Speaker Harris: "The House will be in order. Members will be in their chairs. We shall be led in prayer today by the Reverend Bobbi Dykema who is with the First Church of the Brethren in Springfield. The Reverend Doctor Dykema is guest of Representative Scherer. Members and their guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off cell phones and pagers, and rise for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance. Doctor Dykema."

Reverend Dr. Dykema: "Let us pray. Deep wisdom of the universe, gathered here together are men and women from across the State of Illinois, the ancestral lands of the Illini, Potawatomi, and Miami peoples. We are gathered here in this place to reason and work together for the good of the peoples' of the State of Illinois. We ask that these men and women be filled with a spirit of wisdom, compassion, and justice. And that they might especially remember those most vulnerable and marginalized members of our society. May our cities and towns, rural communities, and wildlands be blessed. May all living beings within our borders thrive. May cooperation and collaboration be cherished above competition and conflict. May the words spoken here be offered from a place of humility that all might learn from the unique perspectives of each Member of this august Body and each constituent for the good of all those who dwell within the borders of this state. So may it be."

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

Kalish - et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands,
Speaker Harris: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Hoffman is recognized to report any absences on the Democratic side."

Hoffman: "Yes. Excused absence Representative Buckner, Representative Cassidy, Representative Zalewski. Absences are Representative Conyears-Ervin, Representative D'Amico, and Representative DeLuca."

Speaker Harris: "And Representative Butler is recognized for absences on the Republican side of the aisle."

Butler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please let the Journal reflect that Representatives Bennett, Cabello, Grant, Hammond, Keicher, Parkhurst, Sosnowski, Wehrli, and Welter are excused. That makes a full baseball team of excuses."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Hoffman for a correction."

Hoffman: "Yes, please add Representative Martwick to the roll. He is not excused, he is present and alive right there."

Speaker Harris: "Also, Members, if we could hold Representative Buckner and his family in our thoughts as his dad became very ill last night. So I'm sure he would appreciate our good wishes. Have all recorded themselves who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. There being 103 voting present, a quorum is present and we are ready to conduct business. We will be going to the Order of Second Readings today. House Bill 123, Representative Willis. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 123, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee
Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Willis, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Willis."

Willis: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just very briefly, this is a Bill in response to the proposed closing of a hospital in my district. Hoping to keep it open. Thank you."

Speaker Harris: "Any discussion? Representative Batinick."

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

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

Batinick: "Representative, I'm sorry, I'm just waking up this morning. Did we know we were bringing this back for a Floor Amendment or how did this work with committee?"

Willis: "This was a shell Bill and so we knew what it was from the beginning."

Batinick: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Harris: "Seeing no further discussion, Representative Willis moves the adoption of Floor Amendment #1. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, Third Reading. I'm sorry. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

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

Speaker Harris: "Third Reading. On page 3 of the Calendar, appears House Bill 356, Representative Hoffman. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 356, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Hoffman, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Hoffman."
Hoffman: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. The Floor Amendment is basically a technical change to comply with Federal Law."

Speaker Harris: "Any discussion? Seeing none, Representative Hoffman has moved that Floor Amendment #1 be adopted to House Bill 356. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, are there any further Amendments?"

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

Speaker Harris: "Third Reading. On page 3 of the Calendar, appears House Bill 357, Representative Hoffman. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 357, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Hoffman, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you. This is the same Amendment to make us comply with Federal Law."

Speaker Harris: "Any discussion? Seeing none, Representative Hoffman has moved the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 357. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Motion is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

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

Speaker Harris: "Third Reading. House Bill 359, Representative Hoffman. Please read the Bill."
Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 359, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Harris: "Third Reading. On page 4 of the Calendar, appears House Bill 895, Representative Morgan. Please read the Bill. I'm sorry, at the request of the Sponsor, out of the record. House Bill 1455, Representative Bourne. Representative Bourne. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1455, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Harris: "Third Reading. On page 4 of the Calendar also appears House Bill 2060, Representative Murphy. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2060, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Harris: "Third Reading."

Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Hoffman in the Chair. House Bill 2153, Representative Feigenholtz. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2153, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."


Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3471, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."


Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3550, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. On House Bill 3628, Representative Bristow. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3628, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3701, a Bill for an Act concerning juveniles. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Slaughter, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Slaughter."

Slaughter: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #1 just represents clarifying language to a definition that does not, in any way, shape, or form change the objective of the Bill. Be happy to explain the Bill on Third Reading. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Any discussion? Seeing none, Representative Slaughter moves adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 3701. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it... in the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. House Bill 3704, Representative Slaughter. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3704, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Slaughter, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hoffman: "Mr. Slaughter..."

Slaughter: "Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "...on Floor Amendment #1 to 3704."

Slaughter: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #1, same thing. Provides clarifying language. Does not, in any way, shape, or form change the objective to the Bill. Be happy to explain the Bill on Third Reading. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."
Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no discussion, Representative Slaughter moves the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 3704. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it, in the opinion of the Chair. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. On page 7 of the Calendar, House Bill 2894, Representative Hernandez. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2894, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Hernandez, is approved for consideration."

Hernandez, L.: "Thank you, Speaker. The Amendment just simply extends the sunset to October 1 of 2024 for the ALL KIDS program."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no discussion, Representative Hernandez moves adoption of Floor Amendment #1. All those in favor say 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. Representative Kifowit, for what reason do you arise?"

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

Speaker Hoffman: "State your point."

Kifowit: "Mr. Speaker and bodies of the... individuals in the House, I would like to recognize an individual that put a lot of effort into being here today. His name is Jordan Mitchell."
He's is an Army veteran and he strapped on a hundred pound rucksack and walked 189 miles over the 5 days to come to the Capitol today. He is on the Democratic side of the aisle, standing up. He is walking... he is walking, today, to raise awareness of a very profound and horrible thing that happens in the lives of individuals, most at the age of 13 or younger, which is human trafficking. Illinois had more than 200 reported cases of human trafficking in Illinois in 2017. And he is bound and determined, as the director of his organization, Provision Lab, to do all that he can and he urges us... and I know that we do all that we can... to eliminate and stop human trafficking. So with that, I just want to give him a warm hearted Springfield welcome. And he will be outside the Chambers for individuals to talk about his mission with him. Thank you. And welcome to Springfield."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Carroll, for what reason do you arise?"

Carroll: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have some guests to introduce today. My lovely family has made their trek down here from Northbrook. First, my son, Asher, who turned 11 last week. My daughter, Brooke. And of course my wife, Katrina. So please give them a warm Springfield welcome. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Welcome to Springfield. Representative Spain, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

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

Speaker Hoffman: "State your point."

Spain: "Ladies and Gentlemen, I also have a very special guest joining me today. She is five years old. She is a
kindergartener at Kellar School in Peoria. Please welcome my daughter, Vivienne Spain."

Speaker Hoffman: "Welcome, Vivienne. Representative Davidsmeyer."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "State your point."

Davidsmeyer: "Today is National Welcome Home Vietnam Veterans Day and I think we all know a number of Vietnam veterans who did not receive the welcome that they should've deserved when they came back. So, I want to thank all them for their service, for stepping up when their country asked. And I personally want to thank my dad, who received a Purple Heart in Vietnam, for his service and for making me the man that I am today. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "On page 12 of the Calendar on the Order of Third Readings... we are now going to go to Third Readings so Members please be prepared... there is House Bill 2601, Representative Morgan. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2601, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Morgan."

Morgan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and good morning to the Body. This Bill amends the Real Property Conservation Rights Act. This Bill came about because we had a number of issues with Amendments and changes to conservation property when you had an easement adjustment, whether it was expanding or shrinking. So, the courts were handling these matters, but it was not clear in the statute as to how to manage these Amendments. And so this Bill creates that process. This is an
agreed Bill. It was negotiated with the Second Amendment... with the First Amendment from the Realtors and the farm bureau. So this is a negotiated Bill and I ask for your support."

Speaker Hoffman: "Is there any discussion? Representative McDermed."

McDermed: "This is a Bill that you presented in Judiciary-Civil, correct, Representative?"

Morgan: "That's correct."

McDermed: "And what we're trying to do... one of the challenges that's come up in this area is that when you want to amend these by adding more property to the conservation that it opens everything up and makes it very difficult to expand some of these conservation areas, correct?"

Morgan: "That's exactly correct."

McDermed: "So we're helping the environment and this is now an agreed Bill?"

Morgan: "That's correct. And I appreciate your cosponsorship of this."

McDermed: "Vote 'yes'."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no further recognition, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2601 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 97 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2617, Representative Martwick. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2617, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this House Bill."
Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Martwick on House Bill 2617."
Martwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2617 is a technical corrections Bill that amends the Chicago Teacher Article of the Pension Code by eliminating the outdated and incorrect term 'special services' and replacing it with 'extracurricular activities'. I know of no opposition. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
Speaker Hoffman: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2617 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 98 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2643, on page 12 of the Calendar, Representative Mason. Out of the record. House Bill 2662, Representative Martwick. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2662, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this House Bill."
Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Martwick."
Martwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2662 is an administrative cost savings measure initiated by the Firefighter's Annuity and Benefit Fund of Chicago. It extends the term of the annuitant member of the fund's board of trustees from two to three years. Has immediate effective date. I know of no opposition. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
Speaker Hoffman: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2662 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the record. On this, there are 99 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Butler, for what reason do you arise?"

Butler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We needed a designated hitter so please let the Journal reflect that Representative Wilhour is excused today."

Speaker Hoffman: "The record will so reflect. On page 12 of the Calendar, House Bill 2665, Representative Robinson. Out of the record. House Bill 2685, Representative Ammons. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2685, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Ammons."

Ammons: "Good morning, Mr. Speaker, thank you. House Bill 2685 creates the Illinois Student Loan Investment Act. Provides for the establishment, operation, and administration of a student investment account by the State Treasurer. It allows the State Treasurer to invest up to five percent of the State investment portfolio in education loan products, such as income sharing agreements and low interest, to help Illinois students finance higher education expenses. And we ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "On this question, Representative Batinick."

Batinick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Hoffman: "She indicates she will."
Batinick: "Representative, can you describe the genesis of this Bill?"
Ammons: "This is a Bill that was established by the State Treasurer's Office. What we saw was people are having an extranomical amount of student loan debt and some of those interest rates are well beyond what families can continue to pay for. And so, the Treasurer's Office came up with a very brilliant idea to be able to take in some of those loans and some of the families in Illinois, reduce their interest rate, and save money on their student loan cost."
Batinick: "There's... we've had a lot of discussions about saving money on student loan costs. One of the ways to do that would be to actually lower the cost of delivering those educational services instead of overcharging students and then having them take out loans that they have to pay back."
Ammons: "I so agree with you, Representative Batinick. I agree with you on that."
Batinick: "So, but here is my concern, what is the amount of default on student loan debts nationally?"
Ammons: "I don't recall. I know the Treasurer's Office answered that in committee and I honestly don't recall what that current default rate is."
Batinick: "Okay. So what is the interest rate for these loans going to be?"
Ammons: "That has... it has to be set through negotiation which is something that'll be done after we pass this Bill. There are several steps of administrative work that needs to be done to set the interest rates."
Batinick: "So I'm going to... I'm hoping some of my colleagues here on my side of the aisle will help me out on this. Here's my concern with this Bill. I think it's a laudable cause. I'm sorry, I'm looking at the screen, I should be looking right here. I think it's an excellent idea what you're thinking about doing. Here's the problem, we're broke. And we're asking the Treasurer to become a lender. The Treasurer is now going to become a bank and he's entering a market where there's a high rate of default."

Ammons: "Well let me just clarify. I know what was testified by the Treasurer's Office in committee, is that this money is actually coming from other accounts that they already have, there interest that we receive back on our investments, and they just what to reinvest that into Illinois families. This won't cost us a significant amount of money to do this. There is a small amount that is... will be in the budget of the Treasurer in the next cycle, but it is a significantly better investment for us to reduce the cost on the families of Illinois by using other investment dollars that we already have in the State Treasury."

Batinick: "So do you have any estimate of what the cost is, Representative?"

Ammons: "The... which part of the cost?"

Batinick: "You said there's gonna be a budget in the Treasurer's Office..."

Ammons: "There was a fiscal note that I received on this project which would be somewhere in a tune of a hundred and fifty thousand dollars."
Batinick: "Okay. I guess my concern is, is the state is essentially gonna become a bank that’s going to give out student loans under this Bill, correct?"

Ammons: "To some degree. It's more of an investment in my estimation. It's not necessarily considered a banking. That would be a wonderful Bill by senior Leader Flowers. But this one would allow us to really reduce the costs on the families by using money that we've invested in other investments that we have in the State Treasury currently."

Batinick: "So are we... do you know what the interest rate... the 600 million that’s invested with the Treasurer now, what interest rate are we going to earn on that? When we get into the student loan business what's going to be our return rate there?"

Ammons: "Those are questions, unfortunately, that require some administrative work because the negotiations have to take place. All of those things, as the Treasurer's Office testified to in committee, those are pieces that are the business process of doing this service for the people of Illinois. And we can't quantify right now what the interest rate is going to be, but we do know that they have the bandwidth within the Treasurer's investments currently to allow us to help these families as well as we'll be able to lower, certainly below what the federal interest rates are currently."

Batinick: "So I guess I'm... let me zero in a little bit more. I'm not concerned about the bandwidth of the Treasurer's Office, I'm gonna take you at your word and the Treasurer's word that he can institute the program. My problem is, is we're gonna
be investing $600 million of state money in something that may have a negative return because of the high default rate of student loan debt. That's my concern. My concern is that we're investing state money and getting... at a time when, last time I checked, we're not in the best situation fiscally."

Ammons: "I do understand the point that you're making. What we saw was that this is it's only... it's structured as up to 5 percent of the State Treasurer's portfolio. So it's not a huge investment in the larger scheme of things in order for us to really help these families. This may not reach the five percent or the 600 million, depending on what the administrative work is after the passage of this Bill, but it could go up to 5 percent. There's no hard line on the 600 million that would be invested and it is quite small."

Batinick: "Okay. I'm going to go to the Bill. Thank you very much for indulging me in my..."

Speaker Hoffman: "To the Bill."

Batinick: "...your questions. My issues are we're at a tough spot fiscally, we have to watch every penny. Without... the Sponsor admitted that there's some questions as to whether we're going to actually profit from this or whether the cost of default is going to be on this. So I'm going to listen to the rest of the debate. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Skillicorn."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "She indicates she will."

Skillicorn: "Hi there, Representative. Just a few quick questions. What kind of return on investment are we expected to get back for this?"
Ammons: "I think the answer, as I shared with Floor Leader Batinick, that is still undetermined because the investment that is being proposed, up to five percent of the state investment portfolio currently, that is going to be negotiated. They're looking for smart investments, of course. They don't want to get the most risky portfolios. They don't want the ones that's going to default at a higher rate. They're just trying to help Illinois families reduce their education burdens."

Skillicorn: "Thank you, Representative. And I think we share a common desire to both make college more affordable and to do something with this, you know, out there, out of control student debt situation. And I think there's probably some stuff we could work on. But specifically, to the Bill. And I want to just echo those comments that we want smart investments. Now, the Treasurer's Office takes in money, sends out money, but their primary responsibility is to invest money while it's in the state coffers. And he has a fiduciary responsibility to get the highest return investment as possible. And that helps everyone in Illinois. If the Treasurer's doing a better job, which he's doing a fine job, the people of Illinois have to pay less money in taxes because that's just the way it comes down to. If he can invest the money that's coming in and out of his office very well and get higher investment returns, that saves all of us money. What it really comes down to, is that I don't think that this Bill is quite ready yet for prime time. If we had a rate of return and if it was better than the rate of return from current financial vehicles, I'd be all for this. But until we
can answer that question, what the rate of return is, I don’t think this Bill is ready for prime time. So I can have people work on this. This could be a fun Bill to work on what the potential rate of return would be, but right now I'm going to urge a 'no' vote. But I think better yet, why don’t we pull it from record and work on it together. And if we do that, I'll cosponsor it. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "There are many individuals seeking recognition so we're going to move to a four minute timer. Representative Demmer."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "She indicates she will."

Demmer: "Representative Ammons, thanks for some of the clarification around this. We're all sort of reading through our analysis now, those of us who weren't on the Higher Education Committee, just trying to get a good feel for what happens here. So in this scenario, the... your Bill would charge the Treasurer's Office with using a certain percentage of their investment accounts to basically buy student loans and then become the venue that gets paid back by students as they paid on their student loans. Is that correct?"

Ammons: "That's correct."

Demmer: "So right now the Treasurer's Office is in charge of managing a significant pool of investments in the State Investment Act. And right now their charge is to do so in the most financially prudent way, evaluate different investment vehicles and find the place where they're going to best service the investment returns for the people of the State of Illinois. Under your Bill, wouldn't this give them a
conflicting priority, which would be to instead of investing the money in the most financially prudent way, now they are instead directed to provide student loan relief to Illinoisans. Isn't that maybe a conflicting priority?"

Ammons: "I wouldn't say it's a conflicting priority. If the Treasurer's Office has the ability to help Illinois families, with what you identify as a real fiduciary responsibility, to make sure that our investments can be helpful to the people of Illinois, I think that this is exactly what we want to do."

Demmer: "So we could use those investments to be helpful to people of Illinois in a lot of ways. We could say, the Treasurer's Office is now going to offer mortgages to people across the State of Illinois. The Treasurer's Office is going to help out with credit card debt for people across the State of Illinois. The Treasurer's Office could use money to do all sorts of things that are not central to their mission of investing in a responsible way to make that money grow and develop over time. There's a lot of ways that we could intervene just to use this money to give you a lower rate on your mortgage or a lower rate on your credit cards. Why should the Treasurer's Office abandon their strategy of having the sound investment returns and instead have a competing priority of trying to, you know, help out with individual debt?"

Ammons: "You know, I don’t necessarily agree with the characterization as this as a departure. This is actually within line of the Treasurer's Office and they manage many accounts in regards to education savings. I believe this is
directly in line with that management and it is fiduciary responsibility that we are trying to get at here to make sure that our students graduate with less debt. If I could pass a Bill with your support that would allow our students to go to higher education at the expense of the state I would certainly do it, but we know that's not reasonable. Today, we're asking for the Treasurer's Office to be able to invest up to five percent of its portfolio to help those same families."

Demmer: "Thank you, Representative. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hoffman: "To the Bill."

Demmer: "I think we recognize that, you know, there are some things that it'd be nice if everything was free, it'd be nice if the state was able to give money to, you know, anybody who needed it. We have to understand, though, that we want to have a responsible investment pool. Now, as many other speakers have talked about, if this was a situation in which we believe that the state could offer these at a competitive rate, that it wasn't going to be a disservice to the investment returns for all the people of Illinois, maybe this program could work. I don't think that we have evidence today, though, that we're going to be able to offer this at a place that gives the Treasurer the ability to deliver on the priority that we've already charged that office with and that is to get a competitive return for all taxpayers in the State of Illinois. We could continue to work on this Bill and try to find a way to put specific interest rates in there, something that makes sense both for the Treasurer, for the taxpayers of Illinois, and for the college students that we're
trying to provide some relief for. So at this time, I urge a 'no' vote. Thank you.

Speaker Hoffman: "Thank you, Representative. Representative Mazzochi is recognized."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Indicates she will."

Mazzochi: "All right. I'd like to know what interest rate do you propose to have the State Treasurer charge on these bonds relative to the federal interest rate? On these types of student loans."

Ammons: "So the Treasurer's Office states that this is not designed to compete with the federal interest rates. We are hoping to give it to those who are in the gap of that who cannot get the best deal they can get at the federal level and provide some relief at the state level. And I'm also informed that, certainly prior to my term here in the General Assembly, we had a similar program called ILGIVE that invested dollars in a similar fashion from the Treasurer's Office and was in venture capital and was very successful. I believe the Treasurer has demonstrated the investments and the fiduciary responsibility of the Treasurer's Office has been successful and I don’t believe that this will be any different."

Mazzochi: "If the demand for these exceeds the supply that the Treasurer's going to give, the five percent of investment portfolio funds, how... what criteria are going to be used to select one group of students versus another in terms of eligibility for these loans?"

Ammons: "So the decision would not be made by the Treasurer's Office. I'm informed that the decision would be made through
a pool because they would be working with an investment group that they're working on these student loans. And so, it won't be a 'I'm choosing your son or your daughter', it would be a group portfolio that they're looking at and making the investments, similar to what they invest in other areas of state dollars."

Mazzochi: "Well if they're going to be using an investment group to help them make the investments, aren't we going to then lose additional funds to just the administrative fees for providing this program?"

Ammons: "I don't have any indication that there's any concern about losing funds at all because they believe that they can get better interest rates that are significantly lower. So we don't..."

Mazzochi: "No. I... sorry, I misstated the question then. The point is if we're going to be working with an investment group, the investment group is going to charge us fees and management fees in order to provide that type of advice as to what to invest in. So that's going to actually take away from the five percent that is being made available. So I'm kind of concerned that we're losing our interest revenue that we could keep as a state and now we're going to be paying these shadowy investment groups some additional fees to decide who actually gets to participate or which bundle of loans we're going to be willing to invest in. It just means that there's now less money available."

Ammons: "I'm sorry, I didn't register that as a question, though."
Mazzochi: "Okay. The point being is that you're basically saying that the Treasurer's Office isn't going to decide which loans they're going to subsidize."

Ammons: "Let me clarify…"

Mazzochi: "They're going to have an investment group decide for them which bundle of loans to invest in. And I'm saying, do we know what types of fees those investment groups are going to charge us to allow us to invest in that portfolio?"

Ammons: "Let me clarify one point. The Treasurer's Office would be one of many investors in a pool, so they will direct their investments. They're going to negotiate directly their involvement in this purchase."

Mazzochi: "Right, but we're still losing money, then, to pay fees for the investment group to have… to assist the Treasurer to invest. I mean you've also got other things in here, we have to buy default insurance. We have to buy all of these other types of things. So we're creating a huge bundle of administrative fees that really aren't outlined where we don't have any sense as to what those are going to cost. So the five percent that you're starting with is going to immediately start dropping down, not in a way that's going to help students, but in a way that's just going to get lost to administrative and management fees."

Ammons: "Now that's certainly a mischaracterization. If you look at the 529 plans, currently Illinois has the lowest interest rate in the country under… lowest fees in the country for its 529 plans. This would be designed similar to that. It would also offer an income sharing agreement. And so, it would also save us money. We don't look at spending a significant
amount of money on fees as well as the Treasurer's Office will continue to look at, again, smart investments and fiduciary responsibility in the same way that they currently do."

Mazzochi: "Well..."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative."

Mazzochi: "But we not capping it. And page four specifically says that..."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative. Representative. Please bring your remarks to a close."

Mazzochi: "Sorry. One additional question is do we... are we going to allow these loans to be defaulted on? Do we know? All right I'm not getting an answer. To the Bill. I agree that we need to lower the cost of college and that means that we need to find ways to lower tuition. This is simply moving an existing student loan debt from one entity to another entity. The student is still going to have the same amount of debt, it's just going to be a question of is that debt held by the Federal Government or by a third party lender, or is that debt held by the State of Illinois? And given that we know that students do default on these student loans at a higher rate, you know, you're basically setting the State of Illinois up for failure. So because of that reason, and because you clearly have set forth in the text of the Bill that the Treasurer's Office is going to incur a whole host of new fees, you haven't specified where all the rest of the liabilities lie, and you haven't capped the administrative losses we're going to spend on this, I respectfully urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Davidsmeyer is recognized."
Davidsmeyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hoffman: "Indicates she will."

Davidsmeyer: "So I had a good conversation with folks from the Treasurer's Office and I had one concern. And it specifically dealt with a frustration of mine that once people are in political office they use new programs and things of that sort to spread their name for future political purposes. And so my concern on this was to ensure that the Treasurer's Office was not using this as a way to get his name out further, right? I don't even think that the Governor should have their name on the sign that says 'Welcome to Illinois', no matter who the Governor is. So this... is this... can his name be on the material or will it be more generic 'Treasurer of the State of Illinois'?"

Ammons: "What was testified in committee, and I know this was asked in the committee as well, the Treasurer's Office is covered by the Ethics Act that prohibits them from using their names on materials that are state focused. This will be covered by... in the same way. And I believe that the testimony in committee clarified that there is no intention of the Treasurer's Office to utilize this as promotional material."

Davidsmeyer: "Great. I appreciate that. I would say that a number of these funds that the Treasurer invests are normally low interest return funds anyway, so there may be a similar return on investment if they do invest in student loans as opposed to other investments. Is that your understanding?"

Ammons: "That's my understanding."

Davidsmeyer: "Also, the other concern that I have, as opposed to investing in something else that would have a similar return,
they would be allowed to default on these loans. As opposed to an investment which there would not be a default component, correct?"

Ammons: "Let me clarify. So, you know, I'm thinking about the investment strategies that the Treasurer's Office uses. What we know is that we want to make sure the portfolio is large enough so that even if a small percentage of folks do unfortunately default, that there is enough revenue that is generated from that to protect the state in the small percentage of defaulting. What we know is that we will see... similar to the 529 plan, the goal is to get the interest rate low enough so that people can really afford to make their payments and thus give some relief to the families of Illinois under this plan."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. I understand what we're trying to do with this Bill. I do have concerns with subjecting taxpayer dollars to a possible greater risk of default. I think the current loans... or the current investment that they go after are fairly safe which is why they're fairly low return. This would add an additional component that would add a possible loss to the State of Illinois or at least a decreased return on investment. So for that reason, at this point, I'm going to be voting 'no'. If we could clean up some of that... those concerns before it goes to the Senate, I would really appreciate that effort."

Speaker Hoffman: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Halpin."

Halpin: "Well, with all due respect to my colleagues from Rockford, I am actually a resident of Rock Island County in
Rock Island. I know the... I believe the board up there is incorrect. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hoffman: "She will yield."

Halpin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, I think this is a good Bill. I wanted to ask a couple questions. First, you kind of mentioned it in your response to the previous speaker, but the default rate... not everyone on a student loan defaults, correct?"

Ammons: "That's correct. It's a small percentage."

Halpin: "And there are very well established statistical data as to what percentage of loans default. Is that correct?"

Ammons: "There is."

Halpin: "All right. And the Treasurer's Office, as far as you know, is capable of constructing a student loan portfolio that will return a positive investment. Is that right?"

Ammons: "That is correct. That is why they have limited this to up to five percent of the investment portfolio so as to minimize the risk."

Halpin: "And right now the student loan providers that are charging exorbitant interest rates, presumably even with the high default rate in student loans, they're able to make money off those, correct?"

Ammons: "They have been."

Halpin: "And was it fair to say that there are certain students within the State of Illinois that are currently struggling to pay these higher interest rates and are at great risk of default?"

Ammons: "There is a significant challenge for the families right now."
Halpin: "And therefore, if a student were to participate or a student loan or to be involved in this program and they can get a lower interest rate, it might actually be easier for that student to afford to pay back that loan?"

Ammons: "The idea is to make it easier so that they cannot default and they can meet their obligation."

Halpin: "Has there been any work... well let me put it this way. The Treasurer's Office, do you know how much they invest on an annual basis, today? Just in general?"

Ammons: "The Treasurer's Office invests $31 billion, today."

Halpin: "So my assumption's always been that they have a pretty good team to balance their portfolio, to make sure they're meeting their fiduciary responsibility to the citizens of Illinois. Is there any reason to think that they won't be able to exercise that discretion and fiduciary capabilities in regards to this program?"

Ammons: "There is no indication that they would begin to operate their business in any manner other than the successful manner they've already demonstrated."

Halpin: "Thank you, Representative. This is a very good Bill. I'd urge an 'aye' vote. It's good for students here in the State of Illinois. It's a good way to continue to stimulate them to not only be able to afford their student loans, but to then be able to continue contributing to the Illinois economy. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Thank you, Gentleman from Rock Island. Representative Brady, for what reason do you seek recognition? Please proceed."

Brady: "Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Hoffman: "Sponsor will."

Brady: "Thank you very much. Representative, in particular to the Higher Education Committee, when this Bill was brought up I thought there was an understanding that some of the questions that are again being asked here on the House Floor that at that time were being asked in committee, that there was going to be answers brought back to us and there was going to be more work on the Bill when the Bill was presented in committee. Is that your recollection as well as mine?"

Ammons: "No, Sir, that would be incorrect. Certainly I would not present a Bill that I am supposed to amend. That's not something that we discussed."

Brady: "Okay. Well, Representative, with all due respect, my memory and that of some of my colleagues on the committee has that recollection that we had unanswered questions, rate of return investments, the list goes on that's being brought back up again here on the floor. And in good faith and confidence we worked with you at the time vote wise to support that, but certainly thought these types of questions were going to be answered here on the floor. And so therefore, I'm going to vote not only 'no', but encourage my colleagues to do the same. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Pappas is recognized."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Indicates she will."

Pappas: "I... the question that I have is the Treasurer's Office right now makes investments that include assets in other states that are helping various other enterprises out of the
states and yield the returns for the benefit of Illinois. Is that correct?"

Ammons: "That's correct."

Pappas: "And so, as I understand that Bill, what the Treasurer is asking to do now is take five percent of our portfolio and make an investment directly in the State of Illinois in improving the skills of our future workforce by helping the students in Illinois to attend college and complete their course of education. Is that correct?"

Ammons: "That is correct."

Pappas: "And we expect that the Treasurer will exercise similar amount of prudence in making these investments that he does right now with all of the other investments that he makes with the rest of the portfolio. Is that correct?"

Ammons: "We have ample evidence of such."

Pappas: "All right. So, what we would be doing here is not just helping Illinois families gain a college education, but we would be helping our state develop a future workforce that will help with the economic development of the State of Illinois. Is that correct?"

Ammons: "Yes, Ma'am, that's correct."

Pappas: "So, in fact, it's a double investment in our future?"

Ammons: "This is a good Bill."

Pappas: "Thank you. To the Bill. I think this is, as I said, a double investment in Illinois. I trust the Treasurer to be prudent in exercising the investment authority that has been granted to him. And I vote the Members... I urge the Members to vote 'yes'."
Speaker Hoffman: "The Lady from DuPage, Representative Stava-Murray."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "She indicates she will."

Stava-Murray: "So I stand today in support of this Bill and I also stand with a future college student, hopefully for the State of Illinois. And I think that when I hear my colleagues speak about how this only benefits a certain set of Illinoisans, the students, I would tend to disagree with that because when our students graduate and they come to work and have jobs in Illinois, we will get the income tax returns and the higher they're... the more they make, the more money for the State of Illinois. So we're investing in our future, we're investing in jobs, and the rate of return is not simply that interest that we're making on the loan, it's also the increased income that we're making. So I strongly support this and if my colleagues are worried about students defaulting on their loans, I strongly encourage them to support legislation that helps students who might not make it through college or who might have difficulty paying back their loans to do support programs for them. So we have the proper structures in place so students aren't in a position where they are defaulting on their loans. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Martwick."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Indicates she will."

Martwick: "Representative, much of the discussion has been focused upon student loans, is that the only compliment of this Bill?
I read something in there about income sharing agreements, can you explain that to me?"

Ammons: "There is an income sharing provision in this Bill that will help our families. And I do urge our members to support this process because that allows them to take that money together and invest in a prudent way and save us significant investment money."

Martwick: "And how does that income sharing agreement work?"

Ammons: "It simply means that they would have an income based return that they would be able to benefit from at a later date."

Martwick: "And has... are you aware of these income sharing agreements being used any other where... in any other places?"

Ammons: "I'm informed that Purdue University uses it extensively and it has been a benefit to them."

Martwick: "And are there... besides Purdue University is there anyone else that offers these, any private groups that offer income sharing agreements?"

Ammons: "There are people in a private sector who also do this kind of work that are starting to offer them. And it helps people not default on their loans which is a great thing."

Martwick: "Yeah, so instead of just giving them a loan that they have to pay back with interest... correct me if I'm wrong here, but an income sharing agreement would give them loan money for college in return for an agreement to pay back a fixed share of their income every year until that debt is satisfied. Is that correct?"

Ammons: "This was featured in Crain's Business Magazine and it was highly recommended that we do this."
Martwick: "Yeah, it sounds like a really innovative process that's just getting started. And imagine Illinois being able to get in on the ground floor of something that could be really beneficial to our students and help attract students to stay back here in Illinois. In fact, I often hear about out-migration in Illinois. Much of that out-migration is college students that are leaving to go to other states. This could be a tool to kind of bring those students back. I think that would be great. I think this is a great Bill. I love the income sharing agreement and I think that that will... something that could definitely offset the risk that's involved with student loans. I encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Weber is recognized."

Weber: "Thank you, Sir. Does the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hoffman: "She indicates she does."

Weber: "All right, just to clarify a few things because I... honestly it's pretty hard to hear in here. So are these loans just for any student in the State of Illinois? Are they targeted towards low income or for anyone?"

Ammons: "It's based on Illinois residency and going to a Illinois school."

Weber: "Okay, that's it. All right, just wanted to verify that. Also, secondly, if these loans wouldn't be paid back, would this allow the Treasurer's Office to garnish wages or hire bill collectors to go after the loan payments?"

Ammons: "Let me clarify that. The answer would be yes. They already have that ability through the Comptroller's Office to do that."
Weber: "I was just curious if there's anything else in the Treasurer's Office where they make loans and have to use a bill collector or garnish people's wages? Currently?"

Ammons: "Let me clarify that. So currently the Treasurer's Office don’t make direct loans. And this is not a direct loan program, either, so just to clarify that. But if there was a case that they needed to work with our state agency through the Comptroller's Office to collect... do collections or garnishment of wages, that is already set in place."

Weber: "So, currently the Treasurer's Office does not have to hire a bill collector or garnish anyone's wages? Is that what you're saying?"

Ammons: "That's correct."

Weber: "All right, thank you for clearing that up. Along the lines of what Representative Davidsmeyer has said about where he would feel more comfortable about... on the marketing materials that he would prefer just that 'Treasurer's Office' or 'Treasurer of the State of Illinois', I actually do have a problem with that. Since this is paid for by the taxpayers of Illinois, would you have any problem with amending it to require all these loans say... all the marketing material says that this is paid for and offered by the taxpayers of the State of Illinois?"

Ammons: "We already have ethics rules that cover that. And if the Member in the Senate wants to do something additionally there, I'll leave that to the Senate."

Weber: "Well I think since this money is coming from the taxpayers in the State of Illinois that is should be marketed as such. Thank you."
Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Walker is recognized."
Walker: "Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Hoffman: "Indicates she will."
Walker: "Thank you very much. I love the idea of income sharing. And I love the idea of relief for students and their families who are paying high interest rates. I'd like you to consider one idea, however. Is there any sunset to this?"
Ammons: "Currently, there is no sunset in this clause. Again, if there's something that the Senate and the Treasurer's Office wants to look at, they can in the Senate."
Walker: "One thing I'd like us to look at is to say something like if after a 12 month period, or in any 12 month period, this program loses money for the state, then it will automatically cease."
Ammons: "I think that would be something the Senate can pick up, but let me just share with my colleague that investments go up and down in every single segment of our state investment portfolio. So, not just this one, but every single investment portfolio would be under such a provision and that may be difficult for them to manage in the best interest of the state."
Walker: "Right, I understand. The difference is that all those other investment portfolios the Treasurer... and we trust him... can pull in and pull out. But this has been established by law that this program exists and there's no discretion by the Treasurer to pull out of it. So I would like to consider that change."
Ammons: "So currently, they're not required. Because we set this program up does not require them to have to do anything."
That's why it's structured in a way up to, it's permissible. They don't actually have to do that and if the Senate is interested in, you know, tweaking some kind of timeframe to review this, I'm not opposed to such an idea."
Walker: "Yeah, I support the Bill. Thank you very much."
Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no further discussion, Representative Ammons to close."
Ammons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you to all the Members of the House. This is a good permissible Bill that will help our families simply lower their interest rate and reduce the occurrence of defaulting on student loans in Illinois. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."
Speaker Hoffman: "Thank you, Representative. The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2685 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 67 voting 'aye', 33 voting 'nay'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Harris for excused absences."
Harris: "Mr. Speaker, let the record reflect that Representative Jones is excused for the rest of the day."
Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2722, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Third Reading of this House Bill."
Gong-Gershowitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 2722 amends the Public Construction Bond Act providing that bonds issued under the Act can be used for apparatus fixtures and machinery used for work on a project. It's an... this Bill is an initiative of the Chicago Bar Association and the intent is to make the Public Construction Bond Act mirror the Illinois Mechanic's Liens Act which contains similar language to ensure that contractors are paid for both construction and goods provided. There are no known opponents to this Bill and I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Wheeler, for what reason do you arise? And is recognized."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "She indicates she will."

Wheeler: "Thank you. Representative, I'm looking through our analysis here recalling... make sure... a little clarity for me, if you would. This Bill has nothing to do with another Bill about wages being paid via prime contractors and subcontractors, right?"

Gong-Gershowitz: "No, that is a completely different Bill."

Wheeler: "Okay, want to make sure everybody understands that over on this side that this is not that Bill. Was there any opposition to the Bill that you referred to at all?"

Gong-Gershowitz: "No opposition."

Wheeler: "Okay, there's... I read here that there's some carpenters who have had some concerns about the Bill. Did you address those concerns for them?"

Gong-Gershowitz: "I was not aware that they had any concerns. The last I heard this was a pretty uncontroversial Bill. It
literally, just provides the same protection to contractors for public construction projects that... rather for private construction contracts that we have for public construction contracts."

Wheeler: "All right, thank you very much. Appreciate the answers to your questions."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Mazzochi is recognized."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Indicates she will."

Mazzochi: "Okay. So, first of all, one of the issues that had come up with regard to this issue in committee is that because this was expanding the scope of what could be recovered under a surety bond. One of the questions that we had is you're adding on that apparatus fixtures and machinery, including rental cost, can now be secured against a surety bond. And even though the whole point of a surety bond is supposed to be to protect the municipality, not necessarily the contractors. Can you explain why you think these particular additions that are going to help the contractors, but not the municipality are being added?"

Gong-Gershowitz: "Yeah, it's my understanding this just ensures that there's no misunderstanding about what's covered. That this would ensure that rental property is also covered. And that that would ensure that they have the same protection for private construction projects that you would have under the Illinois Mechanic's Liens Act already for a public construction contract."
Mazzochi: "Right, maybe we can get at it this way. What's the fundamental point of the surety bond? Why do we obligate contractors on public works projects to do a surety bond?"

Gong-Gershowitz: "That's not what this Bill is addressing. This Bill is just to give sub-contractors on public projects the same rights that they have for private projects under the Illinois Mechanic's Liens Act. It just enhances the security and provides protection to the sub-contractors and public bodies when contractors fail to pay for fixtures, apparatus machinery, or rental equipment on public projects."

Mazzochi: "Right, but what... but when this was originally presented, right, the whole reason why you have contractors present a surety bond to the state, or in connection with any work that they do as part of a public process, they do that so that if there's a failure to pay there's a bond there. And the municipality can use that bond however it sees fit to address the costs that were incurred at the site. If they were not completed, if there were overcharges, et cetera. And now what... and the things is that apparatus fixtures and machinery, because you're also expanding that to include rental charges and that type of thing, those are the types of things that, you know... if there is a machine that's left on the job site, it can be retrieved. If there's fixtures that were left on the job site, it can be retrieved from the state or from the municipality. What you can recover is the cost of the labor and the materials that have essentially been wasted or transformed as a consequence of this. So by expanding this you're actually going to expand the scope of costs that states are potentially at risk for in the context of future lien
actions. You're going to obligate people to then have to increase the amount of their surety bonds. And I'm just trying to understand what's driving the real need behind this because I certainly haven't gotten any feedback from my state or any of my municipalities that this is something that they need. If anything it's something that's going to make it harder for them to use their surety bonds to try to address any claims that arise in the scope of the work being done."

Gong-Gershowitz: "Representative, I don't believe this proposed Amendment to the Act will have any negative impact on public construction projects. The amount of the bonds is already fixed based on the contract price. So, this Amendment just, you know, simply ensures that a surety, as a party to the grantee, receives proper payment in the event a general contractor, the bond principals bankrupt or otherwise unable to pay sub-contractors. And that would include more complicated rental equipment and things that are consumed as part of the construction process."

Mazzochi: "Right, but the whole point is you're not putting any caps on this if that's really what your goal is. The whole point is, is that anybody... so if the state or the municipality could have a fixed contract price that's what they put their bond for, but by now expanding the scope of what's lienable you're now allowing them to go above and beyond the potential contract price to recover against the bond or recover against the state or municipality. I think in terms of the labor and materials you can at least have some control over that, but you're going above and beyond it. And, again, I just don't think that we've covered it."
Gong-Gershowitz: "This is not an expansion. Materials are already covered. This just clarifies that materials also includes rental property and fixtures. That's all this does. It's exactly what we do in the Illinois Mechanic's Liens Act. It just conforms and mirrors the two so that public and private construction projects are the same."

Mazzochi: "Right. And I'm telling you the language, as it's written, precisely because you're not putting any caps on it and you're letting it go beyond the scope of the surety bond, it actually doesn't do that. It's going to expand the scope and it's going to require either more surety bonds or more costs. And it's putting more municipalities at risk that their surety bond is not, in fact, going to cover what you're including on here. So to the Bill, if I may.

Speaker Hoffman: "To the Bill."

Mazzochi: "Again, this is just one of those things where I think that it's a nice idea in theory and on paper, but in practice it's going to have unforeseen costs. And for that reason, I would encourage a 'nay' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "For further discussion, Representative Davidsmeyer is recognized."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "She indicates she will."

Davidsmeyer: "Could you give kind of a scenario of when this is needed? Just give me an idea of why this is needed. Like, so you're on a project and something happens. So what happens to make this necessary?"

Gong-Gershowitz: "Representative, it's my understanding that this is standard practice under the Illinois Mechanic's Liens Act."
That the materials covered include all the materials that you would use or consume as part of the construction process. Including, you know, equipment and things that are rented, the things that aren’t necessarily just labor. So, you know, I would envision that if you had a construction project where you might have specialized equipment that needed to be used for that project, and for some reason you need to cover the cost of that rental equipment as part of that construction project, this would now ensure that that would be covered."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Davidsmeyer, it is a Friday. I'm going to start the timer... a four minute timer if it's okay with you."

Davidsmeyer: "Thank you. I appreciate that, Mr. Speaker. I don’t want to talk very long anyway. So, my understanding of the purpose of these bonds is to ensure that, say, I go and I do work for the City of Springfield, right? I go and do work for the City of Springfield. And if I say, oh this isn't working out and I walk away from the job, they cash in the bond, correct?"

Gong-Gershowitz: "Can you repeat the question?"

Davidsmeyer: "So, let's say I do work for the City of Springfield and I decide I'm done with the project and I walk away. The bond is there to protect the City of Springfield, correct? And so, now the City of Springfield can take that money and put it into a new contractor XYZ to come in and do that and that would hopefully cover the cost... the increased cost of whatever they bid above and beyond what my, say, contractor ABC bid. So, I guess I don’t understand what the need or the purpose is for this. Because they're getting that bond amount,
they're getting those bond dollars that they can apply... that they can then apply to the project so they can have a new contractor or whatever. And that new contractor will have to figure out how to fund it. So I don’t understand what you're going at here. And maybe I'm misunderstanding your Bill, but...

Gong-Gershowitz: "This just ensures that they're covered for the rental property as part of the construction project, too."

Davidsmeyer: "But the new contractor that you would have come in and finish the project would have to build that into their cost and that’s the whole purpose of the bond amount is, you're bringing that bond in to cover the additional costs and the additional burden of having somebody else come in to finish the project."

Gong-Gershowitz: "This is more aimed at ensuring that the contractor gets covered for their costs in the rental property more so than the municipality. This is designed at ensuring that contractors don’t get left on the hook for the costs that they’ve already put in to renting that equipment in furtherance of the project."

Davidsmeyer: "So they're going to have to have additional bonding to cover sub-contractors then?"

Gong-Gershowitz: "No, it doesn't affect the bonding that way."

Davidsmeyer: "But if you’re requiring additional things to be covered under the bond then it would have an additional cost, correct?"

Gong-Gershowitz: "No. The current... the current... it already says materials. This just specifies that those materials also include the apparatus and fixtures. It's just... it's a clarifying... it's a clarification that is already in the
Illinois Mechanic's Liens Act. It just mirrors the exact same language that we use in the Illinois Mechanic's Liens Act to clarify what's covered under materials. This doesn’t change it."

Davidsmeyer: "But if it doesn’t change it then it's not needed, correct? I mean, if it's already covered under the Mechanic's Liens Act, can they go back to that to receive the same benefit?"

Gong-Gershowitz: "This just clarifies it to ensure that there's no misunderstanding about what's covered."

Davidsmeyer: "It sounds like it's expanding what's covered. Which if you're expanding, you're actually going to have an increased cost, which is an increased cost of doing business. I don’t think this is needed. I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Further discussion, Representative Weber."

Weber: "Thank you, Mr. Chair. Does the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hoffman: "She indicates she will."

Weber: "So obviously, I had an issue with this in committee. This is something that concerns me because these bonds are issued in many cases to protect taxpayers and not to protect contractors. So, for many rental products that you would use on construction sites, I've rented backhoes that I've used on... like for the whole year on multiple projects. Oftentimes the reason why you can't lien a property before rental equipment is because it's used on multiple properties. So there is a difference between that and material that's used to build a building or a home or anything else because that material is there and it was purchased specifically for that job. On rental equipment, that could be rented and not have
to have even a job specification where it's going on it. And certain structures there is, but in the majority of rental stuff it is not specific to a job. I could have rented a truck to deliver materials to multiple jobs and then the rental company would now be able to go after that bond money. And that's where I have a problem is because I don't know where the... how the taxpayers are going to look at that. When a product is used on a job that is part of that project. But a piece of rental equipment could've been used anywhere. And that's where I have a problem. Is that you're expanding this to something that may have been used on multiple projects, it could've been rented for the entire year. And I think it's an overstep. And, you know, I don’t blame them for wanting to get paid. But who's going to get shorted because of it? That's what my problem is."

Speaker Hoffman: "Was that a question, Representative?"
Speaker Hoffman: "Are you done?"
Weber: "So I just want to know if this... who is this for? Is this for, you know, anything rented on a project? Is it for a specific piece of rental equipment? And how do we guarantee that that rental equipment was used only on that project?"
Gong-Gershowitz: "It's for the contractor to ensure... for the contractor to know what's covered before they rent things for use on that project."
Weber: "So the bonds are not to protect the contractor. The contractor gets the bond to protect the project owner, or the municipality, or the government body, not to protect the contractor. This would allow the contractor to escape from
having to pay those rental fees. That's one thing it would have to do. The... I think this is a bad Bill. I think it's not what's intended on these bonds. I would urge a 'no' vote. You cannot prove where this rental stuff was rented from and how many jobs it was used on. It's just a way for the contractor to get out of paying the bill. Thanks."

Speaker Hoffman: "For further discussion, the Lady from DuPage, Representative Pappas."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "She indicates she will."

Pappas: "Do I understand correctly that when we require a bond the surety bond is there to protect both the government and the sub-contractor in the event that the general contractor does not make appropriate payments?"

Gong-Gershowitz: "That's correct."

Pappas: "Okay. So, in essence, when we have a sub-contractor who loses, let's say, equipment that is a rental as opposed to equipment that they own, that sub-contractor suffers a loss and expects to be compensated for the loss. Is that correct?"

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

Pappas: "And so, by opposing this Bill what we're actually telling these businesses is that they do not deserve to get compensation for the loss of that rented equipment. Is that correct?"

Gong-Gershowitz: "That's right."

Pappas: "Okay. To the Bill. I believe that we should support all businesses in Illinois and that we should support their right to recoup the monies that they invested in contracts and the
work that they performed for the state. And so, I support the 
Bill and I would encourage the Members to vote 'aye'."
Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no further discussion, Representative 
Gong-Gershowitz to close."
Gong-Gershowitz: "Again, I am not aware of any opposition to this 
Bill. This is an initiative by the Chicago Bar Association to 
ensure that public construction bond contracts... the Lien Act 
mirrors the Illinois Mechanic's Lien Act. And I would urge an 
'aye' vote."
Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2722 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is 
open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? 
Have all voted who wished? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On 
this question, there are 73 voting 'aye', 28 voting 'no', 0 
voting 'present'. The Bill, having received the 
Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 
12 of the Calendar, House Bill 2723, Representative Ramirez. 
Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2723, a Bill for an Act concerning 
children. Third Reading of this House Bill."
Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Ramirez."
Ramirez: "Good morning. House Bill 2723 is similar to Senate Bill 
2628 of the 100th Assembly that passed both House and the 
Senate. And I'm reintroducing because it wasn't launched via 
previous administration. House Bill 2723 creates a task force 
on Strengthening the Child Welfare Workforce for Children and 
Families. The task force will study the compensation and 
workload of child welfare workers to evaluate its impact on 
recruitment and retention and how the turnover rate affects
safely and timely permanency of the children. It increases the membership of the task force on the child welfare workforce for children and families and includes two persons from child welfare organizations, their executive director or a chief administrator in the private sector. It also requires the Department of Children and Family Services to provide administrative support to the task force and engage it's department's research center in collecting analysis of the data. This is about making sure that we are evaluating who is taking care of our children through the Department of Family and Children Services and making sure that our children are put at first safety. I ask for a 'yes' vote on House Bill 2723."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Batinick."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Indicates she will."

Batinick: "Representative, quick question for you. Who appoints these two people?"

Ramirez: "The Governor's Office."

Batinick: "Okay. It doesn't say that in the legislation as I'm reading it here on my computer. It just says two people get appointed, doesn't say who appoints them."

Ramirez: "I would ask my chief cosponsor if she's available, if she can help me speak to the Bill. Both of us have been working on this Bill. And so I'd ask her for her support."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Batinick has asked a question so..."

Ramirez: "Could I yield to Representative Feigenholtz?"

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Feigenholtz."
Feigenholtz: "I believe that when the task force was first constituted, that it stated that the Governor's Office would make those appointments."

Batinick: "Okay. Yeah, that sounds fine. Let's... can we say that for legislative intent but maybe when this Bill goes back over to the Senate... this is kind of fun we have a three way conversation going here. Is this your first Bill? This is...

Ramirez: "It is my first Bill and I..."

Batinick: "Would anyone else like to join the cocktail party? So, to the Bill. I understand it's pretty clear if you could... do you have a Senate Sponsor yet, Representative?"

Ramirez: "I do not, but I will make sure that we make that Amendment to add that language."

Batinick: "Yeah, maybe you can... and just clarify that. I'd appreciate it. Thank you very much and congratulations. I think you're going to be green on this."

Ramirez: "Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Ramirez to close."

Ramirez: "We have been hearing across the nation just the impact that we have when our children are under the care of our state. And because of overworked employees, caseworkers are perhaps, for one reason or the other, are unable to manage cases our children end up at some points even dying under our care. I believe that establishing a task force that is well represented, ensuring that our children's safety is at first priority will say something about our children and our impact and our commitment to their safety in the state. So finally, I urge a 'yes' vote to this Bill. House Bill 2723."
Speaker Hoffman: "Thank you, Representative. The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2723 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Conroy. Davidsmeyer. McDermed. Morrison. Have all voted who wished? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 99 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Congratulations, Representative. On House Bill 2729, page 12 of the Calendar, Representative Didech. Out of the record. Page 12 of the Calendar, House Bill 2763, Representative Hurley. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2763, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Hurley."

Hurley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the General Assembly. Today, it's... very a simple Bill. If an eyewitness chooses, a lineup can be videotaped. That's it. I'm here for questions and I appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no discussion, Representative Hurley moves that... the question is 'Shall House Bill 2763 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted you wish? Representative Gordon-Booth. Meyers-Martin. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 101 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Page 12 of the Calendar,
Representative Hurley on House Bill 2764. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2764, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Hurley."

Hurley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish Representative Wehrli was here because it's a Hurley Wehrli Bill. So this simply allows nonhazardous waste and hazardous waste to use different forms when transporting the materials. I'm here for questions and appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2764 pass?' All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Martwick. Have all voted who wished? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 101 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 13 of the Calendar, Representative Welch, House Bill 2800. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2800, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Welch."

Welch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2800 is an initiative of our great Secretary of State, Mr. Jesse White. This is really an omnibus that cleans up a bunch of different Acts. This proposal amends the Secretary of State Act, the General Not For Profit Corporation Act, the Limited Liability Company Act, the Business Corporation Act, the Uniform Partnership Act, and the Uniform Limited Partnership Act. I think that’s
5 Acts that this omnibus Act cleans up. Cleans up definitions and deletes things. I am not aware of any opposition to this Bill. There's no fiscal impact. And we would ask for approval for the Secretary of State's initiative."

Speaker Hoffman: "Any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2800 pass?' All in favor say... vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 101 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Members, we are going to a few Bills that were missed yesterday. We're going now to page 11, House Bill 2154, Representative Feigenholtz. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2154, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2154 is a clarification that a TANF recipient who is also under a service plan at the Department of Children and Family Services is able to count those efforts toward their job search activity. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2154 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Conroy. Mazzochi. Have all voted who wished?

Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 100 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill,
having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Butler, for what reason do you recognize?"

Butler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please let the Journal reflect that Representative Skillicorn is excused for the rest of the day."

Speaker Hoffman: "Shall be so reflected. On page 12 of the Calendar, House Bill 2571, Representative Feigenholtz. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2571, a Bill for an Act concerning minors. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2571 is a Bill that is a DCFS initiative. It is... lays the groundwork for the state to participate in the Family First Prevention Act that was passed by the U.S. Congress in 2018. It will allow us, as we move forward, to use Federal IV-E dollars which will help dramatically for children on the front end. So I'm happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no other discussion, the question... I apologize. Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to take this opportunity to thank the Lady for introducing and passing this legislation. And would you please add me on because for years we had left monies on the table, the IV-E monies. So thank you very much and I appreciate that."

Speaker Hoffman: "Thank you. Seeing no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2571 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted
who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this Bill, there are 100 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On House Bill... on page 13 of the Calendar, House Bill 2836, Representative Welch. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2836, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "On House Bill 2836, Representative Welch."

Welch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2836 is an initiative of our Treasurer, Michael Frerichs. You may recall that last year I ran a Bill that the Treasurer was trying to purchase a facility to bring all of his offices under one roof. That Bill was vetoed by the prior Governor and it actually got a lot of media attention and a local business in Springfield reached out to the Treasurer and said we think we have a great location for you. So it actually worked out better. There is actually a building identified that is a bank building with vaults and things of that nature. And it's perfect for the Treasurer's Office to bring all of his offices under one roof. This Bill would authorize the State Treasurer to acquire the purchase of that property, bring all of his offices under the one roof, and actually in the long term, save the great state a lot of money. I would ask for approval of House Bill 2836."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Butler, for what reason do you rise?"

Butler: "To the Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "To the Bill."
Butler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, I thank you for bringing this forward. And as you can see, I am a chief cosponsor on it. But I do want to bring up some of my concerns that I brought up in committee when we had this Bill. This is a building that some of you may be familiar with that's across the street, across 6th Street from the Old State Capitol. This is a significant piece of property in downtown Springfield that is a... last year's property tax bill for this place was $130 thousand, $80 thousand of which goes to District 186 here in Springfield. So that's a significant hit off the bottom line here in Springfield. And as the Governor has talked about, looking at vacant property across the state and what we do with all the vacant property across the state, I do have a bit of a concern that we're bringing a building on as a state building. Again, I support this Bill. I've urged my colleagues to vote for it, but I do have larger concerns about the fact that we're continuing to add property when we also have surplus property in the state. And also the negative impact to the property taxes to the folks here in Springfield when we're taking a significant chunk off the rolls. Which is... obviously we're proud to be the home of State Government here in Springfield, but we're also negatively impacted by the fact that we have so many state properties and so many nonprofit churches, things like that, that diminish our property tax base here in Springfield. So I do urge an 'aye' vote, but I think as we move forward we need to keep these things in mind on how we can be smarter and better with our state properties. We have vacant properties across the street here. We have the State Armory which is going into disrepair.
We have space... land around this Capitol building to build projects. And I think as we move forward we need to be smarter with this and hopefully not be taking more real estate off the tax rolls in the capital city like we're doing with this. So, again, I thank you for bringing this forward. This is a good location for the Treasurer. It's good for downtown Springfield. And I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no further discussion, Representative Welch to close."

Welch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2836 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 89 voting 'yes', 10 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 13 of the Calendar, House Bill 2838, Representative Gong-Gershowitz. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Out of the record. Out of the record. House Bill 2854, Representative Gabel. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2854, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Gabel."

Gabel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill amends... this Bill actually creates an additional new preference for hiring firefighters. It was an initiative of my fire chief and the Firefighters of Illinois. It has a new preference that for firefighters they can have an apprentice program. And if they
perform 600 hours they will get certain number of points in addition... as a preference. So there's no opposition. The Municipal League wanted me to make it from 'shall' to 'may', I did. And at this point there's no opposition."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2854 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Feigenholtz. Have all voted who wished? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 100 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2860, on page 13 of the Calendar, Representative Robinson. Representative Robinson. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2860, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Robinson."

Robinson: "Thank you. This Bill is from the Secretary of State to make sure that all of the business Acts across the state have the same mandates. For example, if someone wants to go from an LLC to an S corp they can go back and forth within the Act without any issue. There is no opposition on this Bill. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Carroll is recognized."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "He indicates he will."

Carroll: "Is this your first Bill?"

Robinson: "Yes, it is."
Carroll: "Great. So can you tell us a little more about it, please?"

Speaker Hoffman: "The Sponsor yields."

Robinson: "Thank you, Representative Carroll. Again, as a small business owner that has a LLC, I think that the Secretary of State... it's very difficult to go from an S corp to an LLC. And so what this does is make this possibility accessible without any issue. There's also no fee to the state. So basically this just cleans it up and makes it easy, again, to go from one business entity to the next."

Carroll: "So what's the difference between an S corp, a C corp, can you help us all in here? I'm just kidding. Congratulations. Great Bill."

Robinson: "Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2860 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. This Bill having received this question, 100 'ayes', 0 'nays', 0 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Congratulations, Representative. Page 13 of the Calendar, House Bill 2884, Representative Guzzardi. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2884, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "On the Bill, Representative Guzzardi."

Guzzardi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Members. Representative Batinick, you'll be pleased to know this Bill
actually is technical cleanup language simply removing outdated provisions in the statute. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2884 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Frese. Mah. Morrison. Unes. Have all voted who wished? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 94 voting 'yes', 4 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Davis, on page 13 of the Calendar, House Bill 2931. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2931, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. This is a TIF extension Bill for the Village of Phoenix, a community in my district. All the requisite support letters have been provided, which is why this Bill is on the floor. So I'd be more than happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2931 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Ammons. Wheeler. Have all voted who wished? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 91 voting 'yes', 7 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Davis on House Bill 2937. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2937, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Davis."

Davis: "Thank you very much... thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2937 is an initiative of the Budgeting for Results Commission, a commission that I've been a part of since its inception. Now in its third Governor's administration and this is kind of an omnibus funds cleanup Bill. So what we are seeking to do here is... and we reached out to all the state agencies and asked them to provide us with information relative to any funds that were put in place by statute that are no longer in use or never appropriated over long periods of time. And to get rid of those... cleanup those... their various issues and their statutes, particularly to elevate audit findings for many of these state agencies. This is one of our omnibus Bills that covers a number of funds. I'd be more than happy to try to answer any questions."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2937 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Walker. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 100 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative, the Chair inadvertently skipped House Bill 2936, Representative Davis. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2936, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Third Reading of this House Bill."
Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Davis."

Davis: "Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. This also is an initiative of the Budgeting for Results Commission to kind of clean up and codify a current practice with regard to how whistle blower funds are distributed evenly into two particular funds administered by the Attorney General's Office and the State Police. Be more than happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2936 pass?' All in favor say 'aye'... vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Hurley. Have all voted who wished? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 100 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the order of Davis, House Bill 2943. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2943, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Davis."

Davis: "Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Yet another initiative of the Budgeting for Results Commission. This is revolving... this is attempting to codify how funds are distributed through IDOT for the EPA to pay for emission services or the emission process that we have in two different counties. In Cook and in the Metro East area, I believe that might be St. Clair County, I'm not sure. But this is an effort to codify how that money flows. I'd be more than happy to answer any questions."
Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2943 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 79 voting 'yes', 21 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2968, Representative Davis. Out of the record. Going to page 14 of the Calendar, House Bill 2975, Representative Evans. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2975, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Evans."

Evans: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and the great Members of the Assembly. This Bill amends the Employment Contract Act by eliminating the requirement for a statutory... excuse me, for a waiver of statutory rights as a condition of employment. This is a great worker protection Bill. I request your support."

Speaker Hoffman: "Any discussion on House Bill 2975? Seeing no discussion, the question is shall... Representative Batinick."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Indicates he will."

Batinick: "Representative, I didn’t hear... couldn't hear you clearly say what this eliminates in the..."

Evans: "Yeah, because it's not a very... it’s a short Bill. It eliminates the requirement for a waiver of statutory rights"
as a condition of employment. So it does not eliminate the waiver. It's just as a condition of employment."
Batinick: "Got it. IMA, Chamber, and CPA Society are all opposed. What's the reason for their opposition?"
Evans: "I'm not sure. I mean we passed this out of committee. I think people are just concerned about how it could potentially play out, but it's a worker protection legislation. You got to make a decision, I believe, whether or not you support or you don’t support it."
Batinick: "Okay, so you don’t know what the opposition purpose was. Let me ask you this, can you come up with an example of the type of statutory... what gets waived sometimes by..."
Evans: "Yeah, for sure. Again, we're not eliminating the waiver. An employee, an employer can still get a determination of whether or not they want to waive these rights, but it's really about whether or not it's required for employment. It's something that should be negotiated between the employee and employer, not a requirement to get a job. Some companies do this. Some larger employers do it here or there, but it's not a large issue. It's really just a worker protection issue. Real reputable companies don’t participate in this practice, but we want to make sure workers aren’t taken advantage of."
Batinick: "Thank you, Representative. I'm going to listen to the rest of the debate."
Evans: "Thanks."
Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Ford. Representative Mazzochi."
Mazzochi: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Hoffman: "He indicates he will."
Mazzochi: "All right. One of the issues that was brought up in opposition is that the... this may very well be yet another case that's... that is preempted by the Federal Arbitration Act. Did you ever get any analysis done as to whether the Federal Arbitration Act would apply such that this statute would get struck down?"

Evans: "I don't recall that coming up in committee, but if that's the case then we can address that at the appropriate time."

Mazzochi: "Well what does that mean?"

Evans: "I don't believe so. We've passed this in committee. I don't remember that question ever coming up. You were there so... you didn't ask the question then."

Mazzochi: "I asked one of the questions, so there you go."

Evans: "I'm really not... I can't answer that question. I don't believe so. But the Federal Government... Federal Law preempts State Law so that will be the case if that's so. So you kind of know the answer to the question."

Mazzochi: "All right. To the Bill. I, in fact, I spoke... not only did I raise this issue as to whether this would create an issue under the Federal Arbitration Act, the person who testified at the Labor Committee, who is a proponent of the Act, recognized that very issue and that this may come up. He suggested that I read a Supreme Court decision from the State of Kentucky that actually held that this possibly could be acceptable notwithstanding the Federal Arbitration Act. And unfortunately, the problem is, is that the particular issue for that litigant in that case was it was somebody who is associated with a state entity. So when it comes to private sector entities, which is exactly what you're trying to get
at here, I think that this is going to wind up preempted by the Federal Arbitration Act. I don’t see the reason for Illinois to be the test case on this particular issue. So for that reason I encourage a 'nay' vote because this simply hasn’t been adopted by any other states and it's likely to add to more litigation in the State of Illinois. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no further discussion, Representative Evans to close."

Evans: "Thank you for your support."

Speaker Hoffman: "Thank you for the close. The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2975 pass?' All in favor say 'aye'... or vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Brady. On this question, there are... Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 66 voting 'yes', 34 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2983, Representative Slaughter. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2983, a Bill for an Act concerning homeless youth. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Slaughter."

Slaughter: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 2983 creates a task force for us to continue to help our homeless youth population. Currently, we do not have accurate data on our youth who leave our state systems and experience homelessness. These systems can include DCFS, DJJ, DOC, and our mental health facilities. What we do know is our homeless youth are adversely disproportionally impacted by mental
health issues, chemical dependency, criminal justice interaction, and underemployment. House Bill 2983 creates a youth homeless prevention task force within the Governor's Cabinet on Children and Youth that will put together a host of stakeholders to review discharge planning and service plans, create a framework to improve discharge policies, and lastly, create and put forth recommendations that will ensure future housing stability for our youth. This legislation has no cost attached to it. I urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2983 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Tarver. Flowers. Have all voted who wished? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 100 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2987, Representative Davis. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2987, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Davis."

Davis: "Speaker, we don’t have to adopt the Amendment do we? Is that already done?"

Speaker Hoffman: "This is on Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, has an Amendment been adopted?"

Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #1 was adopted previously."

Speaker Hoffman: "Please proceed."

Davis: "Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. House Bill 2987 is kind of a repeat from previous Session where we created a
disabilities... a task force to address issues involving individuals with disabilities as they intersect the criminal justice system. The Amendment was to add a space for that for organizations that independently monitor correction facilities. Outside of that it's the same Bill that we had last year. We extended the date a little bit to make sure we don't run into the same issues as previously. And I'll be more than happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hoffman: "Any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2987 pass?' All in favor say 'aye'... all opposed vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? On this question... Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 100 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On House Bill 2992, page 14 of the Calendar, Representative Thapedi. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2992, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Thapedi."

Thapedi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2992 is the collaborative effort of the Secretary of State's Office and the Illinois Commerce Commission to ensure that entities that are regulated by the ICC are properly engaging in business activities. The Bill makes clear that the Secretary of State's Office will maintain such information for such entities regulated by the Collateral Recovery Act, which are repossession companies, the Personal Property Storage Act,
which are storage companies, and relevant provisions of the Vehicle Code 18(a), (c), and (d) which are towing companies. The Secretary of State will also keep the ICC advised monthly of any status changes of these entities be they dissolutions or revocations. The information can be shared electronically. There is no known opposition. I'm available to answer any and all questions."

Speaker Hoffman: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2992 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 98 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On House Bill 2993, Representative Davidsmeyer. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2993, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Davidsmeyer."

Davidsmeyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill just simply takes the expansion of libraries, it says, instead of a back door referendum if they expand... instead of a back door referendum to get out, it would require a front door referendum. So it would go to the people and ask them if they would want to join. I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2993 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Greenwood. Have all voted who wished?
Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 97 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3039, page 14 of the Calendar, Representative Unes. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk.

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3039, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Unes."

Unes: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3039 very simply says that if HFS is terminating benefits that that determination to terminate those benefits shall be sent to the long term care facility where the individual resides. I know of no opponents and I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3039 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Crespo. Hernandez. Rita, Rita. Have all voted who wished? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 100 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3040, Representative Unes. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3040, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Unes."

Unes: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. 3040 is very similar to the last Bill we did. This one just simply says that the redetermination of eligibility should be sent both to the individual... where the individual resides as well as the
individual. I know of no opponents and I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no one seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3040 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Representative Flowers. Gordon-Booth. Have all voted who wished? On this question, there are 100 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3061, Representative Slaughter. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3061, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Slaughter."

Slaughter: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 3061 amends the Health Care Worker Background Check Act. So individuals with disqualifying convictions can obtain the health care worker waiver before they receive a job offer. In House Bill 3061 this Act is amended to allow workforce intermediaries and organizations providing pro bono legal services to initiate a fingerprint-based background check before a conditional job offer has been made and in the case where this background check has not been previously conducted. The Bill also clarifies current law and policy on the types of workforce intermediaries and organizations providing pro bono legal services that have access to the health care worker registry. I urge a 'yes' vote. Entertain any questions. Thank you."
Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3061 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Mazzochi. McCombie. Unes. Have all voted who wished? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this Bill, there are 66 voting 'yes', 32 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On House Bill 3065, Representative Bryant. Out of the record. Representative Lilly on House Bill 3088. Representative Lilly. Camille. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3088, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Lilly."

Lilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. HB3088 is a piece of legislation that passed out of House in the 100th General Assembly. And it really affects the issues related to how we structure bonuses within the state. It is important to know that the bonus structures is very challenging for taxpayers. We have minimum resources to do the business of the people and then the structure it compensates and puts stress on the state programs. This particular piece of legislations allows you to have a bonus structure, but does not permit you to use taxpaying dollars. We understand the creativities as you work with your team, however, the taxpayers cannot afford to pay additional costs on top of regular compensation. So we hoping that a bonus structure that requires transparency and monitoring, which is something that is not existing in these programs as of today, we are
bringing, what we call, budgeting for outcomes into line with what is available to, we here, in the General Assembly. I'm asking that you support this Bill because it does save the taxpayer resources. This ideal came to me through a budgeting rally that a constituent put forth. I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Is there any discussion? Representative Batinick."

Batinick: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, there is discussion. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hoffman: "She indicates she will."

Batinick: "Representative, can you speak to the Illinois Health and Hospital Association... their opposition?"

Lilly: "Yes. They were going to work with us to try to put forth some legislation or some words that makes it better. They have not gotten back to me yet."

Batinick: "Okay. Some of our concern, maybe you can speak to it, is we talk over, and over, and over in this Body about getting the best and most competent people in the state. I think we'll probably have some of our other Members on our side of the aisle here talk about the Executive Office wanting to do that. The idea that we're going to take away incentives for doing good work is pretty troubling to this side. How would you respond to me? Do we not want to get the best? Do we not want to give bonuses to the best? Do we not want to have a reward structure, as opposed to just being paid for hanging around or being here for a long time? Isn't the idea that you want to give an opportunity to people that do good things to get a bonus?"
Lilly: "Thank you, Representative, for that statement. I'd like to restate this particular Act does not prohibit you from having a bonus structure. It prohibits you from using taxpayer dollars towards that bonus structure. We wish that you put forth what is needed, but also note that the citizens of Illinois are struggling daily with trying to meet their tax obligations and responsibility. And then to ask the taxpayer to pay twice toward a bonus structure that is not monitored, that does not create transparency, that does not afford every employee in the state to have that opportunity, they are concerned. As I mentioned, we did a budgeting rally in our... in the district of the 78th District and this was one of the constituent's idea who said, we can no longer afford to pay people twice. And not knowing how that bonus structure can be equitable across the board. So you can have a bonus structure, but you cannot use taxpaying dollars for implementation."

Batinick: "So, I mean... I use a bonus structure in my business and the bonuses don't cost me money, the bonuses make me money. It's an incentive to give people an opportunity to do work more efficiently. And I can definitely say efficiency is something that we need in this state. It's... when used properly it doesn't cost the taxpayer money, it saves the taxpayer money. I'm going to listen to the rest of the debate, but at this point I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Demmer."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "She indicates she will."

Demmer: "Representative Lilly, we... I believe you offered this Bill previously. Can you tell us what's different from the
version that you offered this year versus what the House, or at least at committee, considered in a previous year?"

Lilly: "Nothing. It's the exact same. We did ask for how to make it a better Bill. I have not received that information yet."

Demmer: "Under the terms of your Bill, would an employee of the state be eligible to receive a bonus from... contingent on their employment, receive a bonus from an entity other than the state?"

Lilly: "Can you repeat?"

Demmer: "Would a state employee be eligible to receive a bonus as a part of their employment from an entity other than the state?"

Lilly: "I believe so. This particular piece of legislation is just prohibiting it from taxpayer dollars. So, yes."

Demmer: "Do you believe that if a Bill like this were to pass that it would be more likely that private entities may make bonus payments to state employees as a part of their employment to the state because the state was limited from doing so? Would it make it more likely for that to happen?"

Lilly: "I can't guess, but if anyone wants to help the state, I receive that help."

Demmer: "Are you aware of any bonuses that are paid today to state employees by someone other than the State of Illinois?"

Lilly: "No."

Demmer: "I am. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Ugaste."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Indicates she will."
Ugaste: "While I'm all for saving the taxpayers' money, I'm worried about an unintended consequence. If we stop state hospitals from paying bonuses, wouldn't we then have to pay the employee more money to begin with? In form of a salary? Guarantee them that money in order to possible attract them to work at one of our state institutions?"

Lilly: "I don't believe so, Representative."

Ugaste: "Well, if we don’t need the bonuses at all, are you suggesting then that these state hospitals are just wasting money and handing out bonuses where they’re not warranted?"

Lilly: "Representative, what is very clear to me is many bonus structures do not have transparencies, they are not monitored, and they do not share parity and equity across the board. So that is the existing operations or tradition. However, a hospital and any other business who want to do bonus structure, I would ask that they put those pieces in place, meaning transparency and monitoring, and that they could do it they just cannot use taxpayers dollars."

Ugaste: "Okay. To the Bill. I would suggest that we are going to have an unintended consequence here that in order to get some of the best people to come to these institutions to help our people, we are going to now have to start promising higher salaries with unknown performance results. To where if we wait and use a bonus structure we can then reward good work and good conduct at our facilities through a bonus and pay less in a salary. So I would urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Reick."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "She indicates she will."
Reick: "Representative, got a question for you. Does this... this Bill, you say, does not apply to people who are subject to a collective bargaining agreement. Is that correct?"

Lilly: "Yes."

Reick: "So it would be just management people? Or anybody who's not subject to a collective bargaining agreement?"

Lilly: "That is correct."

Reick: "Okay. Aside from the fact that money is a fungible commodity and it's hard to determine what money actual came from the state and which didn't, I have a problem with another one. Way back in the early part of this century we had a Governor named Rod Blagojevich who had a... who had the bright idea of treating people subject to a CBA a lot better than management people in State Government. Resulting in, the unionization of our management people in State Government. Hence, everybody is now covered by a CBA. I see a possibility here where that may happen in the hospital industry as well. And therefore, these CBA agreements could drive up the cost of health care even beyond what the merit pay provisions provide."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative, is that a question?"

Reick: "I'm sorry. That was... how do you address that situation, Representative?"

Lilly: "Representative, I believe that's your opinion and I think that's okay. What we're trying to do with this type of legislation is to make sure that we're using the taxpayer dollars in the best form possible because they struggle to pay their taxes each and every day. And what we do know is the bonus structure that exists within some of the
organization and corporation within the departments here, the state is not being monitored. They don't have no monitoring. There's no transparency and it does not breed parity among all employment opportunities here. If you are the previous Representative who stated about bringing people to... the best people to Illinois to work in the state agency we're paying bonuses, is that for every single job? Can we afford to pay bonuses for every single job that the state offers? I don't believe we can. But how do you pick which jobs get bonuses and which do not? And there's nothing written anywhere to say how we are spending the taxpayer dollars in this bonus structure matters. The State of Illinois citizens cannot afford a nontransparent, nonequitable process to any department here in the state. However, I think we have talented people who can figure out how we can identify other resources other than taxpaying dollars to create a bonus structure that you think is going to benefit the State of Illinois and we welcome that."

Reick: "Okay, that's fine, but I have a question for you. How are we going to administer the... this thing so that we know that state money is not being used for bonuses and it's coming out of some other form of revenue of the hospital? Have you thought about how this is going to be administered?"

Lilly: "As far as... I'm sorry."

Reick: "Well, they're free to pay bonuses as long as it doesn't come out of state money or taxpayer money. How are you going to distinguish between the two? What provisions have you put in this Bill to allow us to say, oh that's taxpayer dollars and that can't be used for a bonus, but that's money that was
collected through private insurance or some other means and therefore they can pay their bonuses out of that? How do you administer that? How do you... how do you maintain transparency on a fungible commodity?"

Lilly: "Okay, Representative. This particular piece of legislation prohibits any taxpayer dollars towards bonuses. That's what this Bill does. And that is all."

Reick: "To the Bill.

Speaker Hoffman: "To the Bill."

Reick: "I think that the question was answered very plainly by the fact that the Sponsor does not know how she's going to maintain transparency in this Bill. I urge... strongly urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Davidsmeyer is recognized."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "She indicates she will."

Davidsmeyer: "So why do you specifically single out hospitals?"

Lilly: "That's not just hospitals. It's other entities, state departments, state agencies, universities, all of those areas. State agencies and state universities."

Davidsmeyer: "Does this affect contractors doing business with the State of Illinois?"

Lilly: "It can."

Davidsmeyer: "So let's say..."

Lilly: "I don’t know all how... we struggle with how people do business with the State of Illinois across the board. So I can't answer that question, but I'm hoping that we can get to the answer of that question."
Davidsmeyer: "But... I mean, I think we need the answer to that question before we vote on this. You know, let's say contractor XYZ does a project for the State of Illinois. Their employees are working hard. They finish it, you know, efficiently and, you know, on time. In fact, they finish it early and under budget. Can they give their employees bonuses?"

Lilly: "Let me say this, can the citizens of Illinois afford to pay someone twice and three times of a job that they already paid for?"

Davidsmeyer: "That's not my question."

Lilly: "That's my question."

Davidsmeyer: "That's not my question."

Lilly: "But that's mine."

Davidsmeyer: "So, let's say... no, here's... I'll give you a scenario. Let's say contractor XYZ bids a project, they're the low bidder, they get awarded the contract, and it's a $100 thousand project. Right? They come in, they do the work, you know, they finish under budget. The state has to pay them $100 thousand because that was the bid amount. Can that contractor then give some of the profit from the company, which the company would receive, can they then give that to their employees?"

Lilly: "Representative, what is clear, and I think you understand this, what we are currently doing now with that scenario, you cannot follow the transparence of its implementation. You cannot follow how it's being operated and implemented and monitored. So even if that is being done, and let's say it is, the taxpayer dollars you cannot clearly understand if
this is how they're being utilized. And the parity from one contract to the other. Our current system is flawed and the taxpayer cannot afford it."

Davidsmeyer: "So, to the Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "To the Bill."

Davidsmeyer: "What I was just talking about, apparently the... this Bill does not affect private businesses doing business with the State of Illinois. So apparently the Bill actually singles that out. So the answer is actually no, it does not affect them. But I think the State of Illinois needs to do everything they can to encourage people who go above and beyond. We've got some great state employees that do the work above and beyond. I know some that do the work of three and four people at some times. And I think that we should be able to encourage those people to work hard, do more with less, and that's what this bonus structure allows that the normal contract would not allow. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Thank you. We certainly want to encourage healthy debate, however, it is Friday and we get to go home. So we're going to institute the four minute timer. Representative Willis."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "She indicates she will."

Willis: "Representative, in this Bill what you're really trying to do... and I want to double check on this because I think we're getting off track of what the intent is. When you're working for a state agency or a hospital, you have a set salary, correct?"

Lilly: "That is correct."
Willis: "You're not a commission worker, right?"
Lilly: "This is correct."
Willis: "So, you know going into the job what your expectations are and I'm assuming that you have a job description also, correct?"
Lilly: "That is correct."
Willis: "And so, what we're saying is when we're paying people with state funding and state money, you should not be rewarded additionally for just doing your job."
Lilly: "That is correct."
Willis: "Right. And then so... then to the Bill. I don't understand why we're going round and around in circles on this. Each one of us comes into work here every day. We know what our pay is. We know what we're getting paid for because we're doing it. We do not get a bonus. We are expected to come in and do our job to the best of our ability. And every single person in this room, no matter what side of the aisle you're on, you are doing your job to the best of your ability knowing what you're going to do and how you're going to do it. Our reward is getting reelected by our constituents. There is no financial gain to that. And that is why I understand what the Representative is trying to do here. We need to do this, continue when we're spending state money, this is your job, this is your expectation, and your reward is feeling that you're doing a good job and making a difference in the world. I totally support this and I hope that everybody would see it to that way and I urge an 'aye' vote."
Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Ammons is recognized."
Ammons: "Thank you, Leader. I will be very respectful of time. Will the Sponsor yield for one brief question?"
Speaker Hoffman: "She indicates she will."
Ammons: "Representative Lilly, is it your intention to make this a transparent process for a bonus structure that currently exists?"
Lilly: "Correct."
Ammons: "Thank you. To the Bill. This is an excellent Bill. My Bill would've been certainly eliminating bonus structures all together because I don’t believe people who are paid by the state should also be getting a bonus structure and it is not across the board. I urge an 'aye' vote."
Speaker Hoffman: "Two more speakers. Representative McCombie then Representative Butler. Representative McCombie."
McCombie: "Thank you. I'd like to yield my time to Representative Davidsmeyer."
Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Davidsmeyer, four minutes."
Davidsmeyer: "I'm going to be brief. So I'm going back, I may have made a misstatement. This actually could cover contractors, from my understanding. What is your interpretation? So if a contractor comes in and does work for the State of Illinois, does this allow them to share their profits by giving a bonus to their employees? So if a contractor does well for the year and they do state contracts, does this allow them to share their profits with their employees?"
Lilly: "Profits is more than likely in a for profit business, it's not taxpayer dollars."
Davidsmeyer: "But they're doing work for the State of Illinois or something like that. Let's say road construction 'cause it's easy, right? If they do work for the State of Illinois and that is their sole business, they only work for the State of Illinois, can they give a bonus to their employees?"

Lilly: "Representative, when a business, whether it's contractual or not, they will understand what profit means to their organization or their business. So profit tends to not be taxpayer dollars."

Davidsmeyer: "No, it came from... specifically came from taxpayer dollars. You're saying taxpayer dollars cannot be used for this, but if they bid a job and its $100 thousand and they, let's say, they are super-efficient and they make... 20 thousand of that's profit. Can they share that with their employees under your Bill? I don’t believe it allows them to do that. So you're taking companies who would otherwise share their profits with their employees and telling them they cannot do that. You're saying a private company cannot share profits with their employees. Don’t you think that's good for employees to be able to share in that profit?"

Lilly: "Representative, I'm not saying companies cannot share their profit with their employees. What I'm saying is..."

Davidsmeyer: "That's what this Bill does. If they do work for the State of Illinois, it does."

Lilly: "That is not what this Bill does. When a company who is doing... a successful company is doing good by their employees and they have a bonus structure in place that addresses the profits, they can do... I would ask, that they do that. However, this Bill here says you cannot use taxpayer dollars for the
bonus structure. And that's it. But they can have a bonus structure. Now the question is, and would you know, does this company have bonus structure that is transparent, that has parity, that dictates that all of the profits that helps all of their employees? And if they have that, they are awesome."

Davidsmeyer: "But you're still... I mean, this is a disincentive for a private company to share profits with their employees. If they do work with the State of Illinois or other taxpayer dollars."

Lilly: "I don't agree with you. I don’t agree with you. I respect your comments and thank you, Representative. I just don’t agree with you."

Davidsmeyer: "I just want the Body to understand that this is a deterrent to private businesses providing... sharing their profits with their workforce, with their individuals. So if you're voting for this, you're voting against a private company sharing their profits because of the hard work of their employees, you're voting for not sharing these profits with their employees."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Butler is recognized."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Indicates she will."

Butler: "Thank you, Sir. Representative, would you consider the legislative stipends that some Members of this Body receive for the work as Leadership or Committee Chairman as bonuses? For the work that they do?"

Lilly: "No."
Butler: "No? I think I kind of would actually. That's a nice little $10 thousand bonus that some Members of this Body get that other Members don't."
Lilly: "It's a reimbursement for travel expenses."
Butler: "Hold on. Hold on. So the Leadership stipend is a reimbursement for travel expenses?"
Lilly: "It's a stipend not a bonus."
Butler: "But it's for your travel expenses?"
Lilly: "It's a stipend not a bonus."
Butler: "That's why you get $111 a day for per diem, which I have opted out of."
Lilly: "It's a stipend."
Butler: "It’s a stipend, not a bonus. Okay. Stipend, not a bonus. Do you have... is there a position from the Department of Revenue on this Bill?"
Lilly: "I have no information on that, Representative."
Butler: "Well, as I looked up the vote from last year, which you indicated this was the same Bill from last year, I noticed that the current Director of the Department of Revenue voted 'no' on this Bill. So obviously the Department of Revenue must not like this Bill since the director voted against it."
Lilly: "Not as of today."
Butler: "So this... as I read this, no state agency or hospital shall pay from state funds, in whole or in part, and no employee of a state agency or hospital may receive a bonus as all or part of his or her compensation. So I just... I kind of want to understand this... some of the questions. So if you're a hospital... which I worked at a hospital, you worked at a hospital... and you receive state dollars, you're not eligible..."
for a bonus. You're not eligible for Christmas bonus. You're not eligible for a performance bonus. You're not eligible for a bonus period."

Lilly: "It cannot come from the tax dollars."
Butler: "Okay."
Lilly: "However, you can create a bonus structure, but it cannot be paid for taxpayer dollars."
Butler: "Okay, so when St. John's Hospital down the street here, gets money from the State of Illinois and it goes into their account, how do you determine that that State of Illinois dollar is different from the other dollars that they have in their big checking account?"
Lilly: "This is a transparency piece of legislation. Everything needs to be transparent with the taxpayer dollars and currently we do not take the time or the energy to do just that. Please note that this is not a deterrent because they can have a bonus structure, they just cannot use taxpayer dollars. And if the transparency is not clear where the dollars are from, going from, and who they're coming to and all that, then there's a problem there."
Butler: "Okay. But to my question, how does the hospital determine which dollar is which? To determine whether or not they can or cannot maybe possibly give a bonus?"
Lilly: "I'm hoping that those types of hospital understand that their dollars are segregated, they know what's coming from the feds or coming from the state. I'm hoping that's the case."
Butler: "Well, we don't..."
Lilly: "That is the case. I'm hearing. So I don't know..."
Butler: "Hope ain't an answer here, I think."
Lilly: "I believe that is the case. You creating another case that's a little challenging for me, but I believe they do know that. They already know that."
Butler: "But you don’t know if they do know?"
Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Butler..."
Lilly: "Yes, they do know..."
Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Butler, please bring your remarks to a close."
Lilly: "...I'm hoping."
Butler: "To the Bill."
Speaker Hoffman: "To the Bill."
Butler: "This is a bad Bill. This will prevent hospitals from giving bonuses. And I would urge a 'no' vote."
Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Andrade."
Andrade: "Thank you, Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Hoffman: "She indicates she will."
Andrade: "So, I just called IDOT and they're checking for me, but I might be mistaken, but I just wanted to ask a question. Now, I believe that IDOT, in their contracts, might give bonuses to a company if they finish on time or if they finish early. Would this prohibit IDOT to include in their contract a bonus for early completion or on time completion?"
Lilly: "Yes."
Andrade: "So IDOT would not be able to give a bonus to the company for completing on time or finishing early?"
Lilly: "They can... they cannot use taxpayer dollars to do that. If they identify resources outside of taxpayer dollars, they can. Taxpayer dollars needs to have transparency, has
monitoring, has parity. And it's very important that we send that message to the...

Andrade: "So I just got an answer from IDOT. 'Yes, we do in some of our contracts offer incentives for early completion. We also have penalties if they are late.'"

Lilly: "That's good."

Andrade: "I mean... in the construction industry this is something extremely... in that industry I think... I understand maybe also, but I think the state agency... every state agency... I mean, these bonuses are... so for legislative intent, is an incentive the same as a bonus? So if IDOT calls it an incentive not a bonus, would then... would they be allowed to include it in their contracts for early completion or on time completion?"

Lilly: "Representative, it is clear that IDOT and a number of other departments, they do not have transparency. They do not monitor. They do not have parity with their contracts and how they implement whatever it is that they're doing. And the people are... the people of Illinois are concerned on top of paying more for whatever the services may be. This is a Bill that does not deter a bonus structure. What it does is create transparency of the taxpayer dollars. Something that we do not have at this time, in the eyes of the people of Illinois."

Andrade: "Okay. I just wanted just a clarification that this would prohibit any incentives for companies... at IDOT. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Wheeler."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "She indicates she will."

Wheeler: "Representative, you've said multiple times in this discussion so far that people can still receive bonuses as
long as the money is not state funds. Is that... did I hear you correctly?"
Lilly: "Taxpayer dollars. That's correct."
Wheeler: "Taxpayer dollars. Okay, well I'm actually gonna read the language of the Bill to you. In Section 10, this is very short, 'No state agency or hospital shall pay from state funds, in whole or in part, and no employee of a state agency or hospital may receive a bonus'... there's no qualification...' as all or part, including work on capital projects. I read that to mean nobody can receive a bonus. That's it."
Lilly: "If you..."
Wheeler: "Taxpayer money or otherwise."
Lilly: "You have to read... it would be a good idea to read the whole Bill. And I can restate it over and over again..."
Wheeler: "Well I'm reading the Bill over and over again. I'm trying to find out what you mean."
Lilly: "But the whole Bill... it takes the whole Bill to understand the Bill."
Wheeler: "Okay, what you say on the floor, if it doesn't reflect what's in the Bill, we vote on what's in the Bill. So, I'm trying to figure out what's in the Bill based on what I'm reading here. And the way I read this it effectively says, 'and no employee of a state agency'. This 'and' is very important."
Lilly: "But like I said, Representative, respectfully, it's the whole Bill that we need to read so that you can get a better understanding."
Wheeler: "Okay, well, I'm just going to point to the fact to everybody that you are voting on a Bill that is written not
spoken. And this Bill says that nobody can get a bonus if you work for a state agency or hospital. So consequently, as you choose to vote this switch, please take into account the fact that you're telling that no employee of a state agency or hospital may receive a bonus. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Thapedi."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Indicates she will."

Thapedi: "Representative Lilly, is it possible to differentiate the pots of money at the hospitals with respect to what's state dollars and what are other dollars?"

Lilly: "Hospitals already do that."

Thapedi: "Oh, so they already do that. So it's not as if hospitals are in a precarious situation where they cannot make the determination as to what's state dollars, which would be barred from using to provide bonuses for... versus what are not state dollars that they can use for bonuses, correct?"

Lilly: "Correct."

Thapedi: "All right. And is this Bill actually cosponsored by the entire Black Caucus?"

Lilly: "It is."

Thapedi: "Thank you. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3088 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Feigenholtz. Harris. Have all voted who wished? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 57 voting 'yes', 37 voting 'no', 4 voting
'present'. This Bill... Representative Lilly, for what reason do you rise?

Lilly: "Can I place this on Postponed Consideration?"

Speaker Hoffman: "The Bill is place on Postponed Consideration. On page 14 of the Calendar, moving onto House Bill 3105, Representative Edly-A llen. Out of the record. House Bill 3115, Representative Mussman. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3115, a Bill for an Act concerning persons with disabilities. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Mussman."

Mussman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the committee... or the House. This is an initiative of The Arc of Illinois in recognition of the fact that individuals with disabilities in our community are underemployed and unemployed at significantly high rates. And we know they want to be and need to be self-sufficient, meaningfully employed members of our society. And we believe the State of Illinois should play a role and be a role model in more inclusive hiring practices. So this Bill creates the Customized Employment for Individuals with Disabilities Act to create a five year pilot program within the Division of Rehabilitation Services and in partnership with a local community-based agencies. The department believes they can do this with no additional funding and there is no opposition to the Bill. I'm happy to answer any questions and appreciate your support."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Harris is recognized for excused absences."

Harris: "Mr. Speaker, let the record reflect that Representative Moylan is excused for the rest of today."
Speaker Hoffman: "The record will so reflect. Is there any discussion on House Bill 3115? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3115 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 98 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 14 of the Calendar, House Bill 3115 just was done. On page 14 of the Calendar, House Bill 3137, Representative Halbrook. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3137, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Halbrook."

Halbrook: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill amends the Public Officer Prohibited Activities Act by simply adding president and mayor to the already aldermen and trustees that they cannot be appointed to a compensated position in their municipality or a body of government. I urge a 'yes' vote, please. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3137 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Burke. McDermed. Have all voted who wished? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 98 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3141, Representative Halbrook. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3141, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Halbrook."

Halbrook: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This just solves a problem in the Township Code when there's a vacancy in a township supervisor that the trustees can appoint a temporary supervisor for the... to do the ministerial functions of that office. I know of no opposition and urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no discussion on House Bill 3141, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3141 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Mah. West. Representative West. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 98 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 14 of the Calendar, House Bill 3216, Representative Kifowit. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3216, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Kifowit."

Kifowit: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is an initiative of the Secretary of State's Office to streamline the identification of veterans on their driver's license."

Speaker Hoffman: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, Representative... the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3216 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Representative Carroll."
Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 99 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Moving to page 15 of the Calendar, House Bill 3217, Representative Mah. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk.

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3217, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Mah."

Mah: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Body. This Bill simply creates the Asian American Family Commission. This commission would advise the Governor, General Assembly, and state agencies on policies affecting the State's Asian American communities. The population makes up more than five percent of the state population and was the fastest growing demographic according to the last census. Such a commission would create a resource that would put it on par with existing African American Family Commission and the Latino Family Commission. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Any discussion on House Bill 3217? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3217 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Davidsmeyer, Morrison, you wish to be recorded? Have all voted who wished? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 97 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Page 15 of the Calendar, House Bill 3244, Representative Demmer. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3244, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Demmer."

Demmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3244 allows that counties who have chosen to implement a school facility tax, made by referendum with approval of the voters, use a portion of those funds to hire a school resource officer or a mental health professional. Know of no opposition. Ask for your support."

Speaker Hoffman: "Any discussion on House Bill 3244? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3244 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Evans. Have all voted who wished? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 98 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3265, Representative Charlie Meier. Out of the record. Representative Crespo, for what reason do you seek recognition? He didn't mean to. House Bill 3269, Representative Walsh. Representative Walsh. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3269, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Please proceed."

Walsh: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You're quite comical this morning. 3269 is a Bill for the Secretary of State. It's their 2019 vehicle omnibus Bill. Does many changes dealing with license plating and permitting for dealerships and dealer licensing."
It's an agreed to Bill and I'm happy to answer any question. Ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3269 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Scherer. Mazzochi. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 99 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 15 of the Calendar, House Bill 3274, Representative Ugaste. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3274, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Please proceed."

Ugaste: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 3274 is designed to help our senior citizens. It requires the Department of Aging, Department of Human Services, and the Department of Health Care and Family Services to compile a list of all programs in the state that are unique to our senior citizens. Compile one list... or send them to the Department of Aging to compile one list, give a brief description, eligibility requirements, and how to apply for this. All three departments would then post them on their website and the Department of Aging would print the list and place it in each Secretary of State office. I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "On this Bill, Representative Batinick seeks recognition. We will impose a four minute time limit. Please proceed."
Batinick: "You can impose a one minute time limit, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hoffman: "Indicates he will."

Batinick: "Representative, is this your first Bill?"

Ugaste: "It is my first Bill."

Batinick: "You are extremely lucky that it's 11:45 on a Friday, in which I told my wife I'd be home at noon. So I have no further questions. Thank you."

Ugaste: "Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Davidsmeyer. He does not seek recognition. Representative Reick."

Reick: "Representative, this Bill specifically applies to people of age 65 or older?"

Ugaste: "It does."

Reick: "It does. Does it apply statewide?"

Ugaste: "It does."

Reick: "So if I live in Illinois and I'm 65 years and over, I will benefit from this Bill by being apprised of all the benefits that might be available to me in terms of state programs and things like that. Is that correct?"

Ugaste: "Absolutely. If you were over 65 years old, you would benefit."

Reick: "This is an absolutely outstanding piece of legislation. And I strongly, strongly urge an 'aye' vote, not for the purpose... not just because I happen to be a beneficiary of this Bill. Thank you very much."

Ugaste: "Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Ugaste to close."

Ugaste: "I request an 'aye' vote. Thank you."
Speaker Hoffman: "On House Bill 3274, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Representative Pappas. Have all voted who wished? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 99 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Congratulations, Representative. House Bill 3331, Representative Ramirez. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3331, a Bill for an Act concerning housing. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Ramirez."

Ramirez: "Thank you. Good morning, again. I'm now officially a pro. So it is my joy and honor to present to you House Bill 3331. It is a Bill to strengthen one of the most effective programs we have in the State of Illinois to prevent homelessness. The 20-year-old Homeless Prevention Program provides a one-time grant, which on average is about a thousand dollars, to help individuals and families making sure that they do not become homeless because of a crisis or an unexpected change of circumstances. House Bill 3331 will allow service providers to use up to 15 percent of the total grant for case management services to ensure that the family's individuals do not reach risk again, and, in fact, don’t become homeless. It also eliminates rigid restrictions and clarifies that providers can support people with up to six months of assistance if needed. The program has proven successfully in keeping more than 80 percent of families and individuals from having to hit the homeless system and become..."
homeless. Service providers would like to make this program stronger and ensure that they are, in fact, preventing homelessness and not just delaying it, by better serving the 20 percent of the people that currently are falling through the cracks. I am working with homeless prevention advocates across the State of Illinois on this Bill. And there is no opposition on this Bill. This is really about strengthening the program so that we don’t, in fact, delay homelessness but truly prevent it. I urge an 'aye' vote. And I welcome any questions?

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Gabel."

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

Ramirez: "Yes."

Speaker Hoffman: "She indicates she will."

Gabel: "Could you describe for us the type of family or individual who would benefit from this program? And also I'd like you to talk a little about a... how much would the... would this cost the state and how much would the state save by providing these prevention programs."

Ramirez: "Sure, I will. So typically when we've talked about people experiencing homelessness we've thought about people who are chronically homeless. Those, oftentimes veterans and individuals that for one reason or the other have not been able to maintain permanent stable housing. What we have seen in the last few years it is actually an average... the child's average of homelessness... the average age of a person being homeless is more like 11 years old across the state. And oftentimes the people that are accessing these programs, these services to ensure that they don’t become homeless are,
in fact, families who have never experienced homelessness that perhaps lost their job or even furloughed federal workers, nurses, and students. And so, this has really changed. We have seen that more than one-third of the people in the State of Illinois currently are living paycheck to paycheck, this program will strengthen their ability to maintain their housing. The second piece in terms of cost savings the program saves the state more than $7,549 for every single individual that does not become homeless. So, there's currently a cost savings program. And I urge an 'aye' vote on House Bill 3331."

Gabel: "Thank you. So, do you think that people in this chamber have become homeless during that time when we didn't get paid for nine months?"

Ramirez: "I will tell you, as someone that depends fully on this check as a full-time Legislator, I would be applying for homeless prevention dollars if, in fact, I was here a year ago."

Gabel: "Thank you for this great Bill."

Ramirez: "Thank you."

Gabel: "Urge an 'aye' vote."

Ramirez: "Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3331 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 97 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby
declared passed. On House Bill 3394, Representative Welch. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3394, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Welch."

Welch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This month all long... all month we have been celebrating Women's History Month, following Black History Month. And House Bill 3394 would require all publicly held corporations whose principal executive offices are located within the State of Illinois to have a minimum of one female director and one African American director on its board of directors by the close of the year 2020. This should've been done already. I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "On this Bill, seeking recognition, Representative Batinick."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Indicates he will."

Batinick: "Representative, so... if I have this correctly, we're telling private businesses who to have on their board and a timely... a failure to timely file a board member... so just... with the Secretary of State results in a 100 to 300 thousand dollar fine?"

Welch: "We're telling publicly held corporations, typically multi-million dollar corporations that they should... it's important enough from a policy perspective that they should have women and African Americans on their board, yes."

Batinick: "What... I'm not... I'm not talking about that. I'm talking about the size of the fine for the... you know, for failure to timely file the information."
Welch: "All they have to do is file it."

Batinick: "Right. So a paperwork error could result in a $100 thousand to 4300 thousand dollar fine?"

Welch: "Yes."

Batinick: "And you think... you think... you know, I'm going to go to the Bill. I understand the intent of the Bill. But we been here a long time and I'm trying remember the... the Bill that says, you know what corporations, Illinois we're open for business for you. You know, I... whether it's... all sorts of Bills we're passing are a red flag at our border saying keep out. Don't file paperwork on time, $300 thousand bill. Passing insurance law, yeah, we don't know if it's work comp, we don't know if it's going to be covered under liability insurance. You could just lose your business if you're doing business in this state. We really don't know. We passed stuff where I believe we passed something that was going to be expensive for businesses where somebody said we are in uncharted waters into the effect. I mean, the... the agenda that is being pushed against businesses across the board... I mean, think about this $300 thousand fine for not filing paperwork on time. You know what, I urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "The Gentleman from Kendall, Representative Wheeler."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Indicates he will."

Wheeler: "Thank you. Representative, I have a couple questions about this Bill regarding a defiance, which my colleague from Plainfield had already brought up, is to why you set them at
that particular level. I just want to start with that. Why are they so high, Chris?"

Welch: "Well, let me first of all, Leader Wheeler, clarify that the Bill... I just pulled up the text. It says, the Secretary of State 'may' impose these fines. It's not a 'shall'. So to... to say that a simple paper error that they probably haven't... that they've received notices for time and time again and they've continued to ignore, I would have to imagine within the discretion of the Secretary of State's Office at that point they would impose these fines. These are multi-million dollar corporations. This is something the General Assembly is ordering them to do and they should comply with it. But, again, the Secretary of State may impose these penalties. And I trust that the Secretary of State will have used their discretion wisely."

Wheeler: "Yeah, the reason why I ask that Chris is a couple things here. One, is that the... says it adopts rules but you've said... you've set some boundaries for those rules and that's how I figured you set those... for a reason."

Welch: "Correct."

Wheeler: "And that's what I wanted to see your take on what those might be. I appreciate the 'may' part of it. I just realized that you set a boundary like that, that limit is set for a reason and I was trying to get your reason. So another question about the constitutionality that a... first this question about EEOC because a... it could violate the Dormant Commerce Clause and the Internal Affairs Doctrine, which requires that internal company affairs be under the regulatory purview of only one jurisdiction. And we're aiming
now at two since the EEOC already covers part of this. Your response?"

Welch: "What's the question?"

Wheeler: "The EEOC already covers elements of this and we're putting a requirement on them that would violate the Dormant Commerce Clause and the Internal Affairs Doctrine. That would effectively put these companies under the regulatory purview of more than one jurisdiction. Right now we're limited to one."

Welch: "You know, this is a Bill that has been patterned after a... a law in the State of California that has received no legal challenges to it. The penalties also were similar to the penalties imposed by the California law."

Wheeler: "That's... that's where you got the... that's what I was trying answer before, where this idea came from for the numbers."

Welch: "That's correct. It's modeled after the California law. It would be..."

Wheeler: "Has that Bill taken full effect yet, Chris?"

Welch: "It's... it's the law in Illinois... in California, yes."

Wheeler: "Right. But I mean is... okay. I mean, is there's... there's two phases of California, one in 2019 and one in 2021. So I guess it hasn't fully affected their yet the way I read the... the background for this. Yeah. I guess some of the business groups anticipate there will be a legal challenge at some point in time if a business is actually fined under this. Are there certain corporations you're identifying in Illinois that don’t already have the make-up of the board like this?"

Welch: "I... I don’t have that list, no."
Wheeler: "Okay. Now that's... I think that's an important element because it... if you're trying to identify maybe a bad actor that would be one thing, but to take a blanket approach here..."
Welch: "This is... this is not about bad actors. It's not saying someone's doing something egregious. This is thinking forward. What we're saying is, is that women and African Americans deserve a seat at the table and that's what this Bill does. It puts them at the table, in the room making decisions for publicly held corporations in the State of Illinois."
Wheeler: "Okay. I appreciate that. I think that most of publicly held corporations that I have studied in the State of Illinois already have achieved what you're talking about here. And I guess that's why I wondered why, you know, what the next steps would be if we start identifying different a... different segments to start requiring and mandating. I think that's... it's a problem. I appreciate your intent. I definitely agree, we all agree that diversity is an important element of success at every level. Inclusiveness is something we are all aligned with. I don’t know that mandating it will work the way you've lined up here. I'd like to discuss it further with you, Chris, if we could, but thank you."
Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Davidsmeyer."
Davidsmeyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Hoffman: "He indicates he will."
Davidsmeyer: "So, Representative, have you talked to your colleagues on your side aisle what's a... what about Latino, or Asian, or LGBTQ, or something of that sort? Is that coming down the pike next?"
Welch: "I strongly suspect that is. And I'm going to support those Bills when they hit the floor."

Davidsmeyer: "So at what point will you have board that's entirely minority with no other representation?"

Welch: "I don't believe that would be the case."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay."

Welch: "But I do think that, you know, there's nothing wrong with inclusion and diversity."

Davidsmeyer: "No, I... I don't... I don't disagree with you. I think that it's a... it's a good step in the right direction and I would encourage a... you know, to... to specify that there should be a minority member and female member as opposed to labeling specific races because there's a... a races of all... all ethnicities all around the State of Illinois."

Welch: "I'll be happy to consider that in the Senate."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative McCombie."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "He indicates he will."

McCombie: "No disrespect, Representative, but is this a real Bill?"

Welch: "This is a real Bill."

McCombie: "I... who writes this stuff? I mean, this is... this is getting crazy here. Just because you have the supermajority, the super duper duper majority doesn't mean that you have to keep continuing to pass Bills that haven't passed over the last three, four different years. This is blowing my mind. You guys are going put your Governor, our Governor on the
books for being the biggest busting... business busting person in the nation."

Welch: "No, I think Rauner has that title already."

McCombie: "You are putting him on a spot here that is not going to help him, I'm telling you. I just... I strongly urge... this is... this Bill is really quite offensive. I agree with Davidsmeyer, why are we not talking about seniors? Why are we not talking about people of different religions? Why are we not talking about people that are disabled? And why are we getting in... why are we continuing to get into the... the private businesses? We are destroying the ability for our state to grow. And we all agree in this room, every single person, we agree that we have to grow our way out of this mess. I strongly, strongly urge a 'no' vote. And I... you know, Representative, you... you have always been one that comes forth with a Bill that sometimes I disagree with and then... then you come back and it's... you change mandate to a... you know, to a 'may' and it's a... it’s a better Bill, it’s a great Bill. This is a bad Bill. This is a horrible Bill. I just... I don’t even... you guys got to get it together here. I... no offense, but this is... this is something else. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Davis."

Davis: "To the Bill. Previous speaker said, no offense. So I'll just say offense taken in that respect. In that offense is already taken. Now I often say when I do supplier diversity Bills, that I wouldn’t have to do them if people would just act right. We wouldn't have to do these kind of things if folks would just act right. And to say... and to say that by suggesting that a board have an African American or a woman,
because the Bill says or a woman, to say that that stifles business growth here in the State of Illinois. So what you just want us all to pack up and leave? So it can be better? Is that... is that what your suggesting? There's no reason why this is a bad Bill. Again, if people would just act right, if folks would just act right we wouldn't have to do this. If contractors would just do right by minority subcontractors, wouldn't have to do any of that. Corporations... we're suggesting diversity. You know, they... they market their products to us. So why shouldn't we have a say and be on the board to help them do whatever it is they are trying to do? Again... now again, you said no offense taken, but if you're saying that all of a sudden the State of Illinois is going to hell because they want to put a black person or a woman on the board... my interpretation, right? Just like with any Bill here it's my interpretation. So, that’s what you said. Come on, give us a break, you're stifling business. If his Bill is trying to put a woman or an African American on the board and you're saying that that’s stifling business in the State of Illinois, how am I supposed to take that? Explain it to me. How am I supposed to take it? So, again, folks would just act right and consider these kinds of things as they're making their decisions we wouldn't have to try to pass Bills like this. Now you want to say it's because we have a super... I think you used the phrase super duper majority, okay. Well even when we just had a regular majority we were still trying to advance these Bills. Some of them pass, some of them don't. I'm a testament that not all of my supplier diversity Bills pass. Because folks on your side of the aisle don’t vote for
them and in some cases some folks on this side of the aisle vote for them and that's fine. But I live to fight another day and I'm going to continue the fight. I'm going to continue trying to push diversity here in the State of Illinois 'cause I live in this state just like you. Now if you want to say because people of color are small populations in the district that you have, you know, that's fine. Obviously there are greater population in my district. But when I make decisions like that I'm not just thinking about the people in my district thinking about the entire state, the entire State of Illinois. And again, it's unfortunate that we have to do Bills like this, it is. But they're necessary for those kinds of reasons, for those kinds of reasons. So I don't know... I don't know if there's any room for us discuss or to talk but when you said no offense taken there's the red flag right there. That’s the red flag. When you have to proceed by saying no offense, offense is already taken. Because again, you just said that we're stifling business in the State of Illinois, business growth and development because we want to push Bills like this. I wish you could hear some of the stories of how people are discriminated against here in the State of Illinois."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative please bring your remarks to a close. Thank you."

Davis: "Okay. And when they reach out to us they're saying come help us to fix that which we have been wronged or... and it's across the board, help us to fix it. When we see opportunities like this, why not say, hey you know what, hundred billion dollar corporation, if you don’t have any diversity on your
board why not consider someone? And in this case it speaks specifically to African American. And the question was asked, what about the Latino population, Asian population? Yeah, they may very well decide to move Bills like that as well. And, just like I think you're going to do with this one, you'll probably vote 'no'. And that’s fine because if that’s how you feel, if you're reflecting the views of your constituency then fine that’s what's expected. But don’t chastise us for trying to do what we think is right here in the state. And if businesses want to pack up leave, trust me, it's not this reason that they're going to pack up and leave. It's for a whole host of other reasons."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative, please bring your remarks to a close."

Davis: "Okay. I'm sorry, Mr. Chair. Anyway this type of Bill, unfortunately, is necessary and I strongly urg... encourage... excuse me, urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Reick."

Reick: "To the Bill. You know, we're coming to a point in this state and in this country where diversity means everybody looks different but everybody thinks the same. I would like to remind the last speaker that if you're so offended by the lack of minority contracting in this state you look to your own party. Because back in the 1930s the Davis-Bacon Act was passed it was a racist Bill that kept black contractors from being able to get contracts, they were kept out. It was the Davis-Bacon Act that created a... the prevailing wage law in this state that keeps minority contractors from being able to bid. And if you look... if you look the websites of companies
like... Illinois companies Boeing, United Airlines, McDonalds, the kind of multi-million dollar companies we want in this state, you will find that they... their boards are adequately covered by the kind of Bill that this... the kind of things that this Bill wants to do. So here's the... here's the real problem, offense is taken when no offense is meant, but I'll tell you what, if what you're going to do is demand this kind of thing you're putting up a... Illinois is not open for business sign in this state. I don’t care whether you are offended or not by the fact that we are against this Bill. The fact remains is that you're not going to get anything in this country in the way of being treated equally if you're going to take offense at every damn thing that comes up. It's time for people to start working together here. Look at what goes on in corporate America not to corporate... or look what happens to corporate America not in corporate America. This Bill is a travesty. And my colleague over here was absolutely right, we're going to end up with multitude of Bills saying you got to have this, you got to have that and somewhere along the line a business is going to say I have had enough. We want to bring Amazon to this state and I'm sure Amazon will be a good corporate citizen if it gets here. But you know something, if it's going to have a $300 thousand even 'may' fine for its failure to file reports they're not coming and nobody else is. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hoffman: "We have several more speakers both Democrats and Republican, about equal number of each. We're going to impose a three... or a two minute time limit. If there are questions of the... the a... questions of the Sponsor of the Bill
I understand we will be judicious but if it is giving statements or speaking to the Bill I would ask us to try to stick two minutes. Representative Walker."

Walker: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As a person who spent my career in the corporate world, I've seen a lot of change. I will say that most of the major corporations that we want to attract to this state already have diversity on their boards. It's not going to be a burden to them or a barrier. I would say that it's been shown by many studies that diversity on the board adds to the success of that corporation it is a... it is a good aim for them to do. I think the overall issue is they don’t like being told what to do. But I still think overall this is a good bill and a good position for the state to have. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Mazzochi."
Mazzochi: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Hoffman: "He indicates he will."
Mazzochi: "Just out of curiosity, if we set a precedent with this Bill can we then pass a Bill saying that we mandate that Christian men be represented on a corporate board?"
Welch: "Is that a question to me?"
Mazzochi: "Yes, Sir."
Welch: "You have the right, just like I did, to file your Bill. If you like that file the Bill."
Mazzochi: "Can we mandate that conservative Republicans have to have a seat at the table on corporate boards?"
Welch: "You can certainly file that Bill."
Mazzochi: "Well I'm asking does... does this... if that Bill gets filed would you then support it...
Welch: "Listen, Representative...
Mazzochi: "...under the same logic as this?"
Welch: "...I'm not going to stand here as a black man with a five-
year-old daughter and be ashamed that I am fighting for her
to have seat at the table. She has a right to be in the room
at the table and make decisions and publicly help corporations
in the State of Illinois. If you believe corporate Republicans
and conservative Republicans have a right at the table file
the Bill, we can debate it just like we're doing here today.
But I'm not going to be ashamed to stand here and fight for
the people that sent me here."
Mazzochi: "Well..."
Welch: "Let's stand up for our people."
Mazzochi: "Well..."
Welch: "You should be ashamed of the arguments coming out of the
other side here today."
Mazzochi: "I... I am..."
Welch: "Ashamed to fight for African Americans that have a right
in a room. Are you kidding me?"
Mazzochi: "I am categorically not going to be..."
Welch: "You gotta be kidding me."
Mazzochi: "...ashamed to... to advocate on behalf of allowing people
to have the freedom to set their own affairs in order for
private businesses the way in which they see fit. What I will
also ask you another question though is your definition of
African American and you definition of female, the way in
which I understand it is because you have used the phrase
self-identify so with someone like Rachel Dolezal qualify as
someone who would meet your criteria under the language of this Bill?"

Speaker Hoffman:  "Representative, I think if you could please repeat the question."

Mazzochi:  "Sure."

Welch:  "I understood her question, I think it's just insulting. Everyone knows that that person was not African American. She was found out to be perpetrating a fraud. That... that lowers the debate that we're having here. And I believe that this debate deserves better than that."

Mazzochi:  "Will a white woman from South Africa qualify under the standards you've set forth in this Bill?"

Speaker Hoffman:  "Representative, could you..."

Mazzochi:  "Under both the African American and the female sections?"

Speaker Hoffman:  "Representative, could you please talk to the Bill. We'll give you some additional time to talk to the Bill."

Mazzochi:  "No, I simply want an answer from the Sponsor is that... does he feel that would suffice under the terms of this Bill?"

Speaker Hoffman:  "Representative, please. Please talk to the Bill."

Welch:  "It's a female director."

Mazzochi:  "Would it qualify under African American?"

Welch:  "She's a... this Bill addresses women and African American."

Mazzochi:  "Right. So I..."

Welch:  "You're talking about a woman from South Africa she would qualify under the Bill."
Mazzochi: "No, I'm just asking if a... if a white woman from South Africa would that qualify under the intent of the Bill?"

Speaker Hoffman: "So, Representative, you refuse to abide by the Rules. We'll move to Representative Bryant. Representative Bryant for two minutes."

Bryant: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I yield my time to Representative McCombie."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative McCombie."

McCombie: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield? Well he doesn’t need to yield. I... this is just more of a statement. The insult for me on my side was about the business busting. Everybody over there that knows me or even has met me knows this is not about a race issue for me. And what I was talking about with Representative Davidsmeyer was that he was saying any person of color. That's... that's all I was saying. It doesn't matter to me. I agree with diversity. I agree with our businesses having a diverse a... a different... a man or woman, a young or old, a black or white. That's not the question here. I'm saying that we as government continue to impose... continue to impose regulations on businesses. I want to know who's... who's not doing these things? There's so much public shaming right now. Who's not doing these things with their public boards? And why are we not just going at them? And if we're going to find somebody what... what's a hundred thousand dollar fine up to three hundred thousand. I mean this is probably one of our most excessive fines that we have here. I'm just... I'm just asking who... who's not doing this and what are we are doing to address them publicly?"

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Welch."
Welch: "Mr. Speaker, I'm going to make a change to this Bill. Can we take it out of the record?"

Speaker Hoffman: "It's the Sponsor's prerogative to take it out of the record, the Bill is taken out of the record. On House Bill 3343, Representative Harper. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3343, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Harper on House Bill 3343."

Harper: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to bring before you today House Bill 3343 which would provide hot meals on SNAP benefits. So the SNAP program is our nation's most effective and efficient anti-hunger program. And it helps recipients buy food at the grocery store that's meant to be prepared at home. However, for people who don’t have access to a kitchen, or a place to store food, or who may have physical barriers to using their kitchen safely traditional use of the SNAP program is not an option. And so, Illinois should follow lead of other states like Arizona and California and implement a prepared meals option in the SNAP program. This Bill would do just that by allowing SNAP recipients who are elderly, disabled, or experiencing homelessness to use their SNAP benefits to buy hot food at the restaurants or grocery stores that opt-in to the program. I encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Demmer."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Indicates she will."

Demmer: "Representative Harper, a... in committee we had debate about this Bill and I supported the Bill in committee, but since then there's a few clarifications arose and I just want
to make sure that we have the right understanding of what this Bill says. So first this would allow for individuals to purchase prepared meals using a SNAP benefit if they are homeless, if they are disabled, or if they are elderly, over the age of 60 is what the definition of elderly is. Is that correct?"

Harper: "That is correct. Only SNAP recipients that are elderly, disabled, or currently experiencing homelessness will have the hot meals option."

Demmer: "So, in committee the testimony indicated that in order to qualify for this... this program to purchase prepared meals that all members of a household must meet one of those criteria. Is that correct or is it simply if any member of the household meets that criteria they're eligible?"

Harper: "If any member meets that criteria that they're eligible."

Demmer: "And that's the reason I asked that clarification is in committee we did talk about the fact that it was going to be only in households in which all of the members were either homeless, disabled, or over the age of 60. But, in fact, it's... it's that any household... if any member of the household is... meets one of those criteria then all members of the household, the entire SNAP allotment is eligible to use for prepared foods. Is that correct?"

Harper: "Well, you... yes. But you do understand how SNAP works in that one member of that household will have a card. So it's not like every member of the household has their own card..."

Demmer: "But their... their allotment..."

Harper: "...to be able to go... benefits."
Demmer: "...their allotment is influenced by the number of people in the household?"
Harper: "Exactly."
Demmer: "And this would... this would allow any member of the household to use the benefit for a prepared meal even if they did not themselves meet one of the criteria."
Harper: "It would allow a member of the household to go and purchase prepared meals, hot meals, yes. That is what it would do."
Demmer: "From the Department of Human Services do you have an estimate of the number of households who would qualify for this prepared meal benefit?"
Harper: "Yes, less than one percent."
Demmer: "I'm sorry, I have to ask again. Given the fact that we had revised input about the number of households that would qualify for this, meaning certainly more than one percent of SNAP recipients have someone in their household who meets any of those three criteria."
Harper: "Sure. I didn’t finish. Let me be... let me clarify that. So as of December of 2018 less than one percent of SNAP households contained a member experiencing homelessness, 10 percent of SNAP households contain at least one elderly member, and 14 percent of households contain at least one member with a disability. However, there is likely substantial overlap between these three groups."
Demmer: "Okay. So what... what we're probably still talking north of 20 percent of... of SNAP recipients. Your numbers would add up to 25 there's some... there's some overlap between those groups and so, you know, let's say maybe 1 in 5 households
will be eligible to use their SNAP allotment for prepared meals under... under this Bill. That’s a significant expansion beyond what was indicated in committee and in early discussions about this Bill. Where much of the focus was on, you know, a very, very small population who I think we would all agree an individual who is homeless does not have a place to prepare a meal period. An individual who is disabled may or may not be able to... to prepare a meal for themselves, but it's certainly understandable to us that somebody with a disability may not be able to prepare their own meal. I expressed in committee some hesitation over the idea that we assume that just because someone turns 60 that suddenly they're not able to prepare a meal for themselves. I expressed some hesitation on that. And I think even more so now with the idea that even if a single member of the household is... is 60 years old that the entire household then would be able to buy prepared meals. And the idea here isn’t to say, you know, that somebody's going to go and spend this money in restaurants and, you know, eat large on a SNAP program. That's not going to happen here. But what the concern has to be is for us to evaluate how much a SNAP recipient receives in a monthly benefit and try to enact policies that help those dollars go as far as possible. When we look at the cost of providing... of buying a prepared meal it's... it's just necessarily a little higher than buying food at a grocery store. And I think we have to be really cautious when we're expanding a program that would affect over 20 percent of... of the programs enrollee's that would let those dollars not go as far. I think we're going to set ourselves up for a
situation in which we come back here and say now because we've expanded this program the monthly SNAP allotment is insufficient that a person is not able to buy prepared meals over the course of a month for their family, because the SNAP allotment wasn’t set up for that. The SNAP allotment had been set up to buy foods that were not yet prepared. So as we look at that I think, you know, I can't support the Bill today, but I do think there is an opportunity for us to narrow the scope here to a... to more accurately put this program behind homeless individuals, individuals with disabilities people who have a specific reason that buying food that’s not prepared is... prevents them from using their SNAP allotment. If we could narrow it to that I think we'd find a Bill that had much more support and one that didn’t... that avoided some of the unintended consequences of expanding this program too far. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Andrade."
Andrade: "Thank you, Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Hoffman: "He indicates... or she indicates she will."
Andrade: "I think it's... there is no extra cost to this program, correct?"
Harper: "Correct."
Andrade: "We're not... we're not adding an extra cost?"
Harper: "No, we are not. We're actually just following the regular federal guidelines that have been sent down. And again, two other states have already passed this."
Andrade: "Also the... the place where they can spend the money it has to be approved by the department, they just can't go to McDonalds, they can't go there?"
Harper: "Exactly."
Andrade: "It has to be a preapproved location, correct?"
Harper: "Correct. Restaurants have to opt-in to the program and then they do have to be approved by the department."
Andrade: "They have to be approved?"
Harper: "Correct."
Andrade: "So the department has some discretion and probably before it approves can say, you know, there has... probably can adjust the prices see if you want to participate in the program you have to make sure that it's affordable for the program."
Harper: "That is correct."
Andrade: "Would that would be fair to say?"
Harper: "That is... that is correct."
Andrade: "Okay. To the Bill. Thank you. I think this... this is a... helps local businesses in the area too because it provides more money for that business and more customers, expands their customer base. And I believe it gives the... an opportunity for the SNAP recipient to actually have some healthy balanced meal. And... and it's important to know that there is no increased cost with this program. Thank you."
Speaker Hoffman: "Thank you, Representative. Representative Butler for the purposes of an announcement."
Butler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We are reaching into our bullpen now. Please let the Journal reflect that Representatives Batinick and Severin are excused for the rest of the day."
Speaker Hoffman: "The Journal will so reflect. Representative Flowers. Representative Flowers."
Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I would like to applaud the Lady for what she is doing because we already have pre... prepared meals, and they are called Meals on Wheels, and so, she's merely extending that. She's merely extending that. And so there's lots of people out there that cannot afford to... who can't fix the food for themselves. There's lots of people out there that would like to eat a decent meal and if they could have it at home so be it. If they can go out to a restaurant and have it they, too, are entitled to that because that's what the stamps are for, for the food. So again, I rise in support of the Lady's Bill. Thank you."

Representative Hoffman: "Seeing no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3343 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Greenwood. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 75 voting 'yes', 18 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On Page 15 of the Calendar, House Bill 3381, Representative Didech. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3381, a Bill for an Act concerning animals. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Didech."

Didech: "House Bill 3381 amends the Humane Care for Animals Act to establish a prohibit future ownership law. Thirty-one states have establish a similar law, we would be, I believe, the thirty-second state. This Bill provides that a person and persons dwelling in the same household may not own, harbor,
or have custody or control of any other animal if the person has been convicted of two or more of the following offenses: a violation of aggravated cruelty, a violation of animals and entertainment, or a violation of dog fighting. I'll be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hoffman: "Any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3381 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 94 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Congratulations. House Bill 3404. Representative Villa. Representative Villa... or Villa. Out of the record. House Bill 3405, Representative Villa. Out of the record. House Bill 3435, Representative Carroll. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3435, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Carroll."

Carroll: "Hi. How are you? This is my daughter Brooke. And this is the reason why I brought this Bill forward. My daughter Brooke has severe food allergies in a variety of areas. I won't go through all of them because it would take us about a year. But I want to have Brooke up here. This is a Bill that I brought forward for people like my daughter, Brooke. Children 18 and under who are having trouble... sorry... people who are 18 and under who are having trouble getting EpiPens insurance companies are not covering those and this will make
sure that insurance companies will cover EpiPens. Thank you so much. And I would like an a... I would like your 'yes' vote. And I'm happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no discussion, on House Bill 3434, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3435... 3435 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 92 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Congratulations. Representative Guzzardi on House Bill 3440. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3440, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Guzzardi."

Guzzardi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm only sorry Representative Skillicorn isn't here today because this is a Bill that both repeals government intrusion and regulation and treats Chicago like everywhere else in the state. This is a Bill I think he would've loved. So this Bill is very simple, it pertains to bulk food bins at the grocery store. So you know when you go to the grocery store and you pull the lever and you distribute the bulk foods like rice or coffee? Right now a... you have to go into the grocery store and use those flimsy little plastic bags. And we want to encourage people to bring their own containers to the grocery store. You weigh them when you come into the store, you fill up the container, and then you weigh them on the way out. Sadly there's prohibition
in Chicago on using your own containers to a... to get these bulk foods. So we just want to make clear that no local municipalities should prohibit this kind of sensible and environmentally friendly practice. I urge an 'aye' vote.

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no discussion on House Bill 3440, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3440 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Andrade. Arroyo. Davidsmeyer. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 91 voting 'yes', 6 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3446, page 15 of the Calendar, Representative Robinson. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3446, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Robinson."

Robinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3446 amends the Illinois Municipal Retirement Fund Article in the Pension Code. And a provision concerning eligibility for temporary disability benefits or total permanent disability benefits. Removes the requirement that an interruption in service for a specific period must have been with the same participating municipality or participating municipality. I do not have any opponents on this Bill and I'm requesting an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no discussion on House Bill 3446, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3446 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Harper. Murphy. Have
all voted who wished? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 91 voting 'yes', 5 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3487, Representative Ortiz. Out of the record. Representative Wheeler on House Bill 3575. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3575, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Please proceed, Representative Wheeler."

Wheeler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 3575 creates the Blockchain Technology Act. This is based on the results of the Blockchain Task Force that was just chaired by Representative Zalewski and attended by both Representative Andrade and myself last year. We did pass this in the last GA but no action was taken in the Senate. Very quickly the... the Blockchain Technology Act would provide that when a records contain blockchain it can be used in a legal proceeding. It also delineates what it can and cannot be used for. I would appreciate an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3575 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 92 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Page 15 of the Calendar, House Bill 3584."
Representative Slaughter. Out of the record. We're moving to page 16 of the Calendar. House Bill 3587, Representative Feigenholtz. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3587, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3587 is a Bill about post-adoption services that currently statute only provides for people whose adoptions were finalized at DCFS. This essentially codifies the fact that no matter how your adoption was finalized post-adoption services should be available. Passed out of committee unanimously. I'd appreciate your support."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Sommer."

Sommer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Thank you, Representative Feigenholtz. This is a certainly important legislation to adopting families and those seeking guardianship. So often we think of those efforts prior to an adoption or guardianship as most important. But the realities are that circumstances arise post-adoption and post-placement that are very important to the family's and a... this service is very vital. I urge your passage of this Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3587 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Yingling. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 97 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is
hereby declared passed. On page 16 of the Calendar, House Bill 3593, Representative Yingling. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3593, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Yingling."

Yingling: "Thank you, Chairman. This Bill puts a mechanism in place for a county board to remove its chairman if that chairman is selected internally from the county board. I'm happy to answer any questions and would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "On this Bill, Representative Ammons."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Indicates he will."

Ammons: "I just want to clarify a... under your provisions in this Bill a... under what circumstances would a chairman be removed just... can you describe why a chairman would be removed from the county board?"

Yingling: "Absolutely, Representative. This Bill is a... the genesis of this Bill came out of my home county of Lake County. We had a situation where we had a chairman who was engaged in systematic theft from the county and then ended up disappearing and no one could track him down. And there was no mechanism in place for the county board to actually remove that individual as the county chairman and replace that individual. This requires a supermajority of the county board members to replace the chair or to remove the chair. And the reason we put such a high percentage in there was to make
sure you didn’t have situation where a chairmen were being removed primarily for political reasons."

Ammons: "Thank you for clarifying that. And just a second question on this. If a chairman is removed is there a particular reason why the vice-chairman of the board would not automatically assume the chairmanship?"

Yingling: "They become the acting chair. But in this… in this event it would provide an option for the county board chair… for the county board as a whole to potentially select someone other than the vice chair to become the new acting chair."

Ammons: "And just clarifying one point on that selection process. If a county board a… of course is based on Democratic, Republican member representation, party representation selects the chairman of the county board. In that case would you see this as usurping the authority of the ruling or controlling party in the selection of the new county board chairman?"

Yingling: "It would be a majority of the board to… to install a new chair."

Ammons: "So the county government could have elected county control, i.e. Republican control of the board but the chairman could become a Democratic member..."

Yingling: "If..."

Ammons: "...under this provision?"

Yingling: "Well that’s already in law. That could actually happen right now."

Ammons: "Okay. All right. I wanted to clarify that. Thank you."

Yingling: "Sure."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Weber."
Weber: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want to say thank you to Mr. Yingling, Representative Yingling for bringing this forward. I was on a board where this situation took place. Where we realized we had no way to replace our current chairman who is elected from amongst the board. This is not only a good Bill for taxpayers it will help to be able to remove chairmen who are not a... doing what is expected of their position as county board spokesperson. So I urge a 'yes' vote on the Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Butler."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Indicates he will."

Butler: "Thank you. Representative, I... thank you for bringing this forward. I had really not paid a whole of attention to it yet. But... I'm just wondering if you might want to amend your Bill because I have a similar situation here from Sangamon County where I've gone a long time without representation on the District 186 School Board because my school board member was arrested and is in the county jail. And there's no way to get rid of him as well. So I'm just wondering as you move forward if we might look at maybe amending this to address some issues with the school boards as well?"

Yingling: "Yeah, absolutely. Let's talk offline about that. I'm would be happy to discuss that with you if additional provisions need to be added for circumstances that pertain to other units of government. Absolutely."

Butler: "Very good. Thank you, Sir."
Yingling: "Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Demmer."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Indicates he will."

Demmer: "All right. Representative Yingling, just a question about current law. So currently I understand the Counties Code provides for the method of electing a chairman but I believe is silent to the question of removing a chairman. Has any county attempted to set up a procedure to do this via their own county ordinance?"

Yingling: "I am not clear on that given that there's 102 counties. I think that codifying this in law to... to just make it clearer that the county boards can do this is an appropriate approach."

Demmer: "All right. This would... by prescribing a procedure for removing the chairman, preclude a county from doing... from amending that, right? From making a different procedure for their own county."

Yingling: "Correct. So this... this would apply statewide."

Demmer: "Okay. And is there any... when the vote to remove a chairman happens is there any requirement that it be for cause or for a stated reason?"

Yingling: "It's... no, it does not... it does not say that specifically. That’s why we made it such a high threshold for the actual removal was to mitigate against any, for lack of a better term, political games."

Demmer: "So in this scenario in order to achieve a four-fifths vote of a board to remove the chairperson there wouldn’t have to be any reason given other than they have some
accountability to voters for why it happened. It would be incumbent on them to explain through that voter accountability process. I mean, would the r

Yingling: "So..."

Demmer: "...the chairman is removed."

Yingling: "So... so the... the county board can adopt rules as to what they... what would cause that removal?"

Demmer: "So a county board could adopt rules that would trigger your four-fifths vote threshold, meaning that... that a county... could a county board say only for criminal offenses, right? Convictions for a criminal offense would a chairman be removed?"

Yingling: "Sure. So it... the law... the law is broad to allow for county board flexibility. The... but just from a good practice, a good policy standpoint I would imagine that any functional county board would probably outline that in their rules."

Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Demmer."

Demmer: "Okay. Thank you. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Are you... Representative West."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Indicates he will."

West: "Quick question for you, I just wanted to make sure this Bill is not for counties where the voters voted for the chairman? Am I right?"

Yingling: "Correct. This is not apply to counties that have a chairman elected at large."

West: "Okay. Thank you so much."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Crespo."

Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker."
Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Crespo, we'll get back to you after the Bill. Seeing no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3593 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 95 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Crespo... Crespo on a point... point of personal privilege."

Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. On House Bill 3217 the Bill that had to do with the Asian American Family Commission, a Bill that I sponsored and I'm proudly Amerasian, for some reason I voted 'present'. Please let the Journal reflect that I'm a big, strong 'yes'."

Speaker Hoffman: "The record will so reflect. House Bill 3597, Representative Yingling. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3597, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Yingling."

Yingling: "Thank you, Chairman. This is a follow-up to a Bill that overwhelmingly passed the General Assembly last year with a bipartisan supermajority. This would a... this would specify that the Chief County Assessment Officer in Lake County shall become an elected office in 2020."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3597 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Martwick. Have all voted who wished?"
Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 94 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Guzzardi on House Bill 3610. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3610, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Guzzardi."

Guzzardi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Members. This Bill simply amends the Liquor Control Act to allow brew pub licensees with multiple locations to combine their production limits from those locations and distribute that production among those locations as they see fit. It represents an agreement between the craft brewers and the Associated Beer Distributors of Illinois. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3610 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Halbrook. Have all voted who wished? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 93 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3623, Representative Costello. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3623, a Bill for an Act concerning wildlife. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Costello."
Costello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill eliminates the one time limitation of the apprentice license program. It seeks to get more kids outdoors. I ask for your 'yes' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3623 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Moeller, Burke, Crespo, Unes, you want to be recorded? Have all voted who wished? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 95 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3668, Representative Costello. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3668, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Costello."

Costello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill creates parity between the state and federal regulations on egg storage and transport. I ask for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no comment, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3668 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Feigenholtz, Marron. Have all voted who wished? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 96 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On House Bill 3677, Representative Didech. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3677, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Didech."

Didech: "Thank you. This Bill creates the Uniform Partition of Heirs Property Act. It creates a right of first refusal for a cotenants of heir's property. It will help family's stay in their homes. It will help family's keep homes that they have had in their families sometimes for generations. I would ask for an 'aye' vote and I will be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative McDermed seeks recognition."

McDermed: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hoffman: "Indicates he will."

McDermed: "This was an effort of the Farm Bureau is it not?"

Didech: "Correct. This is an initiative of... of the Illinois Farm Bureau."

McDermed: "And this will allow those many generation family farms to remain in the family won't it?"

Didech: "Yes, absolutely. It will help family's avoid forced partition by sales and it will make it easier for them to engage in partition in kind which will allow those farms to stay in these family's that they've had for generations."

McDermed: "This is a well-considered Bill that was developed over a considerable period of time and I urge everyone to vote 'yes'."

Speaker Hoffman: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Halpin."
Halpin: "There ya go, Mr. Speaker. So, Representative, since we blew it completely last time let's just pretend that this is your first Bill, okay?"

Didech: "Let's do it."

Halpin: "All right. Vote 'yes'."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Ammons. She doesn’t seek recognition. Seeing no further individuals seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3677 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 95 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 15 of the Calendar we return to House Bill 3394, Representative Welch. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3394, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Welch."

Welch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Earlier I took this Bill out of the record and I said I'd make a change to it. But after further consideration I've decided to put my feet in the right place and stand firm. I think it's important that we stick by the things that we believe in, in having women and African American representation on publicly held boards in the State of Illinois is an important public policy. I have said to my colleagues that if the Senator who takes this Bill decides to modify it and make changes to it based on this debate, I will strongly consider concurring with it. But the Bill that I
want, that I support, and Democrats and Republicans support here today, is this Bill. This Bill is the one I'm going to stand by. I am asking all of you here, today, to stand with me. Stand with me and say publicly held corporations should have women and African American representation on their boards. I ask for a 'yes' vote on House Bill 3394."

Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Durkin."
Durkin: "Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Hoffman: "Indicates he will."
Durkin: "Representative Welch let's makes this perfectly clear that this doesn’t apply to any privately held corporation, correct?"
Welch: "It applies to publicly held corporations."
Durkin: "Correct. Okay. So subs's, sub c's will not fall under this Act that you're trying to pass, correct?"
Welch: "That is not how I've written the Bill. That's correct, Leader."
Durkin: "Okay. All right I want to get to the bigger issue of what we've just gone through over the past hour. I've been down here many years in which sometimes the debate on this floor gets heated and I think sometimes our emotions carry over. And I just witnessed it. And I think it’s a time for us just to take a deep breath and I want to talk about my Caucus. This is a Bill that is important to us because we believe in the free market system. And we traditionally have. We may disagree on how we are to manage corporate America but we take the position that we think government should take a step back and let those entities make decisions on their own. We believe that the more that government micromanages in the
private businesses and corporations in Illinois and also through this country are not the best way for us to move forward to grow our economy. So I speak on behalf of the Caucus is that our objections are nothing more than that we just have a difference of an agreement of how our free market, our private markets should work. And I hope that we do not turn this matter into something that I've gathered through this last hour of how this debate went because that doesn’t reflect my Caucus. We are going to continue to stand with our business partners of what we think is the right way to manage their operations or not manage them at all. There clearly are places and times in which there has to be some oversight. And there's plenty whether on the federal side with the SEC and also different public entities in the State of Illinois to keep an eye on businesses. But please know that our Caucus is going to stand with what we believe in. And we just have a philosophical difference, it has nothing to do with the issue of African American women, African Americans or women. And I can say that with confidence, because I know my Caucus very well. And we are… anytime, any Bill… and I've said this over and over again and I can give you all the examples… when you have a Bill that is of great importance to you come see me. I would like to at least have a discussion, a thoughtful discussion of how our Caucus can manage and work with you on any issues that are important. And my records very clear on that. But please know that with this debate, today, I felt that it was going in a bad direction and one that I think is not worthy of this chamber. And I would ask… Representative Welch, I've known you for years, you’re a Gentleman, and your…
you show a bunch of passion for your constituency and your belief in how Illinois should operate. But so do our Members. And let's just keep this as a debate on issues and nothing more than that. And I would ask that we just take vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Thank you, Leader. Representative Stava-Murray."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "He indicates he will."

Stava-Murray: "So I stand, today, elected of a Representative of my district and who... where my district helped to create the super, super majority. And I'd like my colleagues across the aisle to consider how this super, super majority was created. And it's exactly through the rhetoric that was heard in the debate today. The people of my district felt that we have had enough of putting the interests of a select few who have kept power out of the hands of those who deserve to be equally represented. And when we think about representation, which is all that this Bill is asking for, corporations have not done enough. And it is well documented that corporations have not done enough on their own. And the free market has not taking care of this problem on it's own for... for all of the corporations that this would apply to. And so, to say that this is not about a race issue or about an issue about women and be... that those of African American descent and that women have not been held down by corporate America. I stand here today as a woman who left corporate America because it was made very easy that exit path. And as a Representative of my district who thinks that the status quo is not enough. And I urge all of you across the aisle to consider who you are
encouraging that... that your seat is at risk to create an even more super majority, which I am certainly happy about and I'm excited to be a part of, when you take votes against things like today."

Speaker Hoffman: "Rep... Leader Crespo."
Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Hoffman: "He indicates he will."
Crespo: "Representative Welch, two questions. Number one, you mentioned that California has this statute in place right now?"
Welch: "Yes."
Crespo: "Exact same one? Includes women and African Americans?"
Welch: "There's does not include the African American piece to it."
Crespo: "Okay."
Welch: "I added that because I thought that was extremely important."
Crespo: "So I just want to understand what's the plan moving forward? You had mentioned in your opening remarks a bit ago that this will go back to the Senate, it's coming back for concurrence with changes?"
Welch: "I said I would speak with the Senator who picks up the Bill, let them know about the debate. If they make the change I would be happy to accept it on concurrence."
Crespo: "Was there ever any conversation with Latino Caucus to include minorities or Latino's on this Bill?"
Welch: "I spoke with a couple of our Members about it here today, yes."
Crespo: "Okay. But as far as assurances that those changes will be made in the Senate?"

Welch: "I will speak with the Senator who picks up the Bill about it, Leader Crespo."

Crespo: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Thapedi."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "No need there are no... no additional individuals seeking recognition. So the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3394 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 61 voting 'yes', 27 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. We're going to the Order of Second Reading, page... just to pick up a few of the Second Readings that were missed over the last few days. House Bill 2206, Representative Yingling. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2206, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. House Bill 2209, Representative Yingling. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2209, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. Representative Meyers-Martin on a point of personal privilege. Please state your point."

Meyers-Martin: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman... Mr. Speaker. I am speaking to recognize, on the last business day of Women's History Month, Ida B. Wells. Ida B. Wells was an African American journalist, abolitionists, and feminists who led an anti-lynching crusade in the United States in the 1890s. She went on to found and become integral in group striving for African American justice. In her lifetime, Wells battled sexism, racism, and violence. As a skilled journalist she led... she shed light on the conditions of African Americans throughout the South during the late 19th and early 20th century. Ida B. Wells was born on July 16, 1862 in Holly Springs, Mississippi. She was born into slavery during the Civil War. She was freed by the Emancipation Proclamation during the American Civil War. When Wells was 16 years old she lost both of her parents and her infant brother due to yellow fever epidemic. Wells was one the founders of the National Association for the Advancement of Color People, the NAACP. She documented lynching in the United States where she investigated frequent claims of whites that lynchings were reserved for black criminals only. Since she had such a large role during this era, a white mob destroyed her newspaper office and presses. As her investigative reporting was carried nationally in black-owned newspapers. Wells was very outspoken regarding her beliefs as a black female activist and faced regular public disapproval including that of leaders with different viewpoints from the civil rights movement and the women's suffrage movement. Ida B. Wells was
a historic... historical figure that was very active in women's rights and women's suffrage movement. She passed away at the age of 68 on March 25, 1931 in Chicago, Illinois. She will forever be a memorable figure that will go down in history. And I'm happy to say that Congress Parkway in Chicago has been named after Ida B. Wells. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Brady on a point of personal privilege."

Brady: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. One of the most important things we're celebrating during National Women's Month is how far women have come in the workplace. At all levels government, public service all over our great state. One look around this chamber at the many women we have here honorably representing their districts demonstrates that in this area at least we are definitely headed in the right direction. As a proud father of a daughter who is currently a college senior, I'm grateful for the opportunities she will have when she graduates. And I rise, today, to honor one of Illinois' earliest breakers of the glass ceiling, Emma Boilvin, who is the first female employee at the Old State Capitol. She was born Emma Bailey in Pekin, Illinois in 1852. She moved to Springfield at age 13 and later married William Boilvin in 1869. Emma and William had a son, William Junior who tragically succumbed to cholera as a baby. Adding to the tragedy, Emma's husband also died shortly after leaving her a young widow. But Emma persevered. She was determined to make her way in a male dominated society. That same year she secured a position working at the State Library at the Old State Capitol, becoming the first
woman to hold a position in the Capitol Building. In 1877, the library categorically listed Emma's position as clerk in charge of the State Library. She excelled in this position for many years. She was widely praised for her zeal and work performance and was assigned many other assignments through her career. Emma Boilvin served in her groundbreaking position until 1881. Through her efforts she opened the door for more women in state service. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Butler, for what reason do you arise?"

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

Speaker Hoffman: "State your point."

Butler: "I know Representative Chesney addressed this yesterday, but I just wanted to bring to the Body's attention and to honor Trooper Brooke Jones - Story who died tragically yesterday that this Monday, since we will not be in Session, this Monday, by State Law, is Illinois State Trooper Day in the State of Illinois. And under the Illinois Commemorative Dates Act, let me read to you the Illinois State Trooper Day. 'April 1st of each year is designated as Illinois State Trooper Day, a day to honor the dedicated men and women of the Illinois State Police. Illinois State Trooper Day shall be observed throughout the state by the citizens of Illinois with civic remembrances of the sacrifices made on behalf of Illinois' finest, the Illinois State Trooper's, especially the ultimate sacrifice given by those police officers who lost their lives in the line of duty. Ladies and Gentlemen, we need to do better with Scott's Law. We need to do better as a Legislative Body to address this growing issue. We need
to do better for the state employees of Illinois who risk their lives everyday on the side of our roadways. We need to do better for the citizens that we represent who are on the side of the road if they have car troubles. We need to do better on Scott's Law. I've had a Bill out there, House Bill 2417, that passed this chamber last year and got hung up in the Senate. I've got it back now on Third Reading. I've got two Amendments on it, I'm going to be adding a third. And guess what? It's gonna be a penalty enhancement. And if you guys want to stand in the way of penalty enhancements on Scott Law go right ahead. But we have to do better for the citizens of Illinois. We have to do better. At the minimum we need to make Scott's Law similar to how we treat construction zones. The same penalties that go in effect when people go through construction zones and violate the law. So on Monday let us remember we just lost one of our finest just days before Illinois State Police Day in Illinois. Godspeed to her and remember the tough work that they do on a daily basis. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Crespo, for what reason do you arise?"

Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. On House Bill 3394 if you could please let the Journal reflect that my intention was to vote 'yes'."

Speaker Hoffman: "It will so reflect. Representative Mayfield. Please proceed."

Mayfield: "Thank you so much. I wasn’t going to speak but I'm just feeling really compelled. On House Bill 3394 I'm extremely disappointed that two women, two Member founding
women of our House Democratic Women's Caucus chose to vote 'no'. These are individuals who stood before the Women's Caucus and said they would stand up for women. They would stand for our rights. They would stand up for us across the board but, yet, they chose to vote 'no' on a Bill that would've empowered women. I'm extremely disappointed with their vote."

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


Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Harris moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Mr. Clerk, please read the Adjournment Resolution. And now, allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, Leader Harris moves that House stand adjourned until Tuesday, April 2, at the hour of noon. All those in favor say 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the House stands adjourned. Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. Have a great weekend."

Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Committee Reports. Representative Costello, Chairperson from the Committee on Agriculture & Conservation reports the following committee action taken on March 26, 2019: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 2778, House Bill 2783; do pass as
amended Short Debate is House Bill 3667; recommends be adopted is House Resolution 98. Representative Jones, Chairperson from the Committee on Insurance reports the following committee action taken on March 26, 2019: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 3081, House Bill 3323, House Bill 3451; do pass as amended Short Debate is House Bill 466, House Bill 2847, House Bill 3113, House Bill 3503, House Bill 3509. Representative Walsh, Chairperson from the Committee on Public Utilities reports the following committee action taken on March 26, 2019: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 2855; do pass as amended Short Debate is House Bill 2861, House Bill 3398. Representative Moylan, Chairperson from the Committee on Transportation: Regulation, Roads & Bridges reports the following committee action taken on March 26, 2019: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 3007. Representative Williams, Chairperson from the Committee on Energy & Environment reports the following committee action taken on March 26, 2019: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 840, House Bill 2650, House Bill 2966, House Bill 3184, House Bill 3349, House Bill 3379; do pass Standard Debate is House Bill 3068; do pass as amended Short Debate is House Bill 456, House Bill 2491, House Bill 3624; recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 2296. Representative Lilly, Chairperson from the Committee on Financial Institutions reports the following committee action taken on March 26, 2019: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 3156. Representative Flowers, Chairperson from the Committee on Health Care Availability & Accessibility reports the following committee action taken on March 26, 2019: recommends be adopted is Floor
Amendment #1 to House Bill 2895. Representative DeLuca, Chairperson from the Committee on Cities & Villages reports the following committee action taken on March 26, 2019: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 3149; do pass as amended Short Debate is House Bill 2810, House Bill 2979, House Bill 3148; recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 105. Representative Slaughter, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary - Criminal reports the following committee action taken on March 26, 2019: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 841, House Bill 1482, House Bill 1579, House Bill 1614, House Bill 1616, House Bill 2039, House Bill 2046, House Bill 2135, House Bill 2250, House Bill 2400, House Bill 2649, House Bill 3498; do pass as amended Short Debate is House Bill 1115, House Bill 1633, House Bill 2408, House Bill 3090, House Bill 3580. Representative Kifowit, Chairperson from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs reports the following committee action taken on March 26, 2019: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 3424; recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 120. Representative Hurley, Chairperson from the Committee on Human Services reports the following committee action taken on March 27, 2019: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 344, House Bill 2656, House Bill 2766, House Bill 2767, House Bill 3035, House Bill 3129, House Bill 3247, House Bill 3483; do pass as amended Short Debate is House Bill 422, House Bill 595, House Bill 844, House Bill 2146, House Bill 2833, House Bill 3516; recommends be adopted is House Resolution 97. Representative Thapedi, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary - Civil reports the following committee action taken on March 27, 2019: do pass Short Debate is House Bill
Representative Welch, Chairperson from the Committee on Executive reports the following committee action taken on March 27, 2019: do pass Short Debate are House Bills 37-454, House Bills 457-464, House Bills 467, House Bill 468, House Bills 470-527, House Bill 531-594, House Bill 596-764, House Bill 767-807, House Bill 938-1114, House Bills 1116-1437, House Bills 1660-1881, House Bills 1883-2025, House Bill 3249, House Bill 3438, House Bill 3604 do pass as amended Short Debate is House Bill 1577, House Bill 2176, House Bill 2267, House Bill 3222, House Bill 3661. Representative Mussman, Chairperson from the Committee on Elementary & Secondary Education: School Curriculum & Policies reports the following committee action taken on March 27, 2019: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 2084, House Bill 2165, House Bill 2170, House Bill 2188, House Bill 2258, House Bill 2263, House Bill 2609, House Bill 3086, House Bill 3237, House Bill 3432, House Bill 3479; do pass as amended Short Debate is House Bill 817, House Bill 2549, House Bill 3302, House Bill 3304, House Bill 3305, House Bill 3586, House Bill 3638; recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 427, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 2087; recommends be adopted as amended is House Joint Resolution 9. Representative D'Amico, Chairperson from the Committee on Transportation: Vehicles & Safety reports the following committee action taken on March 27, 2019: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 2397; do pass as
amended Short Debate is House Bill 188, House Bill 245, House Bill 2336, House Bill 2383, House Bill 2523, House Bill 2856, House Bill 3226; recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 331, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 2618. Representative Moeller, Chairperson from the Committee on Health Care Licenses reports the following committee action taken on March 27, 2019: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 2710, House Bill 3484; do pass as amended Short Debate is House Bill 1652, House Bill 2676, House Bill 2811; recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 2123. Representative Guzzardi, Chairperson from the Committee on Prescription Drug Affordability & Accessibility reports the following committee action taken on March 27, 2019: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 3187; do pass as amended Short Debate is House Bill 156, House Bill 465. Representative Scherer, Chairperson from the Committee on Elementary & Secondary Education: Administration, Licensing & Charter School reports the following committee action taken on March 27, 2019: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 256, House Bill 2485, House Bill 2605, House Bill 2840, House Bill 2932, House Bill 3659; do pass as amended Short Debate is House Bill 254, House Bill 423, House Bill 2056, House Bill 2205, House Bill 2272, House Bill 2092; recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 2100. Representative Evans, Chairperson from the Committee on Labor & Commerce reports the following committee action taken on March 27, 2019: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 269, House Bill 2480, House Bill 2565, House Bill 2569, House Bill 2961, House Bill 2962; do pass as amended Short Debate is House Bill 854, House Bill
Representative Kifowit, Chairperson from the Committee on State Government Administration reports the following committee action taken on March 27, 2019: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 3201, House Bill 3294, House Bill 3296, House Bill 3422, House Bill 3469, House Bill 3566, House Bill 3711; do pass as amended Short Debate is House Bill 2924, House Bill 3292, House Bill 3534, House Bill 3589, House Bill 3651; recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 124, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 2460, Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 3147, and House Resolution 163. Representative Rita, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-General Services reports the following committee action taken on March 27, 2019: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 1456, House Bill 2264, House Bill 2698. Representative Cassidy, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-Public Safety reports the following committee action taken on March 27, 2019: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 2541. Representative Ammons, Chairperson from the Committee on Higher Education reports the following committee action taken on March 27, 2019: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 2512, House Bill 3253; do pass as amended Short Debate is House Bill 2691; recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 2152, Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 2237. Representative Zalewski, Chairperson from the Committee on Revenue & Finance reports the following committee action taken on March 28, 2019: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 250, House Bill 1591, House Bill 2243, House Bill 2461, House
Bill 2675, House Bill 2677, House Bill 2947, House Bill 3096, House Bill 3172, House Bill 3426, House Bill 3633; do pass as amended Short Debate is House Bill 3590; recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 102, Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 925. Representative Ford, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-Higher Education reports the following committee action taken on March 28, 2019: do pass as amended Short Debate is House Bill 26. Representative Gabel, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-Human Services reports the following committee action taken on March 28, 2019: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 8, House Bill 2304. Representative Yingling, Chairperson from the Committee on Counties & Townships reports the following committee action taken on March 28, 2019: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 2497; recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 348, and Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 3676. Representative Andrade, Chairperson from the Committee on Cybersecurity, Data Analytics, & IT reports the following committee action taken on March 28, 2019: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 3391. Representative Martwick, Chairperson from the Committee on Personnel & Pensions reports the following committee action taken on March 28, 2019: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 2451, House Bill 2452, House Bill 2903, House Bill 2905, House Bill 2906; do pass as amended Short Debate is House Bill 3082, House Bill 3263, House Bill 3522. Representative Conyears-Ervin, Chairperson from the Committee on Child Care Accessibility & Early Childhood Education reports the following committee action taken on March 28, 2019: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 2420; do pass as
amended Short Debate is House Bill 196; recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 71, and Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 71. Representative Welch, Chairperson from the Committee on Executive reports the following committee action taken on March 28, 2019: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 2625, House Bill 3501; do pass as amended Short Debate is House Bill 2624, House Bill 3046, House Bill 3358. Representative Thapedi, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary - Civil reports the following committee action taken on March 28, 2019: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 3435... correction, House Bill 2435, House Bill 3360; do pass as amended Short Debate is House Bill 2472. Representative Walsh, Chairperson from the Committee on Public Utilities reports the following committee action taken on March 28, 2019: do pass as amended Short Debate is House Bill 2652, House Bill 2713. Representative Slaughter, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary - Criminal reports the following committee action taken on March 28, 2019: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 38, House Bill 1440, House Bill 1468, House Bill 2303, House Bill 2591, House Bill 3396, House Bill 3653, House Bill 3687; do pass as amended Short Debate is House Bill 180, House Bill 1438, House Bill 1587, House Bill 2134, House Bill 2291, House Bill 2519, House Bill 2925, House Bill 3513. Representative Mussman, Chairperson from the Committee on Elementary & Secondary Education: School Curriculum & Policies reports the following committee action taken on March 28, 2019: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 18, House Bill 242, House Bill 2234, House Bill 3303, House Bill 3652; do pass as amended Short Debate is House Bill 208, House Bill
424, House Bill 1561. Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 236, offered by Representative Morgan; House Joint Resolution 52, offered by Representative Morgan; House Joint Resolution 53, offered by Representative Morgan; and House Joint Resolution 54, offered by Representative Hurley are referred to the Rules Committee. Introduction and First Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 205, offered by Representative Welch, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 1200, offered by Representative Moylan, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 1300, offered by Representative Martwick, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House... correction, Senate Bill 1680, offered by Representative Edly-Allen, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Senate Bill 1698, offered by Representative Martwick, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Senate Bill 1765, offered by Representative Martwick, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Senate Bill 2030, offered by Representative Martwick, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. First Reading of these Senate Bills. Introduction and First Reading of House Bills. House Bill 3824, offered by Representative McAuliffe, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. First Reading of this House Bill. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."