Speaker Turner: "Members are asked to be at their seats. We shall be led in prayer today by Alison Pure-Slovin who is the Midwest Regional Director of Simon Wiesenthal Center in Chicago, Illinois. Ms. Pure-Slovin is the guest of Representative Jones. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off all cell phones, and rise for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance."

Pure-Slovin: "Hebrew - ינותנ'a אלוהים, ינותנ'a (translation: Our God and God of our fathers) Accept with mercy our prayer for our land and its government. Pour out your blessing on this land, on its President, judges, officers, and officials, who work faithfully for the public good. Teach them from the laws of your Torah, enlighten them with the rules of your justice, so that peace, tranquility, happiness, and freedom will never depart from our land. This prayer for the Government of the United States, is recited each week on Shabbat, the Jewish Sabbath, in synagogues and temples across the noble nation. It is especially meaningful to me as I grew up in a household where we never took for granted the freedoms and tranquility this country afforded our country. The experience I had as an American-born Jew was drastically different to that of my grandparents who fled from the pogroms of Europe to the safe haven of the United States. Under your leadership, the blessing of freedoms will continue to surround us, the freedom to practice our religion as we choose; to educate our children without interference or imposition; to express our viewpoints openly and to participate actively in the civic process. This is precisely why we pray for the well-being of our government and our elected officials. A prayer of gratitude to our G-d
in heaven that our government should continue to provide its people, whether immigrant or American-born, with safety, security, and peace. We must never take what we have for granted. As Simon Wiesenthal, history’s most acclaimed Nazi-Hunter and Holocaust Survivor, once said, 'Freedom is a not gift of heaven, you must fight for it every day'. Let us pray that we never take these freedoms for granted and that we work together as one people to uphold the liberties that our forefathers guaranteed us in the American Constitution. I pray that you, our elected officials, be given divine blessing to carry out your sacred duties and responsibilities with inspired wisdom as well as with decency, humanity, and civility. Hebrew — (translation: And so may it be God’s will that our land be a blessing for all who live on earth, and that fellowship and liberty will dwell between them.) Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "We shall be led in the Pledge of Allegiance today by Representative Severin."

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

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

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to report that all Democrats are here and ready to do business today."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Butler."

Butler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please let the Journal reflect that Representative Mazzochi is excused today."
Speaker Turner: "With 117 Members present, a quorum is established. Members, on page 3 of the Calendar, we have Senate Joint Resolution 17, offered by Representative Bourne."

Bourne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today I rise on an important topic for our Body. I rise to ask this Body to adopt Senate Joint Resolution #17. This appoints Judge Carol Pope to the office of Legislative Inspector General. Her background, laid out in the Resolution, is impressive. She was a Menard County State's Attorney. She was a Circuit Judge for the Eighth Judicial Circuit from 1992 to 2010. She was assigned to serve on the Appellate Court and was reelected to that in 2012 until she retired in 2018. Also throughout her tenure, she advised on judicial ethics. The process, many of you may know, for Legislative Inspector General changed last Session on legislation that we voted on which setup an independent search committee. This is the first time we've carried out that process. The Legislative Ethics Commission is very proud of the work that we've done. And we think this sets on a good path forward to make sure that this Body is more transparent, is held accountable, and to give the public more confidence that we are able to effectively police ourselves. Judge Pope was the unanimous choice of the Legislative Ethics Commission. This Resolution passed unanimously in the Senate. And I would ask for your 'aye' vote on this important Joint Resolution. I would be happy to answer any questions you might have."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Willis."
Willis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill... or to the Resolution. As a member of the Ethics Commission, I urge this Body support this Resolution. It was done bipartisanly."
Speaker Turner: "Members, can we please bring the noise level down in the chamber? Thank you."
Willis: "This is a step in the correct direction to put professionalism back into the Legislative Ethics Commission. We've worked hard to move it forward in a positive direction. As Representative previously stated, this was totally 100 percent bipartisan support. It was unanimous in both the commission as to the best choice for this opening, and it was unanimous in committee. And I urge the entire Body to, in a very good bipartisan manner, to support this Bill. And I would look forward to seeing 100 percent acceptance of this Resolution. Thank you."
Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Hammond."
Hammond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And to the Resolution. I, too, echo my colleagues' comments about Justice Pope. And certainly serving as the Inspector General in the State of Illinois is an extremely important position. And I believe that Judge Pope has all of the qualities that are needed to serve in this capacity and look forward to working with her in the years to come. Thank you."
Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Manley."
Manley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Resolution. And also my colleagues that serve on the commission, I want to thank you. I'm a newly appointed member of the Ethics Commission. I want to thank personally Representative Hammond, Chairwoman Bourne for your... bringing me up to speed and really being very
impressed by how things are handled on the commission and your willingness and commitment to do this in such a bipartisan fashion. It was really nice to be with you, and I'm looking forward to working closely with you. As is not only in this chamber, but also the Republicans and Democrats in the Senate also have shown their willingness to get work done and the commitment to the work that the commission is going to do. So thank you, colleagues here, and I look forward to working with you going forward."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Butler."

Butler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I've had the great opportunity to know Judge Pope for quite a long time. And I would say the commission and every one that was involved in the decision, this is a wonderful choice for this position. Judge Pope will do a great job. She's done wonderful work on the bench, whether it's on the appellate level or the circuit level. She's done wonderful work as State's Attorney of Menard County. She's a proud resident of the 87th District just up the road. And I think this is a great choice. And I would certainly urge an 'aye' vote from everyone."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Leader Durkin."

Durkin: "Thank you. To the Resolution. I want to thank the men and women on the commission, but also the group that was put together over the summer that we've charged with finding the best person in the State of Illinois to serve as our Legislative Inspector General. I also want to make sure that we thank the outgoing Inspector General, Julie Porter, who took on a very difficult responsibility in a very difficult time in the state and she performed well. And I hope we all
recognize that, but we're moving into it with a new full time Legislative Inspector General. And I think it's important to listen and understand the process it went through. You heard the other talkers... other speakers talk about this was done in a collaborative bipartisan way, in a thoughtful process which was not rushed. And what happened? You got a great product. We've got an Inspector General that was approved unanimously by our Legislative... Legislative Ethics Commission and probably in this chamber today. I think it's great. Now folks, in about 20 minutes or a half hour we are going to completely go away from that process and we're going to take a sharp U-turn on how we work together, working together in a bipartisan process. But remember we can get good things done when we work together and we talk together, and we collaborate, and we allow the parties... both parties to provide their input and their thoughts. We can get good things done when that happens. I'm not quite sure when we get this next Bill that we're going to be able to see that process play out. But today this particular Resolution, SJR17, is a fine piece of work by people who put time and commitment into this extremely important issue. I recommend an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Thapedi."
Thapedi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Turner: "Sponsor indicates that she will yield."
Thapedi: "Representative, I'm looking at Judge Pope's background and it's obviously very impressive. Were there any other candidates that were considered by the commission and by you when you were ushering in her appointment?"
Bourne: "Thank you for the question. There were over 20 applicants for the position of Legislative Inspector General. The selection committee that I mentioned of four members vetted those down as the legislation that we passed clarifies. And they recommended two to the commission. We interviewed both and Judge Pope was the unanimous choice of the commission."

Thapedi: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Bourne to close."

Bourne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to urge the Body that this is one of the more important votes that you will be able to take on the future of the... I would say the integrity of this Body. I want to echo the thanks that Leader Durkin mentioned. Thank you to the other commission members for your hard work. Thank you to our staff. Thank you to the selection committee that was tasked with vetting those over 20 candidates. This has been the number one priority of the commission since I joined. We're very proud of the work. And we ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate... Senate Joint Resolution 17 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 117 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'opposed', and 0 voting 'present'. Senate Joint Resolution 17, having received the Constitutional Majority, is adopted. On page 3 of the Calendar, under Senate Bills on Second Reading, we have Senate Bill 1. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. A fiscal note, a Home Rule note, pension note, and state mandates note has been requested but not filed at this time."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Butler is recognized."

Butler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Republicans request an immediate caucus."

Speaker Turner: "Do you know how long, Representative?"

Butler: "Thirty minutes. Thirty minutes."

Speaker Turner: "The House will be at ease. And the Republicans will have an immediate Caucus for 30 minutes. Members, on page 3 of the Calendar, under Senate Bills on Second Reading, we have Senate Bill #1, offered by Representative Guzzardi. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, Senate Bill #1."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Guzzardi."

Guzzardi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, I rise to present Senate Bill 1, the Bill to raise the minimum wage in Illinois to $15 an hour. I'll keep this short because I suspect we'll have ample time during debate to discuss the details of this Bill. The Bill before you is very similar to a measure that we passed in this chamber two years ago. The
Bill raises the minimum wage gradually over the course of the next six years, beginning on January 1 of 2020 and ending at $15 an hour on January 1 of 2025. Contrary to what you may hear and what we've already heard as a matter of fact, today the Bill has been negotiated and deliberated over the course of years. Including bringing in feedback from many people who had concerns about the Bill. Part of that feedback is contained in the measure you see before you today. The Bill creates a tax credit program for small businesses that are required to raise their wages to comply with the law. That was brought to us at the behest of Representative DeLuca and some other Members, who have sought to address concerns of small businesses. In a concession to some of... concerns that were brought up by Members in suburban areas and concerns brought to us by the Park Districts, we've also created a new sub-minimum wage for seasonal employees who are under the age of 18. That minimum rage... excuse me, minimum wage... I better get used to that phrase... will rise to $13 an hour by 2025. In short, this is a good Bill. It's been thoroughly vetted and thought about for two years now. And it will provide substantive economic relief to 1.4 million Illinoisans. I believe this is one of the most important measures if not the most important measure that I'll have the opportunity to present before this Body in my career here. I'm proud to carry this measure and I look forward to a vigorous debate."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Batinick."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor indicates that he will yield."
Batinick: "Representative, you know, we were both the class of the ninety-niners I'll call us. And I definitely enjoy talking policy with you. I think much of the... many of the people in the Body are probably surprised to find out that we often agree, we're left meets right. This happens not to be one of those Bills."

Guzzardi: "I'm sorry to hear that, Representative."

Batinick: "I'll also say that it was a lot more fun debating this during orientation when we were in the Supermajority, but let's get into... the thing that I liked about debating you, and I said this in my letter to many of you that I put on your desk. This is one of those policy issues, so I'm looking forward to a thorough policy debate. So I want to talk about some of the claims that were made about what the minimum wage is going to do and mean for the State of Illinois. And I just want yes or no answers on these, if that's okay? One of the claims I heard was that this should grow our population. That this is going to attract people to the State of Illinois because they have a higher minimum wage. Would you say that that's... that you agree with that?"

Guzzardi: "Not sure that that's a claim that I've made. I'm not sure what the research would suggest about that claim. I'll maybe... if you could stick to comments that I've made in the past I'd be happy to explain those or happy to answer any future questions you may have I suppose. I'll do my best."

Batinick: "Okay. So to be clear you're not... you're not going to make a claim on what it's going to do to the state's population?"
Guzzardi: "I think I'd be silly to promise you that by passing this Bill we're going to see the population of Illinois grow."

Batinick: "Let me... I'll rephrase it. Do you think that raising the minimum wage will push population growth in a positive direction irrespective of other issues? Is this positive for population growth in the state?"

Guzzardi: "Representative, I'm not sure I..."

Batinick: "Okay. I'll take that as 'no'."

Guzzardi: "...I can give you a really good answer on that question. I'm not sure what you're driving at. Maybe you can help me by putting a finer point on it."

Batinick: "I... I believe it was the Governor said that this is going to attract people to the State of Illinois 'cause it's a higher minimum wage, and it means a higher standard of living. So I just wanted to know if you think that that's going to be one of the impacts of this Bill. I didn't expect this part of our debate to take this long, but it sounds like... it sounds like it's a 'no' that you have no claims on effect on population for the state."

Guzzardi: "I don't purport to make those claims here on the floor, no."

Batinick: "Okay. One of the other claims is, it's going to help women and minorities especially who are hurt by lower wages overall. Would you say that you support that claim?"

Guzzardi: "Yes, I think, in fact, the data bares that claim out quite strongly."

Batinick: "Okay. Would say that it's going to injust... inject money into underserved communities... more money in the underserved
communities, more shopping, more stores, things of that nature?"
Guzzardi: "I... I think that's a reasonable claim, yes."
Batinick: "Okay. So and... and this a serious debate, if we could try to keep it quiet folks I'd really appreciate it. You sent us... Representative Wehrli asked you in committee about some studies and I believe you sent us two yesterday. Is that correct?"
Guzzardi: "Yes, I sent Representative Wehrli a couple of studies, yeah."
Batinick: "Okay. So I would assume that those are the crown jewel, that you didn't send us the two worst studies, you sent us the two best studies that make your case."
Guzzardi: "Well, as a matter of fact, I think I sent to Representative Wehrli is what I like to call a meta-study. So rather than an individual study, what it does is it looks at the body of research as a whole and says there has been a whole bunch of studies on this issue, and they make these various claims, and the consensus among those studies reflects this or that."
Batinick: "Okay. Well let's talk. There's two studies you sent. You sent a meta-study and you sent the Chicago study. And I heard the Chicago study bantered about quite a bit in committee. Let's talk about the meta-study. The meta-study talked about minimum wage increases since the 1990s. I think it's pretty safe to say that it studied a lot of smaller incremental increases. And I looked at study, after study, after study, things that were both for and things that were both against. I have all kinds of studies in my hand here..."
that talk about small incremental increases in the minimum wage do not negatively affect unemployment. I'll also say that of those studies they usually look at about a two year window. So to look at a mega-study that talks about something going from seven and a quarter to eight and a quarter or seven fifty to seven seventy-five, I don't think it's pertinent here, which is why I want to talk about Chicago. Because you did send us Chicago and you said this is it. I heard another Representative talk about it in committee. I heard a lot of people banter about how it has had no adverse impact in Chicago. Is that correct?

Guzzardi: "I have a feeling you are about to say something to the contrary, Representative. Why don't you just go ahead and say it?"

Batinick: "Well you sent us the study. I want to know what you think if that's..."

Guzzardi: "According to that research it demonstrates that there hasn't been an adverse effect in Chicago on employment. And in fact, there's been positive impact on wages earned, which is precisely the effect of the legislation we are hoping to accomplish, put money in people's pockets without driving employment away."

Batinick: "Okay. So I have your study here, and I'm looking towards the end of the conclusion. And on page 27, it says in general, an 11 dollar per hour state minimum wage would insure that all low income workers achieve the same standard of living as a 13 per hour worker earning minimum wage in the Chicago area while minimizing economic distortions in low cost areas of the state. There's two things your study that
you sent me is saying. One, it's saying that there is a difference between Chicago and the rest of the state. It's also saying that if you get above $11 an hour, there's going to be some negative distortions. This is the study that you sent us."

Guzzardi: "I don't think that there... it’s correct to represent a conclusion of that research. That raising the minimum wage to $15 an hour would create negative economic effects on any community in the State of Illinois. I think that's a misrepresentation of the data presented in that study. And it's also..."

Batinick: "While minimizing economic distortions in low cost areas of the state. It advocates, it says, $11 an hour."

Guzzardi: "And, ya know, our Bill is going to raise the minimum wage to $11 an hour on January 1 of 2021. And it will continue to raise the minimum wage beyond that until it reaches January 21 of 2025, at which point the minimum wage will be $15 an hour."

Batinick: "Your same study says... okay. So it says... it talks about 11 and you're talking about 15. There's a pretty significant difference there. And... and the other thing about your study is your study stopped at 10.50 an hour in the City of Chicago, it didn't talk about 15. And whether it be the meta-study or this study, has there been a study done on the long term effects of dramatic increases?"

Guzzardi: "Well it would be difficult to conduct a study on the long term effects of raising the minimum wage to $15 an hour because very few jurisdictions have had a minimum wage at that rate for a considerable period of time."
Batinick: "So, you're admitting that we're in unchartered territory with what we're doing here. There are no studies that have evidence to support what we're doing here."

Guzzardi: "Listen, Representative, when we want to do something new the only way that we can predict how that new behavior is going to affect things is by looking at past behavior. And what I can tell you is that there has been ample, ample economic research. And the most credible, and the most methodologically sound of that research has a very clear consensus. Which is that raising the minimum wage does not have a net impact on employment. It doesn't drive jobs out of the state like you guys are going to say for the rest of the afternoon. It has no net impact on employment. All it does is put money in people's pockets who need it. It's a simple measure, that's why I'm supporting it."

Batinick: "Okay. So can... can you cite a study? You're talking about raising the minimum wage in Chicago from 8.25 to 10.50 is where the study is. Which, you know, I live in Plainfield. Going from 8.25 to 10 doesn't do anything because even fast food team workers are making near $10 an hour as an entry level job. So a lot of that cushion just... just goes away. That's not a big impact. You're talking about the effects of raising the minimum wage to this study, the effects of raising the minimum wage to 10.50 in a booming City of Chicago during one of the biggest boom times the United States has seen. My question to you is what you're doing down state is you're forcing a quick 82 percent increase in the minimum wage potentially during a recession. I have two questions for you. One, do you have a study that's ever looked at the impacts of
an 82 percent increase in low income areas... rural areas? Do you have a study on that? And then if you don't have a study on that, because I'm pretty sure you don't, has that ever even happened before? Can you even point to an instance where the minimum wage has been raised 82 percent in the downstate area, in a rural area during a recession?"

Guzzardi: "Representative, we're doing something new here today. You're right. I appreciate you underlining that. We're taking bold and decisive action because we have for way too long allowed the minimum wage in this state to be a poverty wage, to be a wage that people can work full time and yet live in poverty. That is indefensible, it's immoral, and it's wrong. So yes, what we're doing today is big, it's a big change. It’s a change that is well past due for the workers of this state. How do we plan for setting sail into unchartered waters? All we can do is rely on our experience. And what the experience of every jurisdiction that has raised the minimum wage has been, what the experience of the scientist who studied this been, the universal consensus of all the best research, that's the best thing we can go on. We can go on... I mean I suppose we can go on our gut, or on our theory, or on what we've heard from..."

Batinick: "I think you are going on your gut actually, Representative, 'cause it hasn't been studied. It has not been studied."

Guzzardi: "I'm not. I'm not. I'm going on science. I'm going on science."

Batinick: "There has not been any long term study. We've never done a big rapid wage increase, especially in downstate rural
areas, where you're going to be raising the minimum wage to an amount higher than the median income for that entire county or city. Do you think jobs are going to magically appear in those areas where they're not already? Where the median income is extremely low?"

Guzzardi: "Representative, I don't believe in magic. I believe in data and I believe in science. And the data and the science are unequivocal on the subject."

Batinick: "Okay. Okay. Show me... here's... we're going to switch here because you cannot show me data because it doesn't exist, especially for downstate. So let's talk about Chicago. You talked about underserved communities being helped by this. You talked about women and minorities being helped by this. Let's talk about Chicago. Tell me why... Chicago passed the minimum wage in 2014 to 2019. What's been the effect on those communities in the City of Chicago?"

Guzzardi: "Well, according to the research, Representative, the folks at the very end, the very low end of the wage spectrum..."

Batinick: "You're talking about the two year research, correct? I'm talking about today. I'm not talking about looking at 2015 and 2016. I'm talking about what are you seeing in the City of Chicago today?"

Guzzardi: "Representative, I'm talking about the research that has studied effects of employment and wages in Chicago since the minimum wage increase, which I think is what you're asking me about. But if it's not, I'm happy to talk about something else. The research that has studied the minimum wage increase in Chicago has, again, been very clear. It's shown that people who are earning low wages, who are by and large women and
people of color, have seen more money in their pockets as a result of the minimum wage increase. They've seen, in fact, an increase in hours worked, an increase in employment in those communities. So it's been a boom for the citizens of Chicago who I represent and who seem awfully happy about it.

Batinick: "So you say this has been a boom for Chicago, correct? Let... let me talk... let's..."

Guzzardi: "It has contributed positively to economic trends in the City of Chicago."

Batinick: "There is absolutely, positively economic positive trends in the City of Chicago. Let's talk about it. Chicago's boom—it's real, it's big, and it's mostly downtown. That's the trend. It's mostly downtown. I didn't know the people on Michigan Avenue needed a minimum wage increase. Okay, it's centered in the downtown area. Target closing two stores on the South Side of Chicago, opening stores in more affluent areas. I don't think that was the trend you were referring to. I thought this was an underserved area that five years into a minimum wage increase, these places should be doing great, right?"

Guzzardi: "Representative, here's what you're doing, and it's... I think it's beneath the quality and integrity of your character. What you're doing is cherry picking anecdotal evidence to refute data and statistics. I believe that you're better than that because I've had a lot of debates with you over the course of the past several years. You know that anecdotes aren't statistics. The fact that one Target or two Targets have their doors is terrible for the communities in which they've closed. But it does not refute the macroeconomic
data which tells us very clearly that raising the minimum wage is good for workers and has no net effect on employment."

Batinick: "Okay. I... I think this is data. I think a headline that says, Downtown Gaining Residents, While People Are Leaving The South Side and South Suburbs In Droves, that's anecdotal? That's anecdotal evidence?"

Guzzardi: "Representative, it's very true that people have been leaving the South Side and the South suburbs of Chicago. The causes of that, Representative... you also, I believe, understand the difference between correlation and causation. The causes of that out migration from the South Side of Chicago... if you can find me data that suggests that it's connected in any way to people getting paid more in those communities than they used to, I would be flabbergasted but also very curious to see that data."

Batinick: "I would be very curious to see the data that shows it's helping."

Guzzardi: "I have already sent it to your colleague, Representative Wehrli."

Batinick: "No, you... you sent something that ended that was all Chicago and ended in 2016. It was a two-year look at 10.50. You're talking about anecdotal data. You're guessing. You're taking something... you're extrapolating from something that raised the minimum wage just to 10.50, which was probably pretty close to the floor for most people in Chicago as it is. And then you're extrapping... extrapolating that into a downstate city like Oakland, Illinois and saying that everything is going to be fine if they go from 8.25 and 15. That's not data. That's not using any scientific evidence."
Guzzardi: "Is that a question, Representative?"

Batinick: "All right. I'm going to... I'm going to try to wrap up a little bit and go to the Bill. Look we've had... the minimum wage was increased... the minimum wage was increased in Chicago in 2014. From 2010 to 2014 the population of Chicago was increasing. Since the minimum wage was increased the population is decreasing. My point is it's not this cure all that we've been sold that's it's going to do. That's number one. Number two, there is macro data that I've talked about. And there's two issues that I want to refer to. I talked to a temporary service agency and one of the issues... everybody this is important. I'd really... I know this is long but this is an important debate. I talked to a temporary service industry 'cause I... I said... you know, a staffing agency... what is going to happen? This might be a boom for staffing agencies 'cause businesses are going to say, okay, I have to be at a skeleton crew and only ramp up during my busy time because of payroll costs. So I called one of the largest staffing agencies in Chicagoland. And the one thing she said unsolicited that I wasn't expecting was, I can't believe the number of people coming from the City of Chicago to the suburbs for temporary work. My point is the working poor are being pushed out. That... that's what the data... the longer term data is showing in the City of Chicago. So, to the Bill. There are issues in the South side... South side of Chicago, the South suburbs. If you didn't know that I was born on the South Side. I grew up in the South suburbs. I've seen directly what has happened there. If we're going to affect change in the City of Chicago and the rest of the state, it's about extremely
high property taxes from manufacturers which are disproportionately hurt because they have a big footprint. They have a big building. They have been driven out of Cook County in the city because of the high property taxes. It's about work comp costs. It's about the regulatory environment. It's about the political environment. Those are the things you need to do to bring good jobs and increase wages in the city and downstate. With that I just have an inquiry of the Chair. I assume we are on unlimited debate, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Turner: "We may have to go to a timer. You've been talking for 15 minutes, Representative."

Batinick: "I will close with vote 'no'. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Ammons."

Ammons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just one question to the Sponsor, if the Sponsor would yield?"

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

Ammons: "Thank you. Representative Guzzardi, during the process of working on the negotiations of this Bill, did you work on looking at regionalization of the minimum wage and what impact that would have?"

Guzzardi: "Thank you for the question, Representative. It may not be the last we hear of that subject today. The word was used at the negotiating table and there were certainly folks suggesting the idea. And we opted to not consider that idea and I'd like to explain why for just a moment if I might."

Ammons: "Thank you."

Guzzardi: "And I don't have to tell this to you because you represent a community outside of the City of Chicago. Unfortunately, $8.25 an hour is not a living wage in your
district, or mine, or Representative Batinick's, or any other
district in the State of Illinois. $8.25 an hour is a poverty wage in any corner of this state. If we want to lift people out of poverty, we need to pay people a fair and decent wage that respects the dignity of their work. That wage is no less than $15 an hour in any corner of the Illinois. I would venture that it may be more in some parts of this state. And I think that the City of Chicago will be considering what it wants to do with its minimum wage going forward, but for the moment, I believe that the basic floor, the basic floor of decency and integrity is $15 an hour."

Ammons: "And just one final question to the Sponsor of this Bill. During your process of studying what the wage really should be as the basic floor, as you described it, did you find economic reports that indicated Illinois as probably a little bit behind what the actual wage should be throughout the entire State of Illinois?"

Guzzardi: "Yeah, I believe that to be true, yes. That the $8... as I said the $8.25 that people at the bottom of the wage spectrum are being paid right now, unfortunately, it's considerably behind what's required to pay for the basic cost of living in any corner of the state."

Ammons: "Thank you. To the Bill, I even argue that $15 is actually not sufficient according to economics of what we actually should have as a minimum wage in Chicago or the rest of the State of Illinois. I do want to first and foremost thank our House and Senate joint Black Caucus Chairwoman, Senator Kimberly Lightford, for working on this for several years and bringing this to the House. I do want to thank Representative
Guzzardi for staying committed to this issue and this idea of a state wide minimum wage even for those of us who are considered in downstate Illinois. I want to recognize the Illinois working families who are facing significant existential challenges. Although, unemployment rates are at a record low, in black communities that doubles in our communities according to the national average. So, we are doing something significant, yet not quite enough to really pull people out of poverty. We've heard a lot about out migration over the past years and I believe much of that is due to the lack of resources and low wages that workers are paid in Illinois. And unfortunately, the last few years of political gridlock has starved many of our communities, especially black and brown ones. And many of those folks have left the State of Illinois looking for better opportunities. You've taken us from the bottom with this legislation. Those who are looking to live on full time jobs... I want to make sure that people understand that lots of these people making $8.25 or $8.50 an hour are working multiple full time jobs. My mother was one of those people. And all of her working years she could not afford to work one job in her home state. And even as she passed, as a women who never owned a home, she worked hard to make sure that me and my siblings could actually one day own our own home and that we would have a decent, decent living. I just want to say that there's an economist that he's quoted here to say, you've taken the folks at the very bottom and the people who are hard workers, full time jobs, and you've made the economic conditions worse for them since 1968. And this is not the kind of economy and
society that we want to live in. I want to thank the Coalition of Labor Unions, community groups, faith-based organizations, student organizations, and individuals on the front lines of organizing in Illinois to achieve economic justice and economic parity. I do want to thank our current Governor, J.B. Pritzker, and this administration for their strong commitment to raising the wage for millions of Illinoisans. I want to thank Governor Pritzker and my colleagues in this chamber that I recognize that this is a historic vote and our vote and his signature truly means a significant transformation. And lastly, and most of all, it offers us a hope for a better life. Today we will transform the lives of millions of people of this great State of Illinois. And with this vote, workers throughout the state can see a brighter future for themselves and meet their own basic needs. Especially those living at the current minimum wage. Let this vote signify to all working people that you can make a change by organizing in your communities, and in spite of long standing opposition, you can actually change what the future looks like for your children. Thank you so much, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Representative Guzzardi. And thank you to all the Members who will support this initiative."

Speaker Turner: "Members, everyone seeking recognition will be recognized. But going forward we will be moving to a five-minute timer. Representative McSweeney is recognized for five minutes."

McSweeney: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. This is a well-intentioned piece of legislation and I know the Sponsor means good. But what's going to happen here is this is going to hurt people.
This is going to reduce the amount of jobs in the state. And let's be specific about it. Let's start with the national retail firms, the national food service firms who will look at Illinois and they will make a policy decision that will say we are going to do two things. Number one, we're going to increase automation. That means less jobs. Number two, we're going to move towards kiosks, and we're already starting to see that. And again, that means less jobs. And that will become a policy specifically for the State of Illinois and some of the other states that have done this. I don’t favor this increase. But if you're going to be looking at an increase, it should be done on a national level. So all that we are doing here is putting Illinois at a disadvantage. And there is no doubt through automation, through kiosk that jobs will be lost. That’s number one. Then two, is the small businesses that we all know and that we've all heard from. And I know everybody in this room has heard from those small businesses. They have a strong attachment to their employees. They want to keep people employed. But what this Bill is going to do is to force them to do two things. One, force them to lay off people. And number two, force them to move people to part time. Again, that means less jobs. And I think one of the biggest tragedies in this Bill is the fact that this is going to limit opportunities for the young people of this state who are looking to start off while they're in high school, while they're young, to get a job that will give them experience, that will give them a leg up for the future to be competitive in this global economy. Again, this will cost jobs. Another tragedy of this is going to be that for the
increases that are actually going to be paid, it's going to result in cost increases. If anybody believes that these costs are not going to be passed on, that is absolutely false. They will. And what that means is that we're going to have higher prices for low income people. So low income people are going to be negatively affected by the following things: automation, kiosk, being moved to part time, and young people aren’t going to have the opportunities. Why aren’t we focused on creating jobs in this state? And why aren’t we creating opportunities zones? At the federal level there's an opportunity zone program for economically-depressed areas where they're limiting the ability to increase taxes and specifically providing tax benefits for companies to locate. I am one thousand percent in favor of that. Why don’t we eliminate all together, all together the tax for past entities, for corporations that actually are manufacturing the state of Illinois? Those are good high paying jobs in the global economy. So as you think about this Bill, think about the people who are going to lose their jobs. Think about the people who are going to be put at a disadvantage. I respectfully ask you to vote 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Murphy."

Murphy: "To the Bill. I want to talk about how this Bill will create lost opportunities for workers across the State of Illinois. In my career, I had the opportunity to hire many people, many times their first jobs. One of the great rewards I had was watching them develop, gain new skills, move up the ladder. Sometime they took that skill set and moved onto another company. But it was very rewarding to see that. I can
give you hundreds of good examples of success stories, but today I want to talk about one. When Sam came into my diner asking for a job, I looked over his application. And I said, tell me a little bit about yourself, Sam. And he said, I just got out of prison. I spent the last 17 years in prison for selling narcotics. And he also added, but that’s not me today. That was me 17 years ago. So I looked at Sam and I said, today's your second chance. Don’t let me down. Sam didn’t let me down. He worked for me for many years until I sold my business. It was a great joy to watch him grow, not only as a worker, but become a productive member of society. Last October, Sam posted something on Facebook and I want to share some of it with you today. He talked about that first day and how it changed his life. He talked about how working for me kept him clean. And he ended it by saying, thank you for the chance because now I'm a supervisor for Pizza Ranch. My response to Sam was quite simple. I said, Sam, the only thing I did for you was give you an opportunity. What you did with that opportunity was all you. I went on to congratulate him on his new job. But then really, I was impressed that Sam has taken time now. He mentors men and women who are coming out of the prison system to try to give them some of the life skills that he's learned working for me and being associated with others and try to help them to become more productive citizens. I shudder to think what would've happen if Sam came into my diner and this Bill was in effect. Because I'm gonna tell you right now, the job that I gave him would not be in effect... would not be there. I just would have had to eliminate that job. I cannot have a 30 thousand dollar a year busser
working for me. That would have been a shame, not only for Sam, my diner, me personally, and possibly all of the people he has mentored over the years. This will not only affect people in the restaurant business. I look back to my personal experience. In 1966, I worked for minimum wage for Paul Cody on his farm. He hired me for three years. Some of the life lessons I learned from Mr. Cody are still part of my core values today and I look back on him and I thank him for that opportunity. Don’t take the opportunities away from the people in the State of Illinois who need this. I'm going to close by reading the last thing that Sam posted on Facebook. 'Thank you for giving me the chance to make me a better person. Thank you. Your trust that I could do better inspired me to do so.' Do not take the opportunities away from the Sam's of the world who need it. Please vote 'no'. Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Meier for five minutes."

Meier: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

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

Meier: "To the Bill. Senate Bill 1 will hurt Illinois agriculture industry. The small family farms will suffer the worst but the organic farms, orchards, vineyards, wineries, and livestock industries being the hardest hit of all. This states extremely labor intensive livestock farms which are currently losing 10 to 20 dollars per animal. And the dairy industry that we've lost 70 percent of our dairy farms in the last 22 years, 10 percent in the last year. Minimum wages increasing, increases all of our competitors cost. But this doesn’t happen
with farm economies. Our economy can't add 10 percent on. Our farm prices are dictated to us by what's happening in the world. Foreign economies, carry overs, world harvest is what affects our prices, not what our inputs are. Our current prices right now are lower than they were 10 years ago. Our inputs have greatly increased over the same time. Farmers' net income has dropped for the last five years straight. This follows the tendency that happened in the 80s when many of our farms, the family farms went bankrupt. We are on the road to that again. These family farms are often the high school and college students' first jobs. Illinois industries love to hire kids that have worked on family farms. They like the work ethic that they've learned working on these farms. On our farm, we have many people who have helped us over the years. The one that’s a dentist, the one that’s a surgeon who goes overseas and works with Hands for Hope in Liberia, a mechanical engineer, a mechanic, an electrician, and a stock broker. We are all still good friends with these former employees that started working on our small family farm. They still appreciate what we did and how we helped them and we're proud of what they’ve done. These jobs help keep our small towns alive. The current downturn in our small communities is getting worse with many storefronts empty and numerous houses waiting to be raised as towns search for monies just to be able to knock these empty houses down in Southern Illinois. Throughout Southern Illinois, many towns have lost their mom-and-pop grocery stores. We just lost the longest operating grocery store in America that was family owned. One hundred and fifty-two years of operating in Illinois and it is now
bankrupt. As more of these small towns stores close due to the increase cost associated with minimum wage increases, our residents will have to make a 50 to 60 mile round trip to go to a grocery store, just to get to a grocery store in rural Southern Illinois. Many of them don’t even drive. These mom-and-pop grocery stores that can't afford the minimum wage would deliver food twice a week to these homes. Walmart's not going to do that on a 50- or 60-mile round trip. Just yesterday, friends of mine listed their grocery store for sale. They're tired of doing business in Illinois. The last grocery store in that town. The towns next to it was the one that went bankrupt last month. They lost their grocery store. It seems crazy that farms and businesses that have survived Illinois for 150 years will not survive an 82 percent increase in the minimum wage dictated to them by a people who have never done a payroll on their own account. Tax breaks only help the farmers if there is income, not when there's zero profit. Agriculture's been the bright spot for the State of Illinois during economic down tore. Four hundred thousand jobs in the State of Illinois, our largest employer is Ag. This Bill will hurt Ag. It will make Southern Illinois suffer. Today, NASA announced the Martian rover named Opportunity no longer exists. I'm afraid Senate Bill 1 will mean opportunity is over…"

Speaker Turner: "Representative, can you please make your final remark?"

Meier: "Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Question of the Sponsor."
Speaker Turner: "Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Zalewski: "Will, first I want to commend you on the work you’ve done on this. I know it hasn’t been an easy lift. I know you’ve done your level best to balance this out along with Representatives Evans and Hoffman. I've been approached by social service agencies that are contracted by the state to do work on behalf of individuals for the state and they're expressing gentle concern. And I think my question for you is, as we approach the budget in Fiscal Year 20, do you have a sense of what the advocacy will be to reconcile the increase costs they’ll have with this new minimum wage and how we're... and I know this is not just a question for you, but I think people will have a comfort level if we talked about that a little bit."

Guzzardi: "Yeah, no. Thank you, for bringing it up. And it’s a really important question and one that we've thought a lot about as we've been crafting this legislation. So, a couple of points about it. First of all, there will be... and the Department of Revenue has put together some numbers on this... there will be some additional revenue to the state as a result of raising the minimum wage by increase in income tax receipts, increase in sales tax, etcetera. So there will be some additional revenue to the state. But as you mentioned, there will be a cost to the state as well. And that cost is particularly going to affect those providers who the state contracts with, the very ones you're describing, who are currently only able to pay a very low wage because the state doesn't reimburse them at a high enough rate. And from the very beginning when the Governor... the new Governor took
office, he and his team have made this issue a priority and they also have been very keenly aware of that particular problem. So I can tell you with confidence that the Governor's team is aware of this problem and that as they are crafting the budget that they're going to present next week, they are taking account he need to raise those reimbursements and they will present a budget that contemplates and includes a lift to those reimbursements in that budget."

Zalewski: "I appreciate you making that part of the record. I'm happy to work with you on that in any way I can. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. You know, I think we've worked on this matter a long time and I think, quite frankly, this is as good as it gets in terms of balance, and approach, and doing the best we can for something I think our constituents really want and something that its time has come. So I urge an 'aye' vote and I thank the Sponsor for his work on this."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Demmer for five minutes."

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

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

Demmer: "Representative Guzzardi, thanks for your answers to the many questions we have today on the floor. I kind of want to piggy back off of the previous Representatives' questions about the impact this has on the state budget. What do you project... I know you said that the Governor's office is aware of this circumstance. What do you, as a Sponsor of this Bill, project the impact will be on the state budget?"

Guzzardi: "The most recent numbers I've seen suggest that in order to raise those reimbursements and keep those providers able
to provide the services they're doing, while also meeting the requirements of the minimum wage increase, in the coming fiscal year there will be a roughly an additional $60 million in the appropriations that will be required."

Demmer: "Sixty million dollars. And it's important to note that your Bill takes effect half way through a fiscal year, correct?"

Guzzardi: "That’s correct, yes."

Demmer: "So, we would say that $60 million in the first year, but then as the way your Bill is structured there's an increase six months after that, and six months after that, and the year, and the year, and the year after that. So we're really looking at not just a one-time increase of $60 million but really an annual onus on social service providers and non-profits to come down to Springfield to ask for, what will amount to in the end, hundreds of millions if not over a billion dollars in new state revenue being directed to pay these increased cost. Is that correct?"

Guzzardi: "Yeah, I guess I would say the onus won't fall to the provider, but rather to us to make them whole. And this happens a lot here. When we passed the new evidenced-based model in a bipartisan way urging the state to fund public schools at the rate that they deserve, one of the components of passing that legislation was a commitment to increase the funding year over year, to make sure there's room in the budget because we believe that full funding of public schools is a priority. And that’s the same statement that I proposed to make with this legislation. That paying providers, paying the people who are caring for the very most vulnerable in our
state, paying those folks a decent living wage ought to be as much of a priority and that we ought to find room in the budget to make sure it happens."

Demmer: "Thank you, Representative. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. I think that it's incredibly important that all of us in this General Assembly understand the financial commitment that’s being made in this Bill today. Every year one of the most difficult votes that we have to take is on passing a state budget. We just heard this week from the new administration their projection for what next year's budget deficit is. This Bill today adds hundreds of millions of dollars in new budgetary pressures that we'll have to deal with year, after year, after year. And if we don’t, if we don’t come up with a sufficient increase in appropriation, if all those other priorities that we have are crowding out the funding that we need to give yearly rate increases to every social service provider in the state, guess who it falls to? It falls to social services, to non-profits, to school districts, to local governments, to live up to the expectations that we've built into this Bill. It puts incredible pressure on local governments, on schools, on non-profits, on social service providers to the tune of hundreds of millions of dollars. And it puts them in a position to come to this Body every single year to not just ask for our funding to be protected, but to ask for hundreds of millions of dollars more. What we're doing here is a problem. The Sponsor indicated the Governor's Office is aware of the problem. What's the problem? It’s the problem we're creating with this vote here today. Let's not put ourselves, again, in this position of putting the cart before
the horse. Let's not put ourselves in a position of creating a problem only to come back here the last week of May and be in a more precarious position, in a more difficult way to reach a balanced budget. We don’t need that extra pressure. We have billions of dollars of unpaid bills that already are upon our shoulders. Local governments have billions and billions of dollars in unfunded liabilities and budget deficits that they wrestle with every single year. We cannot afford the kinds of commitments that we're making here today and to say that we're aware of the problem is insufficient, because today with this vote, we are causing the problem. Let's choose a prudent financial path. Let's have real bipartisan negotiations. Let's make a promise that’s realistic for us to keep. Let's not, yet again, choose political expediency over the long term interests of this state. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Bryant for five minutes."

Bryant: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. Will the Sponsor yield?"

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

Bryant: "Thank you. I'm going to go directly to the Bill, but I'm going to have some rhetorical questions because I'd like some of the Members maybe just to think about these questions before they take a vote today. So, my questions and comments really are to those who in this Body who are going to be considering supporting this Bill today. So question one is, Representatives, do you on your desk or anywhere close to you have handy what would explain the potential economic impact
to any of our nine public universities? I'm guessing that that's a 'no'. But you know what, I'm going to invite everyone to do this: if you have a 'yes' answer to a question, just put thumbs up if you want to. If you don't, just a thumbs down or don't participate. But I'm going to ask the questions anyway. If not, why not? Have they been... haven't they been through a lot in the last decade or so? So we're trying... these are not questions. This is to the Bill. So just asking everybody to kind of think about these. Yeah, it's okay, Will. It's all right. It's okay. No. So again, don't you agree that we should be working to return those public universities to stable economic conditions? That we should know the total financial impact to our institutions of higher education once this Bill is fully implemented? Do you have projections year by year how this will this affect them, Members of the Body? I don't have figures for all of them, but I do have some figures for the university system that I represent, that Representative Windhorst and I represent. And I have some figures for that same university because some of our... colleagues on the other side of the aisle represent that particular university as well. So, let's consider the cost to the SIU system of raising minimum wage to $15. So when looking at SIU, at the university system as a whole, it's important to note that there are two classifications to consider. Both the student employees and the civil service employees, who would be impacted by the provisions of SB1. The estimated cost, individually and combined, are for SIU Carbondale and SIU School of Medicine which has approximately 2353 student employees, based on current student employment that cost
would be an average of $665 thousand annually. When fully implemented at $15 it would cost an estimated additional $5 million annually. For civil services employee's increasing the minimum wage to $15 would cost 990 thousand annually. With a total estimated cost to just SIUC per... once fully implemented an additional 6.9 million. So let's talk SIUE for a minute, because as I said, some of our friends on the other side of the aisle represent the area that SIUE sits in. So SIUE, in total with student and civil service estimated cost for the average hourly $1 increment, for every $1 it goes up $865 thousand. So a total additional SIUE estimated cost, once fully implemented, $5.8 million annually. Total increase in cost to the SIU system per year, $12.7 million. Cost to other universities, once fully implemented... maybe should... we should each probably call them to ask for sure, but I have a few of those: EIU, once it's fully implemented, 6.74 million; ISU, 7.5 million; U of I 70 million; Western, 4.382 million; Northern, 11.13 million. For a total, once fully implemented to our already strapped university systems, of $112.335 million in increase spending. Question two. I represent a district that either includes or is geographically adjacent to Rend Lake Community College, John A. Logan College, Kaskaskia College, Shawnee Community College, and Southeast Community College. Do we have any figures that would explain the economic impacts to these institutions? Do you have a figure available that would explain the potential economic impact of these institutions? Do you have any information available as far as how much money this will cost the whole community college system together? I think, no. Or maybe you
do know and don’t care. But I don’t think that’s the case. That hasn’t been the case with most of the folks that I know in here. Question three. I'm hoping someone's going to yield me some time for."

Speaker Turner: "Please make your final remarks."

Bryant: "Representative Severin wants to yield me some time. Is that permissible?"

Speaker Turner: "Representative Severin yields his time to Representative Bryant."

Bryant: "Thank you. And I'll try to finish quickly. Question three. I have 32 school districts in my legislative district. Do we have any idea what this is going to cost K-12 school districts? I contacted Murphysboro because that’s where I live, just because it's kind of a mid to small sized district. A hundred thousand dollars for Murphysboro alone. Remember that the highest cost in our property tax bills are related to what? School costs. So in essence, we're going to be passing a Bill that’s going to force our property tax bills to go up. So, let's move on. In deep Southern Illinois we have trouble with meeting our human service's needs, mostly because of a lack of availability. So I'm just going to pick one because in the 100th General Assembly I was the Minority Spokesperson for the Department on Aging. Department on Aging for CCUs alone this is $90 million of new spending per year with about $1.5 billion in new spending. And then we have other state agencies that are going to be involved. But let me go on to employers. So I have a letter from a business that is in deep Southern Illinois. Happens to be in Chester. And this is from Don Welge who owns Gilster-Mary Lee. 'I would
again like to'... and this is quoted from his letter... 'I'd again like to take the liberty to write you about the 15 dollar an hour minimum wage being discussed in the Legislature and supported by Governor Pritzker. I understand the support for the 15 dollar an hour minimum wage in Chicago where data I've seen shows the average rent for a 1 bedroom apartment at over $1800. However, in that minimum wage is put forth across the entire state, many downstate and rural Illinois businesses would be forced to either close or move to other states. This would be especially true here in Southern Illinois where the average rent for an apartment in Carbondale, 1 bedroom, is $600 a month.' This goes on to talk about how he's the largest employer... fourth largest employer in Southern Illinois and that basically he has 6 businesses in Illinois and about 10 or more others in other states. And that he would basically move his businesses from Southern Illinois across the river into Missouri. And again, that's because they have a small profit margin. So I'm going to go on quickly because I know I'm going to run out of time again. This is just one employer, but I think Mr. Welge did a very good job of putting all of that together. So my question again, number four, is we have till January 1 before this is implemented, why the rush? We know why the rush, because there's been an arbitrary date put... that the Governor wants this passed prior to the state of the state address so he can sign it before then. I don’t think that that's an adequate reason to do that. And then I just kind of want to... a couple other things, but I'll skip over those. Just kind of getting to the end, I heard that the Sponsor basically... there's a quote where the sponsor said,
'It’s the state's job to step in when the invisible hand of capitalism isn’t supporting people.' Well, I'm going to say that the heavy hand of socialist policies, which is transferring money from one person to another against their will, doesn’t work. I would ask Castro Chavez and Madura how that works. These are statist policies and they don’t work. I would ask for a 'no' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Members, can we please be respectful of the five minute timer? We will no longer be yielding time. Representative Davidsmeyer is recognized for five minutes."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor indicates they will yield."

Davidsmeyer: "I'm... I'm gonna ask you a few questions. I'm gonna ask you to be brief because I only have five minutes and... and Joe won't yield me any time anyway. So, do you know... do you know the state of our nursing... nursing home, nursing care facilities right now in the State of Illinois?"

Guzzardi: "I'm familiar with the state of some of them, but why don't you enlighten us, Representative?"

Davidsmeyer: "So over about the last year, about 25 nursing homes have closed in the State of Illinois and they're already coming to us asking for an additional $200 million. Do you know the impact of this on nursing care facilities?"

Guzzardi: "The impact of the closure of those facilities?"

Davidsmeyer: "No, the impact of the 15 dollar minimum wage, what it will cost them?"

Guzzardi: "Representative, I believe that those facilities... those who are caring for our most vulnerable in our state, particularly the people on the front lines of that care,
deserve to make a decent wage. And the state has a responsibility to compensate those providers in such a way…"

Davidsmeyer: "Okay."

Guzzardi: "...that they can pay a decent wage."

Davidsmeyer: "I'm... I'm gonna interrupt you. I only have five minutes and I'm not trying to be rude, I just wanna keep going. Fifty million dollars, if no one else gets a raise. So $50 million if nobody else gets a raise. So what's happening in a nursing home if nobody else gets a raise? You're taking somebody who is currently making $15 an hour, who has worked their way up to $15 an hour, and you're moving them down to the minimum wage. That's the essential result of what's happening if they don't get the commencer raise. So if they don't get 80 percent over the next five, six years... 80 percent raise, you're actually taking them down to the minimum wage. Taking people who are in middle class and moving them down to lower middle class. Do you know what a food desert is?"

Guzzardi: "I sure do, yes."

Davidsmeyer: "I've heard the word food desert from a number of a folks on your... your side of the aisle. I want you to know that I have food deserts in my district."

Guzzardi: "That doesn't surprise me at all."

Davidsmeyer: "In rural areas, it's 10 miles from a place to purchase food, and I believe in urban areas it's one mile. I would give my left leg for a place one mile from where I live. But I... I want you to know, and... and the Speaker is actually... the Gentleman in the Speaker's Chair knows some of my friends from Scott County, from Winchester, Illinois, their grocery store recently closed. And the nearest place to purchase
groceries is about 15 to 20 miles away. And so a group of local citizens got together, not to start a business to make money, but to provide a service. And they are breaking even. They have a small little market. It's got a small deli counter. It's... it's probably the size of a small freshman office here in the... in the Capitol. So it's a very small place. If... if this goes through, they won't be able to afford to keep it open. Right? These... these are young people who have stepped up to do the right thing for their community and they can't afford to raise their families and support a business that's losing money. So you're creating food deserts. I'm gonna bring up another one. Prescription deserts, right? Pharmacies. In rural... in rural Illinois, especially in my district, the big... the big pharmacy companies are not gonna move into a town of 2 thousand people, right? We have to provide opportunity. I've got a friend, who has over the last three or four years has spent a lot of his own income putting pharmacies into these small towns, finding a pharmacist that will travel to these small towns. And what we're doing is we're making sure these places are closed because they're being reimbursed at rates that the big guys can handle, but the small guys can't."

Guzzardi: "You won't hear any quarrel from me on that point, Representative. I think that what's happening to particularly independent pharmacies in Southern Illinois, it's a real shame."

Davidsmeyer: "I've only got one minute."

Guzzardi: "Oh, sorry. Carry on."
Davidsmeyer: "I wanna say, what happens to grandma on social security? Is she gonna get an 80 percent raise? Have you talked to your Congressman?

Guzzardi: "I..."

Davidsmeyer: "Have you talked to your Congressman?"

Guzzardi: "I... I haven't, Representative."

Davidsmeyer: "I am concerned because they're already barely getting by, right?"

Guzzardi: "I agree."

Davidsmeyer: "We can agree on that."

Guzzardi: "Yes."

Davidsmeyer: "So how is she going to deal with the increase in cost? And if you don't believe there's an increased cost of living I think that you're... you're a little out of sync with reality."

Guzzardi: "Is... is this finally a question I can answer, Representative? Because I'd love to."

Davidsmeyer: "If I could get a few extra, an extra minute I would love to."

Guzzardi: "No sweat. We'll have this conversation another time, Sir."

Davidsmeyer: "So in Seattle... really quick. Seattle, when they went to 11 bucks an hour, there was a small difference. It didn't make a huge difference because a lot of people..."

Speaker Turner: "Final remark, Representative."

Davidsmeyer: "Thank you. A lot of people were already making close to that $11 so there wasn't a huge impact. But when they went from it... over one year, when they went from $11 to $13, they said that low wage jobs, hours worked in low wage jobs, went..."
down 9 percent while hourly wages went up 3 percent and the average person working minimum wage received at least $75 less per month because of the decrease in hours. And so I think that we're trading dollars for hours. Business and employers are going to say, we're gonna cut everywhere we can. And I appreciate the extra time and I urge a 'no' vote. Let's do a thoughtful process on this. I think we can do this the right way, but you are killing downstate Illinois, who severely wants to be a huge part of the state's economy. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Evans. Five minutes."

Evans: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will not take five minutes. In a question... couple questions for the Sponsor."

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

Evans: "Thank you, Speaker and Sponsor. And thank you, Representative Guzzardi, for your hard work on this issue and advocacy for just real working class people. Just a couple of questions. I'm hearing a lot of conversation about the suddenness of this and I want you to remind me, are we passing for $15 to take effect tomorrow, or next month, or when will the $15 take effect?"

Guzzardi: "No, this is a gradual increase in the minimum wage that will arrive at $15 on January 1 of 2025."

Evans: "Is this an increase that you negotiated with? I know I was there, but could you remind the Body, and all those listening about the negotiations, and how you sat down as an advocate yourself, but also open to all business interests around the state?"
Guzzardi: "Sure, and thank you for bringing that up. We had extensive negotiations on this Bill with folks from business, and folks from labor, and folks from the Legislature. And I think there was strong demand for a faster ramp. Especially because we passed a Bill two years ago that would've gotten the minimum wage to $15 an hour by 2022. So I think there were a lot of folks, particularly lower income folks, people who are at the bottom of that wage spectrum, who are saying, we need something faster. And as a part of the negotiation, the push and pull and dialogue around this Bill, we settled on a ramp that will be over the course of six years, which I believe is a balanced compromise."

Evans: "And my final question is, before my closing remarks, who is a minimum wage worker? I think sometimes we have a view of the minimum wage worker. Is it a... who is this individual? Could you give us an explanation of the average minimum wage worker within the State of Illinois?"

Guzzardi: "Yeah, I think the average minimum wage worker... it's not what most people have in mind. The average minimum wage worker is a woman of color, in her 20's or 30's, and is likely to have children. So, you know, these are people who work in the health care field, who work in the services sector, and it's not the teenager flipping burgers at the Dairy Queen. The average minimum wage worker is someone trying to provide for their family, and at this minimum wage, unfortunately, they are certainly not able to."

Evans: "Thank you, Representative Guzzardi. And to the Bill. Ladies and Gentleman, we're standing up for the working class folks, not $100 million for individuals, not something that's
unreasonable. We're talking about the minimum wage. We're
talking about a gradual minimum wage. We're talking about a
negotiated wage. Please stand with Will Guzzardi, the
cosponsors. Stand with the people of the State of Illinois
and vote for this very reasonable, negotiated Bill. Thank
you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Ramirez for five
minutes."

Ramirez: "Thank you. You know, Representative Evans, you asked
who is the minimum wage worker? It's my mother. And it has
been my mother for the last 25 years. And so when we're
talking about raising the minimum wage, for me, it's actually
a personal issue. It is why it gives me such great pleasure
to stand in support of Senate Bill 1. Will this Bill help
working families? Absolutely. As a new Member, I am happy at
the first Bill I will be speaking in support of on this floor.
It's such an important piece of legislation to so many working
people across the state, like my mother. At its core, the
issue we're discussing today is about equity. And as
Representative Villanueva so eloquently put it yesterday, it
is about dignity. It is about justice. We are discussing how
we value the work of low income workers. We are discussing
how we value the work of working families, of low income
women. Frankly, that work is worth far more than $15 an hour
that we're debating today, but it is certainly a good start.
As the former director of a homeless social service agency,
I know what it's like to work with people experiencing
homelessness. I also know what it's like to want to raise the
minimum wage for my employees and the challenges that come
behind that. I know parents like Victoria, who came into my organization and had to work two jobs just to be able to get out of homelessness, to pay child care, to be able to send their children to school, and to be able to pay basic utilities. You see, for her, it never felt like she could work enough hours in one day to keep her family from homelessness. Today's vote is for the many Victoria's across the State of Illinois that are still under paid and at the verge of homelessness. Our vote today to increase the minimum wage is an important step towards ensuring a living wage for all Illinoisans. While let me be very clear, this legislation does not completely get us to a living wage. It is a critical step in addressing decades... listen to me... decades of growing income inequality. This is particularly true for African-American workers of which only... which more than 48 percent of them make less than $15 an hour, and more than 61 percent of Latino workers making less than $15 an hour, like my mother. For too long, corporate profits have seen record increases while workers' wages have remained stagnant. I am encouraged today that Illinois is taking a lead in being one of the first states to pass a $15 minimum wage. I also want to acknowledge that this victory today doesn't mean our work is done. We actually have a long way to go. But I look forward to the day when I can stand in this chamber, as your colleague, voting in support of a fair minimum wage for all workers. I also want to recognize that for many workers in Chicago, where I serve, this Bill will only have a marginal impact many years from now. That's not acceptable for me. And I am committed to working with my local city council members to ensure that
workers in Chicago have a fair minimum wage that accounts for local costs of living differences and that we reach 15 an hour in the next few years. I want to thank, from the bottom of my heart, my colleague and neighbor in Chicago, Representative Guzzardi, as the Chief Sponsor and Senator Lightford for all their work leading up to this moment. I want to thank our elected officials, Governor Pritzker. But more importantly, I want to thank all of the workers who made it out today to make sure that they could be here to say how critical, how important, how right now we need a minimum wage raise. So thank you to 15 for all. Thank you to SEIU, and to all the labor advocates. Truly, it's been a long time coming. What feels like endless conversations, rallies, and advocacy work, but the day is here for all Illinoisans. And I'm anxious to press that button. Let's make it happen."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Reick for five minutes."

Reick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. One of my favorite things on the floor is to engage in repartee with my good friend, the Sponsor, but since most of my questions were answered or I heard answers yesterday in committee, I will just rehash what many of you did not get a chance to hear in committee. We talked about several things, and I'm gonna specifically mention and focus on the tax credit that is supposedly included in this Bill. I'll read from... one of the... one of the provisions. It says, full time equivalent employees mean the ratio of the number of paid hours during the reporting period and the number of working hours in the period. I asked what that actually meant and I got no answer.
Another one, an employee may not claim a credit for an employee who has worked fewer than 90 consecutive days immediately preceding the reporting period. Now one of the real... one of things I've learned in law school was the fact that there's a rule of statutory interpretation that says, if possible, you must use the plain language of the statute to interpret what that means. So if I use the plain language of this statement, no... an employee may not claim a credit for an employee who has worked fewer than 90 consecutive days immediately preceding the reporting period. I read that as 90 days in a row. And except for dairy farmers, I don't think there's anybody who works 90 consecutive days in a row. So also, full time equivalent... this question was brought up by one of the witnesses who said full time equivalent doesn't tell us anything. Is full time equivalent a 40-hour week, a 30-hour week, a 50-hour week? There's no way to calculate it. There's no way to calculate it because you don't understand what the actual number is you're shooting for. So, those three things stuck out in debate yesterday with regard to the credit. There's no question... there's a question in here, does... do salaried employees count toward the determination of full time wages? There's no... nothing in here. What was left here was... the answers that we got from the Sponsor of this Bill and those who were in favor of the Bill said that, yes, it is an imperfectly drafted Bill. There are a lot of things in here that need to be done after the Bill is passed. Now, and the... the incoming director of the Department of Revenue said that well, these inconsistencies are something that can be rectified by the rules making process in JCAR. As a member of
JCAR, I think this is an in... this is bad, because JCAR is there to be the last line of defense against imperfectly drafted legislation, and this is going to be a nightmare of regulations to try to interpret improperly and inelegant legislation. Finally, this is a political Bill, if nothing, for no other reason than the fast track upon which this Bill has been made. The Governor, he won the election. He wants to have this Bill on his desk. He wants to have it signed so we can all stand up and applaud when he comes in next week. But the fact remains, is this Bill is not ready for... it is not ready. And if it's going to take effect on January 1 of 2020, it will take effect on January 1 of 2020 whether we pass it today or whether we pass it in May. So what I would say is, to put this Bill, which is going to have such a huge impact... as we've heard from my down... especially downstate colleagues... to put something like this on the table with so little thought, with so little effect to... you know... it's just poorly drafted, folks. This Bill needs time to cook. It needs to become soup. It is not soup. At this point, I would urge the Sponsor, in spite of his desire to make everything look good for the Governor next week, please pull this Bill. Let's talk about it. Let's do it. Let's do it right. Let's bring every... and all the stakeholders in. Let's do this right. If we're gonna do it, let's do it right. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Wehrli for five minutes."

Wehrli: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Yesterday in committee we heard several fatal flaws in how this Bill was drafted. And one that I brought up yesterday was that it does
not allow for waivers under FMLA for those who do piecemeal work. And since our debate 24 hours ago in committee, I've been contacted by several lawyers that do this work, and they gave me a couple of cases to reference. Because if this Bill passes the way it does, those people that get waivers will no longer get them. I'd like to interject into the record a case out of the Seventh Circuit right here in Chicago. A 2013 case, Patriot Veterans Inc. v. Indiana. The fact that... and I quote, 'The fact that a state has more stringent regulations than a federal law does not constitute federal preemption. We know that states frequently, and without preemption, by federal law, create more stringent laws regarding minimum wage, employment discrimination, educational standards, gambling, and highway safety to name a few.' That's case law that's on the books right now. There's also an Attorney General's opinion out of Arizona when they passed their minimum wage increase. The opinion stated, and I quote, 'Developmentally disabled workers are not exempt from the minimum wage enacted in their minimum wage law. Thus, developmentally disabled workers formally earning a sub-minimum wage under the FMLA special certificate are entitled to earn the state's minimum wage.' Why is that important here today? In my community, my hometown, the town I was born in, is an organization called Little Friends. Little Friends does wonderful work with those with intellectual disabilities. One of the things they provide through Spectrum Services located in Downers Grove, Representative Ann Stava-Murray represents Spectrum. In talking with them today, if they have to this pay this minimum
wage 175 people with intellectual disabilities will be out of a job. Representative Stava-Murray, a 'yes' vote, please be able to explain that to the parents and those people with intellectual disabilities, who will be out of a job because of your 'yes' vote. But it is not just that, it's also property tax impact. This also applies to community colleges. College of DuPage, located in Glen Ellyn, Representative Costa-Howard's district, will see a $1.5 million impact. That doesn't go to fees, it will go straight to property taxes, which in the collar counties are vitally, vitally important that we drive them down, not up. Same things applies to Representative Sam Yingling's district. College of Lake County has indicated... "

Speaker Turner: "Shhh. Members, please keep the noise level down. Representative Wehrli."

Wehrli: "Thank you. College of Lake County has indicated that this Bill will have an impact of $1.1 million. That goes straight to the property taxes in Lake County. But businesses can be reasonable. Matrix Plastics, located in Representative Pappas' district, has simply asked for more time. They can do a minimum wage if done incrementally. But those requests have fallen on deaf ears, because we are trying to ram this through in warp speed for political purposes. Reasonable heads can come together and solve these problems when we're included to have a seat at the table. We have been shut out of this process. It is being rammed through for political reasons. That's unacceptable, that's why Illinois is in the financial state that it is in. Mr. Speaker, should this Bill receive
the number... requisite number of votes I request Roll Call verification."

Speaker Turner: "Members, a verification has been requested by Representative Wehrli. Please be at your seat to vote your switch. Chair recognizes Representative Martwick for five minutes."

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

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

Martwick: "Thank you. Representative Guzzardi, I've been listening to this debate today, much as I listened yesterday during the hearing in the Labor Committee. And I'm finding some interesting things about some of the statements from our friends on the other side of the aisle. So, let me ask you a question. Can you tell me exactly and specifically what the economic effect of this Bill will be?"

Guzzardi: "It's very hard to say with exact specifics..."

Martwick: "Fair enough, because we really... I mean, at some point you... you have to make a decision. You have to go forward, right? It's hard to say exactly what's going to happen tomorrow. We don't know. But how do you base that decision then on what we should do for tomorrow?"

Guzzardi: "You know, in my experience, my admittedly short experience in life, you can make some reasonable assumptions about what will happen in the future based on patterns of things that have happened in the past."

Martwick: "And yet, our colleagues have said, and I've heard these and I quote, unequivocally, 'You will create food deserts.' 'You are creating pharmacy deserts.' 'You are ensuing that places are going to close.' Do you know that to be true?"
Guzzardi: "I certainly don't, Representative."

Martwick: "So, a lot of those statements are based on an economic theory that says if you raise wages then the job market will shrink or costs will go up, prices will go up and... so these negative effects. So, they are theorizing based on a school of economic thought that this will be the income... or the outcome of this... of this Bill. Have you ever heard any economic theories, theories that would contradict that theory?"

Guzzardi: "Yes, Representative. There's a pretty robust school of economic theories as far as I know. And again, I don't purport to be an economist. But it's my understanding that there's a pretty robust theory of field of economic theory that suggests that by raising the wages, what you do is inject dollars into local economies and cause economic benefit."

Martwick: "In fact, there is a quite a robust school of thought that says that by enriching or... or improving the conditions of those at the bottom that they're going to spend every disposable dollar that they have and that will increase spending on consumer goods and will drive demand. It's a different school of thought. But when we make these decisions we can contemplate those theories, but wouldn't it be best if we made our decisions based off of available data?"

Guzzardi: "That's how I prefer to operate, Representative."

Martwick: "Have you seen any study that says that the doom and gloom predictions that they're making has ever happened when there's been a minimum wage increase?"

Guzzardi: "You know, as I said earlier, there's a few outliers on both ends of the spectrum when it comes to economic impacts..."
of minimum wage increases. Some say there's a good deal of economic growth, some say there's a good deal of decline. But the consensus, especially of the most methodologically sound and the best studies, the consensus shows there's essentially zero net impact on employment."

Martwick: "When we had the subject matter hearing a week ago, we heard from a professor from the University of Illinois. A professor by the name of Marc Doussard, who is an associate professor of urban planning... urban and regional planning. And he's got a PHD from the University of Illinois. And he talked about this voluminous wave of research that shows minimum wage increase has no impact, negative impact on unemployment or job growth. And he specifically cited a study that was done by Dube, Lester, and Reich... not our Reick but a different Reich... that compared where minimum wage increases happened on border communities. So they shared the almost identical, in some cases identical, economic conditions, except on one side of a border they increased the minimum wage and the other it stayed stagnant. And yet, they found no negative impact whatsoever and even positive impact in certain situations."

Guzzardi: "Sounds like a thorough and well researched study."

Martwick: "And this was backed by the study for the City of Chicago, which in the city for... the study about the City of Chicago's minimum wage, they said that the positive impact of the increase in the minimum wage actually brought up the economy even in areas around Chicago that didn't raise their minimum wage, but they said it would raise their economies even more had they adopted the same minimum wage increase as the City of Chicago. And so this is the data that we have out
there. And so when we look to make a decision on something like this we really ought to rely on the data. And the data overwhelmingly supports the conclusion that a raise in the minimum wage will have positive economic effect. And therefore, I respectfully request an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Villanueva."

Villanueva: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. During the last 10 years, basic living expenses like health care, food, housing grew while the minimum wage remained the same. A loaf of bread, a gallon of milk doesn't cost the same as it used to. But even outside of that fact, things have changed and we as a Body have to understand that the status quo, the current minimum wage, just isn't enough. When 48 percent of black workers, 61 percent of Latino workers, and 46 or... I'm sorry, 46 percent of female workers earn less than $15 an hour in Illinois, we have a problem. We have a problem with the way that we value our low-wage workers. We have a problem with the way we value what low-wage workers look like and what it means. I said it yesterday in committee and I'll say it again, this Bill isn't just about raising a minimum wage, this Bill is about dignity. Folks that are working fulltime in our state should not be forced to decide between putting food on the table for their family or being able to make rent at the end of the month or at the beginning of the month. I wanted to share a very quick personal antidote. Last week I was speaking with my mother and she was telling me that her and my father were doing some very early spring cleaning. And in a box they found some documents of theirs from back in the 80s... which I know for some folks that's aren't back in the day, but for me
it is... of when they were minimum wage earners, earning three dollars, something around three dollars an hour. My mother earning slightly less than my father. I don't remember the first 10 years of my life where my parents were actually in my life during daylight, because they were minimum wage workers working several jobs. McDonalds... a trip to McDonalds was a birthday treat. It wasn't an everyday occurrence. It wasn't a weekly occurrence. This was something we did maybe once a year because we were working poor. We lived with my grandparents, along with the rest of my very expanded Mexican family, because we were working poor. When we talk about this Bill, when you talk about the money in the institutions, when you talk about everything else that will be effected by this, what we are talking about are human beings. People that deserve the respect and the dignity to spend time with their children instead of having to work 20 hours a day to make ends meet. I bring up my story because my story is like so many other people's stories. When we talk about people, minimum wage just being the beginning of what they earn, what we don't take into consideration is there's a lot of dumb luck, a lot of privilege that goes into people earning more than just the minimum wage. This vote is just the first step. It's never been the end for me, because I've been in this fight with the workers that are standing up in the gallery with us. I was with them in 2014 when we were working on the campaign to raise the minimum wage. This one is personal for me. Taking this vote is a first step in getting to somewhere near close a living wage. Because let's face it, this is not a living wage. Like Representative Guzzardi said, this is the
basic floor of decency. But this raise is a step in giving people a fighting chance to live not just to survive. I want to take a moment to thank the Sponsor for taking the hot seat to answer all these questions with grace and dignity and little bit of sass. But most importantly, to the workers up here who didn't waiver in their commitment and dedication to this issue because for them this is personal. This one is for you, because of you, and because of your sacrifice. I urge a 'yes' vote from all of my colleagues."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Stava-Murray."

Stava-Murray: "I was hoping that I wouldn't have to go next because that was so wonderful. Thank you, Representative Villanueva. And thank you, Representative Ramirez. Thank you, Representative Ammons. Thank you to so many of my amazing colleagues, who have been fighting this fight so much longer than I have. Thank you to every single person who came here today for the Fight for 15 because there are those who would say... there are those who would say that I should vote 'no'. And they don't know my community, because I did a poll and we lean 'yes' on this. So, thank you to every single person because I know that my constituents might not of been here today sitting next to you, but we appreciate your fight and we are grateful for your work. And we see you and we know that you deserve this dignity that Representative Villanueva has spoken on. And I would urge all those in my area who say that our people don't have the empathy to understand why this is important to think about your action on this button, because the majority of people in our district, in our area want you to vote 'yes'."
Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Welch for five minutes."

Welch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I rise today in strong support of raising the minimum wage. I rise today because this is not just a Fight for $15. I rise today because it is a fight for families. This is a fight for families all across Illinois. Many of the people that are standing here today saying that this will hurt social services, hurt our universities, and hurt our community colleges are some of the same people who didn't bother to vote to break the 736 day budget impasse that caused unprecedented harm to our social services, universities, and community colleges. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle also keep asking, what's the rush? Why are we trying to ram this through? Can't we slow this down? Why can't this wait? Where have we heard that before? Those are the same questions people asked Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. in the 1960s when he was fighting for civil rights and fighting and leading the poor people's campaign. And Dr. King told them then why we can't wait. People should not go to work 40 hours a week and still not be able to put food on their table. People should not work a fulltime job and still experience homelessness. People should not work every day and still live below the federal poverty line. This Bill helps our entire state. The cost of living for working families across Illinois is rising. And a $15 minimum wage is necessary for families across the state just to make ends meet. In East Saint Louis, in Peoria, in the Quad Cities, in DuPage County, it helps everyone across this state. Dr. King said, 'There is nothing but short-sightedness to prevent us
from guaranteeing a livable income for every American'. Let's not be short-sighted today. Let's think about the long term health of those poor families across this state. We can't speak for every American, but we can start by speaking for every Illinoisan, no matter what region they live in. No matter what part of this state, east or west, north or south, you have a chance to speak for them today. You can tell them when you go to work, you can pay your rent. You can buy food. You can put clothes on your kid's backs that you can have the decency when you go to work. Mr. Speaker, let's pass this Bill today and let's raise the wage and return decency to working families across this state. I ask that we vote 'yes' on Senate Bill 1. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Halpin."

Halpin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm a Representative of downstate Illinois. And I'm going to support this Bill because Illinois low-wage workers are long overdue for a raise. In my district, as the previous Speaker mentioned, a single person with no kids, today, needs nearly $13 an hour to meet their bare needs. And again, that is a community in downstate Illinois. That's not Chicago. And by the time the ramp that's in this Bill even gets to $13, that worker's going to have fallen further behind. And that doesn't even count workers with children or couples that... with families that are low-wage workers. Their expenses are much, much higher. So when we talk about regional rates, you know, that type of plan, it wouldn't work for our community. It still wouldn't do enough. I won't repeat the other arguments for why we should pass this Bill, they're good arguments. But I do want to add
something else, many, many workers in my district and across the State of Illinois will be helped by this Bill. And I'm convinced that on the whole, it'll benefit my district and the State of Illinois. But I am not so naïve as to think this won't hurt anyone. Some of the sky is falling claims that we hear are overblown. But there are businesses, particularly in my district, in my home of the Quad Cities on the border of Iowa that might choose to lay off employees or cut back employee hours or even close or move across the river. I don't take those concerns lightly. But to be clear, companies don't make that choice based on the minimum wage alone. And I think it's about one thing above all others, which is property taxes. It's about 30 years of not paying for our pensions or not giving enough money to our schools and our local community colleges which forces our local officials to rely every more desperately on those property taxes. And so, I would just ask you all today, no matter how you vote on this Bill, please commit to doing something that the folks before us haven't done for a while and make a plan to fix and pay our pension debts, to support our schools, support our local governments. So, we can get real property tax relief, not gimmicks, and not just help border communities like mine, but help the entire State of Illinois. I thank you for the time and yield back the balance of my time.

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Frese for five minutes."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor indicates that he will yield."
Frese: "Representative, we've had this discussion a number of times over the past couple of years, as you’ve mentioned earlier. And my discussion, my questions back to you have always been in regard to the district that I represent. And I was given some information that about 66 percent of Illinois residents live within 40 miles of the Illinois border. In the district I represent... I don’t know if that’s true or not, I... I've read it, somebody gave it to me. But I can tell you in the district I represent, 100 percent of the people live within 40 miles."

Guzzardi: "Mine too."

Frese: "Matter of fact... Yeah. Yeah okay. So I'm talking about 75 percent of them live within, you know, 3 or 4 miles. So I get, as everyone does, emails, phone calls from those small businesses, large businesses, agribusinesses concerned about being put at a competitive disadvantage. Can you address that for me one more time, please, because I'm still not getting it? I don’t have apparently the correct answer for that... for those businesses. Can you help me out?"

Guzzardi: "Yeah, I guess what I would say is, it would be easy to speculate about this on one side or the other, as we have done a lot of today. To speculate that this will have adverse economic impact for a community like yours or conversely to speculate that it will have positive economic impact on a community like yours. That folks will look at your community and say, boy I can make a much better wage living and working there than I can across the border. Maybe that’s a place where I should start my family and raise my family. This again..."

Frese: "So... and that's..."
Guzzardi: "...we could speculate on either side here, but I'm not a big fan of speculation, as I have said. And I know you all might get tired of hearing me say this, I'm a fan of data and research and empirical evidence. And we make plans for things like this it's best to reflect on what's happened in the past. And the record is just unequivocal that on net, when you raise the minimum wage, you don't see a loss of jobs. That's just what the record tells us."

Frese: "And we had that yesterday, I believe, in committee where we had the discussion of what some studies have shown. And then we had the actual, what I felt... compelling evidence from some of the business owners that are going through some of the grief that they've been going through trying to pencil the numbers to make it work. Now, you know, I don’t know... I don’t know your background, have you run a business? Have you started a business?"

Guzzardi: "I haven’t."

Frese: "Okay. So, businesses are concerned, you know, if they are dealing with the public, they certainly don’t want to let people go. They don’t want to let labor down, because they need people to be in touch with people to keep the service rate up, right?"

Guzzardi: "Sure, yeah."

Frese: "So how else would you suggest that they make ends meet if their wage cost is going to go up... what is it, 33 percent in just the first year that this is in effect?"

Guzzardi: "What I'd say again here is, that we can trade anecdotes right back and forth because I can tell you all the business owners in my district are paying considerably above $8.25 an
hour because they are in Chicago and the minimum wage is higher. And what they found..."

Frese: "I'm not talking about those."

Guzzardi: "I'm just telling you that what they have found, as the minimum wage in Chicago has gone up, is that they have been able to keep pace and, in fact, folks in our community go out to eat more, they go patronize our local shops more. So they have seen increased economic activity as a result. So again, rather than your anecdotes and my anecdotes or the previous witnesses and the next witnesses, I prefer to reflect on the macroeconomic data which, again, speaks very clearly to this concern."

Frese: "Well you might consider this anecdotal too, but Mr. Karr from the Retail Merchants Association testified and just kind of breached on a little bit the other day in committee about an incident that happened within the district that I represent. And that is when the flood came and closed the bridge, our gas stations, our service stations noticed a 2 to 300 percent increase in business because nobody was going across that bridge and buying the discounted gas across the river, right? So we know that people vote with their dollars, they vote with their feet. Those are the concerns that the businesses in my district have. We may continue to have steady employment throughout our region, but our region is going to see perhaps increased employment on the other side of the river, which doesn’t do Illinois any good. Can you see that point?"
Guzzardi: "Yeah, I suppose I could have imagined that outcome. I could also imagine an outcome that is quite different from that where in..."

Frese: "Well this is real life. This is what happened, it had happened several times."

Guzzardi: "You mean the gas station example?"

Frese: "Yes."

Guzzardi: "Yeah, yeah. No, I understand that. And there are certain goods and services which are more easily traveled to and purchased, right? If you are already, for instance, traveling across the border to commute, for instance, for work, that you might choose to fill up over there rather than at home. Whereas, if you had to drive 40 miles to get a gas station with 10 cent cheaper gas, you might..."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Frese, can you please make your final remark?"

Frese: "Sure. And I appreciate that, Representative. And we... the State of Illinois drives people in from my district across that river for more than just gas. We drive them for a number of different things and I'm afraid this is one more. And so I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Bennett for five minutes."

Bennett: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Appreciate your patience today. It's been a good day, a long day, a chance at a number of things. So, I appreciate your help. Will Sponsor yield please?"

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor indicates that he will yield."
Bennett: "Thank you. I would like to applaud Representative Guzzardi, as we mentioned yesterday, for wanting to help Illinois workers. That's important to do."

Guzzardi: "I'm sorry. I'm having a little trouble hearing you if you wouldn't mind speaking closer to the mic."

Bennett: "I applaud Representative Guzzardi for wanting to help Illinois workers, is that better?"

Guzzardi: "Oh, thank you. Yeah, that is wonderful. Thank you very much."

Bennett: "Okay, thank you. I also want to applaud Governor Pritzker for saying that he wants to compromise. I get it. In part this is about dreams and making dreams come true. Making more so that you can do more things. However, in this case of the minimum wage Bill, it's not helping the people of the state nor is there any compromise, true compromise. There has been no real discussion. It's getting rammed through quickly, and my fear is that this Bill is going to hurt the very people, the very people that we are trying to help today. Supporters have claimed multiple times that studies say the economy will not be impacted by raising the minimum wage. No job loss, nor decrease in hours, but when we took up a similar Bill just a couple years ago in 2017 the NFIB Research Center crunched the numbers and concluded that raising the minimum wage to $15 per hour would result in a loss of over 93 thousand jobs. And that’s spread out through the State of Illinois and mostly small business. Recently here, just a few weeks ago, the Center Illinois Regional Chamber of Legislative Effort provided information as to how the proposed minimum wage increase will negatively, and I say negatively, effects
central Illinois. Out of more than 500 responses, 70 percent of those 500 will have to raise prices to cover costs. Sixty-three percent will reduce hours for employees. Reductions, friends. Sixty-two percent will slow down hiring new positions and 48 percent will lay off employees. Seventeen percent potentially considering closing their doors, friends. Closing the doors, that means shutting the business down and go and do something else. It appears employers outside of Chicago are receiving the same consideration as employees within Chicago. Employers in Chicago have had 10 years to get to $15. Well, why are employers in the rest of the state only be getting half of that? And I don’t have a good answer for that. Chicago is an international city. We all know that it's a wonderful town. It almost entertains almost 16 million tourists and receives millions of dollars in hotels and food, beverages, shows, just a wonderful place to go. But friends, downstate Illinois is just a little bit different. With many small communities that have to sustain themselves, we don’t have that massive influx of money to afford such an increase in wages. Manufacturers in my district told me just a few days ago that there will be job losses, period. No study, no fancy economists, just more families with no jobs in our state. Recently a restaurant owner in my district told me this, some people, he said, come to me to work for me, they just do not have life skills. This is coming to work in a business. No life skills, they're not prepared. So the business owner spends time mentoring them and he has become a safety net for some of his workers. And if this passes, he says, he will not be able to offer 401K anymore. The money
given to community groups he says like Rotary, Kiwanis, Lions, all gone. It's all over. He can only raise the price of sandwiches so much. And many of the people that come in to eat, don't forget this folks, they also are on fixed incomes or don't have a lot to spare. A business owner who is a wife and mother of three told me she is tired of being the bad guy. Tired of being the bad guy. They put their heart and soul into their family business. She and her husband work on average 80 hours a week and that's each, not total, each. And when averaged out they don't make minimum wage. And friends, these are the owners. These are the owners. Ask about small farmers, Representative Meier mentioned this a little bit ago. Current commodity prices are low and are dictated by the ebbs and flow of the global market. And friends, farmers cannot raise prices, they're locked in. They're already struggling with increased costs of seed and fertilizer, insurance, equipment, fuel, and labor and it's getting harder and harder to make small families going and this is going to hit the small farms squarely up front. A local school superintendent told me just a couple days ago, you know, the evidence-based funding model that we approved last year, he goes, you tie that in with minimum wage..."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Bennett, can you please make your final remark?"

Bennett: "I sure will. Thank you, Sir, appreciate that. So in essence the minimum wage, friends, is another tax on the business world. The warning alarms are loud, you hear it from all kinds of places, education, government, newspapers, farm bureau, IRMA, IMA, Chamber of Commerce, and NFIB. I ask
please, let's back up. We need a better answer. We need to work through this for both our workers and our businesses. There is a better answer, let's find it together. Please vote 'no'. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Morgan for five minutes."

Morgan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill, I just wanted to wish everyone happy Valentine's Day in the middle of this difficult debate. But I did want to stand and rise in support of this important legislation. This is important for moral reasons. This is important for fiscal reasons. The community in the 58th State Representative District supports this legislation. The businesses, the small businesses, the large businesses, the community, the working families, the working individuals in this community supports this Bill. And I urge a 'yes' vote. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Robinson for five minutes."

Robinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to thank Senator Lightford, Representative Guzzardi, Representative Evans, Representative Hoffman, labor, and Governor J.B. Pritzker for their hard work on this Bill. Representative Frese, I understand more than anyone, as a small business owner, how tough it is to stay afloat as a small business in the State of Illinois. But I currently pay my employees $15 an hour because it is the right thing to do. This Bill is the first step in order to help families in Illinois make a wage to take care of their families. As we celebrate Black History
Month this is the civil rights issue of today. I ask that you vote 'yes' for working families in Illinois. Thank you.

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Tarver for five minutes."

Tarver: "Thank you. You know, I actually did not plan to say anything, but it feels like the folks on my right are kind of coming after my colleague about not having... you know, not staring a business, not owning a business. And it seems like they are looking for a business owner, so I popped up to let them know, here's one, okay. So first of all, we opened our business in 2014 and since 2014, we have always paid at least $15 an hour. And this funny thing happened in 2018, we quadrupled our capacity, moved into a facility that was four times as large, and we are still in business. So this notion of $15 automatically puts you out of business is disingenuous and is just as irrelevant as the question to my colleague as to whether or not he owns his own business. You don't have to own a business to give people a fair shot, okay? This is not about a minimum wage, this is about minimum dignity, minimum respect, and minimum appreciation for their hard work and their time. Time is the only thing you cannot get back, the only thing. You can make more money, you can start a new business. And if you think you're going to automate or kiosk your way out of a situation into profitability, I ask you, do you own a business? And if so, what business do you know that is going to kiosk, I'm using it as a verb, its way to profitability? Are you going to go to somewhere where it's going to be nothing but kiosks at a hotel? Who's going to carry the bags? Who's going to greet you? It's silly. It's
time consuming and it's just time to put it to rest. The bottom line is we owe these people a minimum amount of dignity, respect, and appreciation. And it's embarrassing, absolutely embarrassing and appalling that it has taken this long. So if you're looking for a business owner like my colleague from the 5th District, who supports people and provides them a decent wage, you have another one over here. Happy to talk to you anytime."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Conyears-Ervin for five minutes."

Conyears-Ervin: "Thank you so much, Mr. Speaker. February 14, 2019 is a day in history for Illinois that I am so proud to stand here as an Illinois House of Representative. I know it's hard sometimes if you have not walked in the shoes of others, I know it's hard. Being raised by a single mother of three girls, I know what it means to have to even fight for a livable wage, and today we are talking about the minimum wage. My mother back home is watching, and she can say that Melissa stood up for working families of Illinois. My mother can be proud that she raised this young woman that watched her fight to stand up and fight for all working families. But I think what I'm even more so proud about, is that my mother would be able to say that it wasn't just Melissa that did it today, but it was the men and women in the Illinois House of Representatives that put politics aside and put working families ahead. That's what I'm proud of today. So I thank you. Thank you to the Sponsor. Thank you to the men and women in the Illinois House of Representatives. I am happy to serve in this Legislature with you. And I ask that you would cast
a 'yes' vote for this legislation and put working families ahead of the agenda for Illinois. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Wheeler for five minutes."

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

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

Wheeler: "Will, I'm going to try to move through my comments as fast as you're trying to move this Bill through this House. Tell me, which Republican House Member was part of your negotiation?"

Guzzardi: "Republican House Member?"

Wheeler: "Yes, Sir."

Guzzardi: "The entirety of this House, this Assembly, has contemplated this Bill for two years, Representative."

Wheeler: "So the answers none?"

Guzzardi: "We've had ample time to debate this measure."

Wheeler: "There was no House Republican Member invited to the negotiations for this Bill, correct? Just say correct, because it's correct, and you know it. Will, has any other state ever contemplated or actually in this case raised the minimum wage by 33 percent in a single year?"

Guzzardi: "Representative, I'm not certain about the percentages but I know that many states in this country are moving to a $15 minimum wage. And I think many of them are doing it quite fast."

Wheeler: "Are they doing it in a ramp that’s this fast? We're going for 33 percent in a single year. You do not have any information that shows that's ever happened, right?"

Guzzardi: "I'll be happy to look into it for you, Representative."
Wheeler: "Okay great. I looked into last night for several hours frankly. And I couldn’t find anything from the study that you had sent us, which means that all that we are basing this on is speculation of what you want to have happen because this has never been done before. Never been done before. We keep talking, in this case for you about this macro concept here. Macro meaning the whole state. I'm concerned about downstate Illinois, with how this Bill is being rammed through and ramped up. Here's why. If your projections that are based on speculation don’t come true, that there is not job growth and job increase of wages overall for downstate Illinois, are you willing to in three years come back and look and see if maybe see we should make an adjustment for downstate Illinois, a regionalized approach to this?"

Guzzardi: "Representative, I can guarantee you that there will be an increase in wages as a result of this Bill because the people that are making $8.25 won't be making $8.25 anymore. There's going to be a wage increase."

Wheeler: "Hold on. Hold on. You're a macro guy now. You're all about macro. Hold on, I only have a minute."

Guzzardi: "If for some reason people are still making $8.25 in three years I will happily come back and reconsider this measure."

Wheeler: "Okay. We're talking about macro wages which means that there is job loss versus the wage increase that's still a net wage loss, that’s what I'm talking about. I'm concerned about that. To the Bill. I know that the Sponsor is not interested in the anecdotal evidence, but I'm going to provide some anecdotal evidence anyways because this is real. The social
service agencies in my district I have reached out to have universally come back and said that they will have a negative impact, that they’ll have to raise more funds in spite of the fact that they are getting a promise from the State of Illinois to get more revenue from us in a budget that we've never really balanced. My school districts have said that over the next... and this is just 5 out of the 9 school districts that I represent... have said, in 5 years this will cause at least $6 million more than what they are paying right now for the minimum wage increase. That has to impact our property taxes. We are not obviously raising our income for them from the state fast enough. What I'm really concerned about here is what we say to every employer who can either no longer compete and has to either move or close their doors. And I know that the Sponsor is not in favor of this part of it, but I have talked to several who are very concerned that they will not be able to compete. Like my friend Representative Meier had mentioned, they don’t get to set their own prices in every case. They have to compete interstate, not just intrastate, we don’t live in a bubble. What do we say to that employer when they’ve spent their entire life putting together a business that hired people and gave them and opportunity? As my friend, Representative Murphy, had mentioned, he gave people a chance and they went onto become bigger things because they had the opportunity to afford an entry level wage. We are taking some of that away today. Kid yourself if you want to, but this will hurt some people at the entry level part of our wage spectrum. And what do you say to that former employee who can't have that job anymore?
Of course, you don’t know what to say to the employee that never had a job because they didn’t get a chance to start. It was mentioned before about a trip to McDonalds being a special trip, I get that. My trip to McDonalds was to go to work in 1984 making the minimum wage of $3.34. But we aren’t going to be able to say anything to those people because they're not going to have the chance. So talking about this Bill for the last two years is not the same as negotiating. We have to be honest with ourselves and realize that this Bill has untold consequences that have never been studied by anyone, anywhere. It's all speculation based on wonderful ideas. But we're rushing through a massive impact Bill in record time, in record time."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Wheeler, please make your final remark."

Wheeler: "Sure. However well-intentioned this Bill is, House Members like me today are limited to five minutes on the floor to make the case that this Bill directly jeopardizes real companies, real jobs, built by and held by real people. And the lost opportunities for those people are coming soon. We need to find a balance between employers and employees that makes sense. Rushing a Bill like this does not make sense. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative McCombie for five minutes."

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

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

McCombie: "You had stated in your opening remarks that you had been negotiating this Bill for two years. And Representative
Wheeler had just asked who on our side of the aisle was part of that negotiations. And unfortunately, I don’t think he gave you enough time to give us a name."

Guzzardi: "Representative McCombie, you and I and Representative Wheeler, and our colleagues in this chamber have been discussing this concept ad nauseam for two years. We presented a Bill that does almost exactly what the Bill before you does today. You voted on that Bill. I voted on that Bill. That Bill has been before this Body. There is nothing in here that's a surprise, there's nothing in here that’s a gotcha. This is legislation that we have talked about and talked about and talked about, and it is now finally time for us to act upon it and I'm proud that moment has finally come."

McCombie: "Well, I can tell you 110 percent I have not sat at a negotiation table with you or anybody about this Bill or over the last two years that I was here as a freshman. Everybody's talking about this being a moral issue. Yes, this is a moral issue. It's immoral to continue to raise our property taxes and keep people house poor. It's immoral to continue to underfund our K through 12 schools by $11.8 billion which we should fully fund. And when we fully fund that then we are going to go ahead and raise that gap of those folks that are entry level to a higher level of pay. It's immoral to hurt our seniors with higher costs without mirroring any sort of raise for them. It's immoral for you not to consider our communities. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Leader Durkin."

Durkin: "I really don’t know where to start. But wow, wow. I'd like to know what happened. It's February 14, we're fresh off
a new administration, new General Assembly, new attitudes, new momentum, new perspective, a sense of cooperation. Does any of that sound familiar? How about this, the new administration promises political unity, pledges bipartisanship in the approach towards governing. And here's another one, here's a quote from our Inauguration from your Leader, 'If we set a tune in this Session where we recognize the state has got some serious problems, we should get together. People working with people to solve the problems.' What happened? It's only been a month. Do we have serious problems? Of course we do. Out migration, we're number one in the nation. It's nothing to be proud of. We have high areas of unemployment through the State of Illinois. Danville is at 6.4 percent, Rockford 6.3, the Metro East is over 5 percent. All border communities in our state. We also have an extreme, extreme lack of confidence with the State Government through our citizens. No matter where you go in the state over the last two years, people have said loud and clear, work it out. Figure things out, get things done together. Now, that’s my sincere goal. I've always been that way. I made that very clear in my speech at the Inauguration. I asked for good faith, good will, reasonableness, and a fair shake. I also said if you meet those requests, you will have a partner. Boy, have things changed since that speech. Senate Bill 1 may be the most significant policy change in the state in many, many years. We, as the House Republicans, we represent 4.8 million citizens in the State of Illinois. And those 4.8 million citizens and the 44 Representatives on our side of the aisle are basically being told, take it or leave it.
impact and consequences of this legislation will affect every Illinoisan, every worker, every employer, public, private, nonprofit, charity, you name it. But today, February 14, this rush, and I repeat, this rush to pass this Bill is nothing less than breathtaking. Now, I recall, and I look at these things and we have a number of freshmen and also progressive Members of this Body who proclaimed during the campaigns that they are here to break the status quo. We're not going to have business as usual; this is an open process. I know you. I know who said those statements. Your vote today is a strike out. I'm telling you right now we can negotiate a better product. We are 50 days, 50 days away from adjourning. We got plenty of time to do this. And this Bill doesn't even go into effect until next January. But we have to get it done today when we've been shut out of negotiations? Representative McCombie and Wheeler both told you, they had absolutely nothing, no influence, no one approached them about working out on this Bill. It flies in the face of everything that was said a month ago. About how we're going to work together, we're going to get things done, we're going to stop this… this craziness that's gone on over the past four years. We're getting back to the old business right now and that’s unfortunate. The process with which this Bill has gone is wrong and it's not fair to those who are going to have to live and have to live with it. You've heard the statements in committee, you've heard it from your constituents about what it's going to do to them and how the financial impact will affect them. And that was not prepared by political partisans, those are statements that came from real people, real
employers who live in this state but feel that the American Dream in Illinois is no longer within reach. Well, I'll tell you also, there was a discussion earlier about these economist. I'll tell you what, if I bet we could look into their backgrounds that none of these economists have ever had an experience of creating a job or making payroll once in their life. I've seen this before and I think it's the same thing, so let's not put a lot of weight into that. Now, I also said back a little bit ago, that this is a time for us not to be a General Assembly, but this is a time for us to be a great assembly. But I guess shame on me for having this optimistic attitude. I have a friend... here's my story... owns a car wash in DuPage County. It’s a full service car wash, 26 employees. His employees love coming to work every day and he operates on a very thin margin. He told me yesterday, this Bill goes through, within 2 years he will have to change to be a fully automated car wash, exterior only, and he would have to fire 23 people because of this Bill. That's reality folks. And I trust his economics a lot more than these economists, these so called experts, who are talking how this is going to have a positive effect in Illinois. So, I'm going to finish up by saying, usually I'll say don't vote for this Bill, I'm asking you to vote your district. That's all I'm asking for you. But I'm going to make it very clear, you've got the majority, you've got plenty of votes. This is not the way to start off the General Assembly when we're making such an important policy decision that has basically taken... the Republicans have been told, your interests and your thoughts are not valid and we don't care."
Speaker Turner: "Members, a verification has been requested by Representative Grant Wehrli. Please be at your seat to vote your switch. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1 pass?'

Excuse me. Representative Guzzardi, would you like to close?"

Guzzardi: "I'd love to get a word or two in edgewise here"

Speaker Turner: "Go ahead, Sir."

Guzzardi: "Thank you. I'll be very brief. Colleagues, thank you for the very thorough debate. I was called a socialist and sassy in the same debate. This is a banner day for me. There's a lot of details and facts that I could go back and re-litigate and rehash but I want to conclude by saying the following. So in 1967, in this country, the rate of poverty among senior citizens was almost 30 percent. Almost 30 percent, so practically almost 1 in 3 seniors in this country is poor. By 1975, 8 years later, that poverty rate had fallen by almost half. You might be wondering, how did we accomplish such a remarkable reduction in elder poverty? Addressing such a huge problem so quickly. What we did was we started paying out more in social security. In fact, we nearly doubled the social security benefit per capita during that span of time. And I tell you this story to make the following point. My colleagues across the aisle have spoken a lot today about wanting to lift people out of poverty and I appreciate that they genuinely intend that. But there's only one way to stop being poor, friends, there's only one way. It's not to go to college, or to pick your chin up, or pull yourself up by your bootstraps. Not to disparage any of those things but that's not a way to stop being poor. The only way to stop being poor is to have more money. The only way to stop being poor is to
have more money. That's how we lifted those millions of seniors out of poverty in the 60s and 70s. We gave them more money and then they weren’t poor anymore. And that's what this legislation is going to do. The working poor in our state are going to have more money. We will treat their labor with the dignity and respect it deserves and we will allow them to provide a better standard of living for themselves and their families. Many of those workers are here with us today in the gallery. I commend these leaders and the leaders around the state and across the country who have led the Fight for 15. You all, you all have stirred our nation's conscious. You have redefined the conventional wisdom. You have led this fight from the streets to the Capitol. The victory here is yours and it's my humblest honor and privilege to carry your fight into this chamber. And... to my colleagues... my colleagues on the floor, my message to you all is simple, be brave. Do what's right, not what's right for the loudest voices or for the most politically influential voices? Do what's right for the people who need us the most. The people working as hard as they can, the people stuck in the hamster wheel of work, and debt, and poverty, 1.4 million Illinoisans are counting on you today. Do what's right and vote 'aye'. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Again, Members, a verification has been requested by Representative Wehrli. Please be at your seat to vote your switch. The question is 'Shall Senate Bill 1 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 69 voting in 'favor', 47 voting 'opposed', and 1 voting
'present'. Mr... excuse me. Mr. Clerk. Mr. Clerk, will you please read the names of those voting in the affirmative. Mr. Clerk, the verification has been withdrawn. And on a count of 69 voting in 'favor', 47 voting 'opposed', and 1 voting 'present'. Senate Bill 1, having received the Constitutional Majority, is declared passed. Representative Harris, you are recognized on a point of personal privilege.

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to acknowledge on this historic day for the working families of Illinois that we have been joined on the floor of the House by the Governor of Illinois, J.B. Pritzker, and the Lieutenant Governor of Illinois, Julianna Stratton."

Speaker Turner: "Welcome to the chamber. Representative Will Davis, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Davis: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. You all can continue celebrating, I'm just here to give the black history moment for the day. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Today's black history moment, on behalf of the House Illinois Legislative Black Caucus, will speak to a gentleman who has a unique history of being a fighter against slavery, and an abolitionist, and that gentleman is Frederick Douglass. Frederick Douglass was an escaped slave who became a prominent activist, author, and public speaker. He became a leader in the abolitionist movement which sought to end the practice of slavery before during... before and during the civil war. After that conflict and the Emancipation Proclamation of 1862, he continued to push for equality and human rights until his death in 1985. Douglass' 1845 autobiography titled Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass, an American Slave described
his time as a slave in Maryland. It was one of five autobiographies he penned along with dozens of noteworthy speeches, despite receiving minimal formal education. Douglass was born into slavery around 1848 in Maryland. Though he did not know his exact date of birth, he chose, ironically enough, February 14 to be his birthdate, today. As a child, Douglass taught himself to read and write and that desire also led to his being given to another farmer, known for his brutal treatment of slaves who sought formal education. After several failed attempts at escape, Douglass finally left Covey's farm in 1838, first boarding a train to Havre de Grace, Maryland. From there he traveled through Delaware, another slave state, before arriving in New York and a safe house of abolitionist David Ruggles. Once settled in New York, he sent for Anna Murray, a free black woman from Baltimore he met while in captivity, with the Aulds family. She joined him and the two were married in September 1838 and they had five children together. By 1843, Douglass had become part of the American Anti-Slavery Society's Hundreds Conventions project, a six month tour through the United States. Douglass was physically assaulted several times during the tour by those who opposed the abolitionist movement. Two years later, Douglass published the first and most famous of his five autobiographies, *Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass, an American Slave*. In it, he wrote, 'From my earliest recollection, I date the entertainment of a deep conviction that slavery would not always be able to hold me within its full embrace; and the darkest hours of my career and slavery, this living word of faith and spirit and hope departed not
from me, but remain like ministering angels to cheer me through the gloom.' In 1852, he delivered another one of his more famous speeches, that one came... that one later came to be called What to a slave is the 4th of July. In one section of the speech, Douglass noted, 'What, to the American slave, is your 4th of July? I answer: a day that reveals to him, more than all other days in the year, the gross injustice and cruelty to which he is the constant victim. To him, your celebration is a sham; your boasted liberty, an unholy license; your natural greatness... your national greatness, swelling vanity; your sounds of rejoicing are empty and heartless; your denunciations of tyrants, brass fronted impudence; your shouts of liberty and equality, hallow mockery; your prayers and hymns, your sermons and thanksgivings, with all your religious parade and solemnity, are to him, mere bombasts, fraud, deception, impiety, and hypocrisy-a thin vail to cover up crimes which would disgrace a nation of savages.' For the 24th anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation in 1886, Douglass delivered a rousing address in Washington, D.C., during which he said, '...where justice is denied, where poverty is enforced, where ignorance prevails, and where anyone class is made to feel that society is an organized conspiracy to oppress, rob, and degrade them, neither persons nor property will be safe.' In an era when institutions of an open and inclusion democracy are under attack, when intolerance has risen over peaceful protests against patriotic symbols, Douglass' voluminous writings and speeches carry an important lessons for Americans. They remind us never to turn away from the hard
truths, never to stop believing in a better future. They reveal a man who believed fiercely in the ideals on which America was founded, but understood, with the scars to prove it, that democracy would never be a destination of comfort and repose but a journey of ongoing self-criticism and struggle. He knew when he lobbied relentlessly to abolish slavery and he knew it after emancipation when he confronted the battle for equality, for rights under the law. Ladies and Gentlemen, our debate today, to me, is indicative of what I think Frederick Douglass stood for. And we know that in this debate, there were some hard truths. There were some very hard truths that we have to come to grips with, but as that democracy suggests, our job is to rise up the people who can't offer that voice for themselves, and we are that voice. And so we even appreciate those on the other side of the aisle, those that couldn't vote for this. What they said, in terms of how they perceive the impact of minimum wage would be. But again, if we believe, Ladies and Gentlemen, if we believe that minimum wage is a pathway out of poverty to help every citizen in the State of Illinois, then yes, that is why that Bill passed. And Frederick Douglass, while he can't be here to celebrate with us, obviously had prophecy that days like this would come. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Willis for a point of personal privilege."

Willis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Happy Valentine's Day to this robust Assembly, but unfortunately, Valentine's Day, 11 years ago was marked by a tragedy which we need to remember. That tragedy was student taking a gun and committing a shooting
that took the lives of 5 students at Northern Illinois and injured 17 others. A year ago from today, we also witnessed it happening again. This time in Parkland, Florida, where a gunman opened fire in a high school killing 17 and injuring 17 others. It took the activist from Parkland, Florida, to finally get people to open their eyes and take a step forward. I can... proud to say that this Assembly, bipartisanly, took that... the words from our Parkland survivors and made a difference in our lives. Think we went and we passed a piece of legislation that I'm happy to say is working today to prevent further tragedies. It's not going to prevent all, but let's hope that never have these tragedies again. So, thank you very much for working bipartisanly in this. But as we go a close off today, please, remember those that have lost their lives on Valentines past. And I ask for a moment of silence in remembrance of those that lost it at Northern and those that lost it at Parkland."

Speaker Turner: "The Body shall take a moment of silence. Thank you, Representative Willis. Mr. Clerk, Committee Reports."

Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative DeLuca, Chairperson from the Committee on Cities & Villages reports the following committee action taken on February 13, 2019: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 158, House Bill 814. Representative D'Amico, Chairperson from the Committee on Transportation: Vehicles & Safety reports the following committee action taken on February 13, 2019: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 808. Representative Slaughter, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary - Criminal reports the following committee action taken on February 13,
2019: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 51, House Bill 900. Representative Feigenholtz, Chairperson from the Committee on Adoption & Child Welfare reports the following committee action taken on February 13, 2019: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 831, House Bill 836. Representative Yingling, Chairperson from the Committee on Counties & Townships reports the following committee action taken on February 14, 2019: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 348. Representative Mussman, Chairperson from the Committee on Elementary & Secondary Education: School Curriculum & Policies reports the following committee action taken on February 14, 2019: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 921, House Bill 922. Representative Ammons, Chairperson from the Committee on Higher Education reports the following committee action taken on February 14, 2019: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 1444. Representative Martwick, Chairperson from the Committee on Personnel & Pensions reports the following committee action taken on February 14, 2019: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 350. Representative Kifowit, Chairperson from the Committee on State Government Administration reports the following committee action taken on February 14, 2019: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 271, House Bill 346, House Bill 356, House Bill 357, House Bill 359."

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

Speaker Turner: "Leader Harris moves for the adoption of the Agreeed Resolutions. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolutions are adopted. And now, allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, Leader Harris moves that the House stand adjourned until Tuesday, February 19 at 12 noon. Tuesday, February 19 at 12 noon. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the House is adjourned."

employee benefits. House Bill 2679, offered by Representative Zalewski, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 2680, offered by Representative Zalewski, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 2681, offered by Representative Zalewski, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 2682, offered by Representative Zalewski, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue."


Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2887, offered by Representative Guzzardi, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 2888, offered by Representative Guzzardi, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 2889, offered by Representative Guzzardi, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law."
RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ONE HUNDRED FIRST 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 amend Article V of the Illinois Constitution by changing Sections 1, 3, 7, and 18 and by repealing Section 17 as follows:

ARTICLE V
THE EXECUTIVE

SECTION 1. OFFICERS
The Executive Branch shall include a Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Attorney General, Secretary of State, and Treasurer elected by the electors of the State. They shall keep the public records and maintain a residence at the seat of government during their terms of office.

SECTION 3. ELIGIBILITY
To be eligible to hold the office of Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Attorney General, Secretary of State, or Treasurer, a person must be a United States citizen, at least 25 years old, and a resident of this State for the three years preceding his or her election.

SECTION 7. VACANCIES IN OTHER ELECTIVE OFFICES
If the Attorney General, Secretary of State, or Treasurer fails to qualify or if the office becomes vacant, the Governor shall fill the office by appointment. The appointee shall hold office until the elected officer qualifies or until a successor is elected and qualified as may be provided by law and shall not be subject to removal by the Governor. If the Lieutenant Governor fails to qualify or if the office becomes vacant, it shall remain vacant until the end of the term.

SECTION 17. COMPTROLLER - DUTIES (REPEALED)

SECTION 18. TREASURER - DUTIES
The Treasurer, in accordance with law, shall (i) maintain the State's central fiscal accounts, and order payments into and out of the funds held by him or her, (ii) be responsible for the safekeeping and investment of monies and securities deposited with him or her, and for their disbursement upon
his or her order, and (iii) have the duties and powers that may be prescribed by law.

SCHEDULE
A Comptroller shall not be elected in 2022 and thereafter. This Constitutional Amendment otherwise takes effect upon the conclusion of the term of the Comptroller elected in 2018. This was the First Reading in full of House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #23. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."