "Well, there's two parts. There are jobs that are tied to these plants that are closed down, that are currently people employed with in both Quad Cities and in Clinton, which will be saving them jobs. But the job creations comes a bulk of them through the energy efficiency and job training, and to installing solar panels, installing the new portions of the energy efficiency of this Bill."

Ford: "But the guaranteed jobs, with the somewhat bailout..."

Rita: "I wouldn't say guaranteed jobs. The jobs that the two facilities where people currently work at, there's a number of jobs that they have not replaced because of the preparation of them closing. But the creation, cause of...with in the legislation for the job creation is part of the new components of the policy."

Ford: "So, there are no guaranteed jobs with the bailout? So, that's a possibility?"

Rita: "So, the money tied into here that will go to job training.

To train and certify individuals in the energy...

Ford: "What about the plant?"

Rita: "Industry..."

Ford: "Yeah. I agree with those. I commend you for ... "

Rita: "So, that's part of this. So, it's a two part. You can't, you got to look at all these different parts..."

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

Ford: "Well, let me just commend you for that part. But I want to know about those permanent jobs. That's important because those are going to be tax payers..."

Rita: "Yes..."

Ford: "I just want to know. Are there permanent jobs that's tied to this Bill? The part two..."

Rita: "Well, there will be permanent jobs that will be created.

There's permanent jobs that if this legislation don't pass that we will lose."

Ford: "So, there's probably no guarantee. Alright, I'm just wondering. I thought that there would be guaranteed jobs. And the jobs that are there in the new plant areas, are those areas where prisons are? Already where they have jobs?"

Rita: "I wouldn't say there's no guarantee, there's targets in here. So... so, as this Bill takes effect, there's targets to me."

Ford: "Well, I appreciate..."

Rita: "And the goal is to create permanent, full time, good paying jobs."

Ford: "I appreciate your work on this. And you know, as a business person and a business owner, I got to tell you this feels good to business people because they're going to get a big pay day as a result of our work. And I heard the debate, and I heard people say that this is not a perfect Bill. And in my mind that means there will be some winners and some losers. And where I come from, everyone knows I live in the Austin community, the Westside of Chicago, and there still reporting that Chicago tops 700 homicides with this month. And in order of us to be serious about helping all communities, this Bill

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

should be one that tied the communities together with the business community to do what's good for all the people in the State of Illinois. I hear people talking about, there are goals in this Bill. Goals have gotten us in the situation that leaves us hopeless. What we need are opportunities on the West and South side of Chicago. Because the goals as stated in Article 10 of our Constitution, is just hopeful that we will do right by our children. I want to congratulate all of the people that did the work on this Bill and provide the human service or the social service programs but Ronald Regan once said that the best social service program is a job. And it's my belief that if we could only bring some real jobs to the Westside of Chicago, where I live and where I represent, we would all do better in this state. And for that reason, because this Bill is not equal in access to jobs and opportunities, I don't think the people that I represent would be happy for me to vote for this Bill. So, congratulations to the winners and I apologize to the losers."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Frese for 5 minutes."

Frese: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Wish to yield my time to Representative Ives."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives for 5 minutes."

Ives: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I think there's some really important facts that need to be brought out as it relates to renewables and to jobs. Because the other side wants to talk about how this is important to the renewable community and to jobs. And the truth is, renewables are not the answer in a modern society. In fact, this Bill disregards the movement away from wind and solar that is happening in

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

Europe because you can't run the modern economy on diluent interment energy. Denmark erected over 5,000 wind turbine towers, 1 for every thousand Danish citizens. They blanketed the nation, providing a beautiful view of 300-500 foot towers from every house, farm, field and forest. But in total the turbans produced only 1.3 gigawatts of electricity on average. And all of that could have been replaced with one single conventional power plant. Let's look at Springfield itself. Springfield, the plant that runs this city, 500 megawatts, its sitting down there. In order to replace that plant, you're going to look at 1000 minimum of wind turbans to replace it. And then, you have to be lucky enough to make sure the wind is blowing at the right time in order to funnel it. The truth is, that this Bill is a direct contravention of its intentions. It will actually require more fossil fuel, not less, as back up energy sources, if wind and solar are forced to become a larger portion of our energy mix. Germany and England are already learning that more renewable fuels they dispatch there electric gids... grids, the more coal they must burn to back it up because of its interment generation. So it's not the answer to do this. In fact, Germany managed to increase its use of renewables and its output of Carbon Dioxide at the same time because it resorted to cheap coal to keep the lights on and price... at a price people could afford. In truth, the cost of backup power not only caps solar and wind growth, renewables may have already over shot. The International Renewable Agency... Energy Agency is discordantly sober in its report, predicts that wind and solar will start shrinking their share in the fast growing developing

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

economies in the coming years. Wind and solar is not the answer especially when we have some of the most largest coal deposits in the United States. The other thing about jobs. Once a wind farm is built it only takes 10 workers to actually manage that wind farm. 10 workers. Versus a coal plant which takes hundreds of workers, versus a nuclear plant which takes a decent amount of workers. The truth is wind and solar once they're built, there's not real jobs there. And if we want to talk about preserving jobs, why didn't we talk about it when U.S. Steel laid off 2 thousand employees down at the Granite City plant? Why didn't we talk about it when manufacturing lost 62 hundred jobs last year? Why did we talk about jobs when were already down 69, 79 hundred jobs in manufacturing this year? We don't talk about this holistically. We're talking about a specific industry, a specific billion dollar company and we're bailing them out based on jobs and information that nobody has verified. This is not the way for Illinois to go, this will actually, your right, this is going to cause a massive rate increase because solar and wind is not efficient, it's not effective, and it's extremely costly, requiring loads of backup energy. One more point, when they made the switch in coal, from Illinois coal, which was too dirty to burn, and bringing in Wyoming coal, at that point in the mix you had about 20% excess energy. So, a lot of those coal plants had to retool. Some of them went off line, we actually lost energy at that point. But now, about a decade later, we're back to an excess energy amount of 40 percent. 40 percent more energy that we produce. And here's what going to happen if nuclear... one of those nuclear plants actually

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

does close, which is very suspicious I think, actually, I don't know that there going to close. Especially if their capacities needed on the border PGN market. But if they do, the Kendall County combined cycle, steam and gas plant that's already in production is 1000 megawatt plant. That plant can be reproduced cheaper than building wind, building solar, or building nuke. So, we have other all... alternates for energy and those sources are going to come in. You don't... trust a free market that has built this country. And that's the truth. You don't trust the free market and I do. Let the market decide where this lies and don't bail out a big company."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Leitch for 5 minutes."

Leitch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I love the theater. And I truly will miss episodes of last day, end of veto session in Springfield. There are many, many good reasons to pass elements of this Bill. Many have been worked on for some time. There are green aspects, none of us want to see the jobs lost by the nuke workers and devastate those communities. The problem is I think this Bill needs more work because everyones in favor of the Bill except for the people who are now producing the jobs. That's the manufacturing base and the small business base in the state. And those are the communities who are telling us more work needs to be done on the Bill. So, it's with that observation that I thank you for the theater. And I look forward to opposing the Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Scherer for 5 minutes."

Scherer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I really care about the members of my district as I know that the other people in

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

here do also. So, I've read one line that really scared me, which said, December 31, 2030. And that was really frightening. 1, that it goes on that long and 2, that there's no plan of what happens after that. There's just too many lose threads in this Bill. So, after much deliberation of the pros and the cons, I just have to come to the point to believe that there are just too many concerns. Just multiple concerns about the effect on... of the middle class, the working class. What's going to happen to the everyday people if this Bill passes? So, with that in mind, I've reached the conclusion that I would like to urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "And Ladies and Gentleman the last speaker. Mr. Phillips for 5 minutes."

Phillips: "Thank you. I yield my time to the great orator Tom Morrison."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Orris... Mr. Morrison for 4:54."

Morrison: "All right. Thank you. I won't use all that time. I just, you know, some points have been made from both sides. Will the sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsors yields."

Morrison: "Representative Rita, do I understand that you are a smoker?"

Rita: "Yes."

Morrison: "All right. Well, I would like to call you..."

Rita: "What's that got to do with this Bill?"

Morrison: "...I would like to call you to account, Representative Rita, for adding to your Carbon foot print. And besides its not good for your health. Solar panels, wind turbines, do we know where these are made?"

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

Rita: "The what?"

Morrison: "Solar panels, the components of solar panels...

Rita: "I don't know."

Morrison: "...the rare Earth minerals. The components of wind turbines. Where are they made? Where are they produced? Where are they manufactured?"

Rita: "I have no idea."

"Okay. I think it's an important question to ask. Morrison: Because while we have seen attempts to build solar electricity generating devices in this country, probably the greatest example was the Solyndra experiment. And what a disaster that was, that harmed our tax payers. So, what has happened as a lot of inexpensive manufacturing has moved overseas, think about this, for those of you who are saying we want the clean energy. How does this make sense? If the solar panels and the components are made in China, they're made in manufacturing plants that are generally burning coal, adding carbon dioxide and pollutants to the atmosphere. We share that atmosphere on planet Earth. Those panels and components are shipped on diesel ships over to the United States. They're transported on diesel powered locomotives, diesel powered semi-tractor trailers. How is this environmentally friendly?"

Rita: "So, can you explain to me then, why doing nothing is better?"

Morrison: "Actually..."

Rita: "You're saying it is."

Morrison: "...Actually. Yes. I am that..."

Rita: "Without putting solar and using wind..."

Morrison: "What I'm saying..."

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

Rita: "...and looking at these alternatives or not fixing..."

Morrison: "...in my opening remarks..."

Rita: "...not fixing the RPS that they've been trying to fix for the last 7 years."

Morrison: "Okay. Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. The RPS is a part of the problem. And we are doubling down on that. We are tying our hands as a state. We are saying the state and all of our rate payers, every constituent, must buy from this segment of electricity. We must do that. We are tying our hands, handcuffing our... handcuffing ourselves. And, you know, I want quote Secretary of State, John Kerry. You know, the Paris climate talks he admitted that reducing carbon dioxide emissions in the United States and the developed world will not help the environment or even slow down global warming because the developing nations of the world continue to produce with coal and other fossil fuels. So, we're going to hurt ourselves, we're going to hurt our own economy, not just in Illinois but across the United States, for what? Quoting, again, John Kerry, so that we can lead by example. This is not an area where we should be leading. The proponents of this Bill made their case to the Chicago Tribune Editorial Board, and it was outside the pressure cooker of the State Capital, where we have lobbyists seemingly everywhere. Some of our former colleagues who are saying you got to pass this Bill today, ya got to do it, ya got to do it, ya got to do it. This is what the Tribune said, we shouldn't favor a hand full of businesses at the expense of every other business in Illinois. Illinois consumers, it is not appropriate for Illinois to pick winners and losers. Illinois and the

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

governments are repeatedly putting the thumb on the scale to determine which energy industries will win and lose. This is no way to run an economy. It distorts the market place. This Bill distorts the market place, it creates safe spaces where rivals should wrestle and tramples urgency. The best way to encourage innovation and efficiencies is to permit and to encourage competition. That's why we need to vote 'no'. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Rita to close."

Rita: "Well, we've had a long debate with... very robust debate. We've had number of hearings. We've had lot of stakeholders come together in the last 72 hours. More importantly with these last Amendments, it brought the Governor, his assurance that he's going to sign this Bill. There was some uncertainty, where the Governor was, whether he was going to sign it or not. And with the final Amendments that was put in, insured his signature to this. You heard a lot about jobs. We heard a lot about saving the jobs in Clinton and Quad Cities. We heard a lot about creating jobs through the energy efficiency in the RPS. We've heard a lot of the debate. So, if you're about saving and creating jobs, it's a 'yes' vote and join me in passing Senate Bill 2814. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. Please be reminded Representative McDermed has asked for a verification should this receive 60 votes. 60 votes is what it needs. Please be in your chairs and vote your own switches. Those is 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? Please

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

record yourselves, Members. Please record yourselves. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 63 voting 'yes', 38 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority... sorry. I apologize. Thank you, Sir for the reminder. Mr. Clerk, please read the affirmative."

"A poll of those voting in the affirmative, Clerk Hollman: Representative Acevedo; Representative Andersson; Representative Andrade; Representative Arroyo; Representative Bellock; Representative Bradlev; Representative Brady; Representative Breen; Representative Brown; Representative Daniel Burke; Representative Butler; Currie; Representative Cloonen; Representative Representative D'Amico; Representative Monique Davis; Representative William Davis; Representative DeLuca; Representative Demmer; Representative Drury; Representative Durkin; Representative Evans; Representative Feigenholtz; Representative Fine; Representative Fortner; Representative Representative Gabel; Representative Guzzardi; Franks; Representative Harper; Representative Greg Harris; Representative Hays; Representative Hernandez; Representative Hoffman; Representative Hurley; Representative Kifowit; Representative Jackson; Representative Lang; Representative McAsey; Representative McAuliffe; Representative McSweeney; Representative Bill Mitchell; Representative Christian Mitchell; Representative Moeller; Representative Moffitt; Representative Nekritz; Representative Rita; Representative Sente; Representative Sims; Representative Skoog; Representative

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

Representative Soto; Representative Stewart; Representative Sullivan; Representative Tabares; Representative Tryon; Representative Turner; Representative Verschoore; Representative Walsh; Representative Welch; Representative Welter; Representative Barbara Wheeler; Representative Williams; Representative Willis; and Representative Zalewski."

Speaker Lang: "Representative McDermed."

McDermed: "Representative Feigenholtz."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Feigenholtz. Representative Feigenholtz. Representative Feigenholtz is down here. Next."

McDermed: "Withdraw."

'yes, 38 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is here by declared passed. The Chair is in receipt of a Motion from Mr. Franks. Pursuant to Rule 65, having voted on the prevailing side, I move to reconsider the vote by which Senate Bill 2814 passed. Leader Currie, moves to table that Motion. Is there leave? And the Motion does adopted. And the Motion for reconsider is tabled. Ladies and Gentleman, the 2017 Session schedule is being distributed. Ladies and Gentleman, we're going to adjourn on a Death Resolution. Will the Members be in their chairs and rise? Page 6 of the Calendar. House Resolution 1497, Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you very much, Members... Speaker and Members of the House. John Matijevich, was a Member of this chamber for 26 years. He was born on Christmas Day, 1927. He died just a month ago. John was wonderful person, a compassionate human

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

being, a strong citizen of the North Chicago area. Very active in the community. His passions in the Legislature were two. First, he was among the strongest consumer advocates I have ever known. He was one of the creators of the Citizens Utility Board. And he was personally the government watch dog for the Illinois Commerce Commission and the Illinois Toll Highway Authority. The other thing that was really important to John was transparency and accountability in government. Long before those were watch words of the way we try to do business, John was the one who was forever calling out procedures and activities that didn't quite meet requirements of an open and fair government. John was a terrific Member of this institution, a strong member of his community, he wrote newspaper columns for most of his adult life. He was married for 60 years to his wife Agnes, and his son Robert was the very apple of his eye. He was a family man, he was a caring person. We lost a great leader when John Matijevich left us. And I would like to say to his family, to his friends, and to his community, God speed, and thank you John Matijevich."

Speaker Lang: "This Resolution has already been adopted. Let the Body take a moment of silence in memory of John Matijevich. Apparently this has not been adopted. Leader Currie moves for the adoption of the Resolution. Those in favor say 'yes'; those opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. And now, leaving perfunctory time for the Clerk, Leader Currie moves that the House stands adjourn 'til Monday, January 9, 2017 at the hour of 12 noon. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Motion is

153rd Legislative Day

12/1/2016

adopted. And the House stands adjourned 'til January 9 at the hour of 12 noon. Everyone have a wonderful holiday."

Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Instruction and First Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 328, offered by Representative Walsh, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Senate Bill 402, offered by Representative Turner, a Bill for an Act concerning Liquor. First Readings of these Senate Bills. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."