



STATE OF WISCONSIN

Assembly Journal

One-Hundred and Fifth Regular Session

FRIDAY, April 9, 2021

The Chief Clerk makes the following entries under the above date:

AMENDMENTS OFFERED

Assembly Amendment 1 to **Assembly Bill 122** offered by Representative Sortwell.

Assembly Amendment 1 to Assembly Substitute Amendment 1 to **Assembly Bill 147** offered by Representative Petersen.

Assembly Amendment 1 to **Assembly Bill 194** offered by Representative Brooks.

INTRODUCTION AND REFERENCE OF PROPOSALS

Read first time and referred:

Assembly Resolution 16

Relating to: directing the attorney general to seek to join the state as a plaintiff in State of West Virginia, et al., v. US Department of the Treasury, et al.

By Representatives Vos, Steineke and August.
To calendar of April 13, 2021.

COMMUNICATIONS

April 9, 2021

Edward A. Blazel
Assembly Chief Clerk
17 West Main Street, Suite 401
Madison, WI 53703

Dear Chief Clerk Blazel:

Please add my name as a co-author of Assembly Bill 232, relating to assistance to households and property owners.

Please add my name as a co-author of Assembly Bill 233, relating to grants for certain small businesses.

Please add my name as a co-author of Assembly Bill 234, relating to tourism industry grants.

Please add my name as a co-author of Assembly Bill 237, relating to deposits into the unemployment reserve fund.

Please add my name as a co-author of Assembly Bill 238, relating to allocation of federal American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 funds for local highways and bridges.

Please add my name as a co-author of Assembly Bill 239, relating to the use of certain federal funds for broadband

expansion grants.

Please add my name as a co-author of Assembly Bill 241, relating to retiring public debt and transportation revenue bonds.

Please add my name as a co-author of Assembly Bill 243, relating to allocation of federal American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 funds for certain environmental purposes and granting rule-making authority.

Sincerely,
DAVID STEFFEN
State Representative
4th Assembly District

April 9, 2021

Edward A. Blazel
Assembly Chief Clerk
17 West Main Street, Suite 401
Madison, WI 53703

Dear Chief Clerk Blazel:

Please add my name as a co-author of Assembly Bill 244, relating to top-five primaries and instant runoff voting for the offices of U.S. senator and U.S. representative in Congress.

Please add my name as a co-author of Assembly Bill 251, relating to impersonating a public officer, public employee, or employee of a utility and providing a penalty.

Sincerely,
STEVE DOYLE
State Representative
94th Assembly District

April 9, 2021

Edward A. Blazel
Assembly Chief Clerk
17 West Main Street, Suite 401
Madison, WI 53703

Dear Chief Clerk Blazel:

Please add my name as a co-author of Assembly Bill 54, relating to farmland preservation implementation grants, agreements, and tax credits and making an appropriation.

Sincerely,
DIANNE HESSELBEIN
State Representative
79th Assembly District

April 9, 2021

Edward A. Blazel
 Assembly Chief Clerk
 17 West Main Street, Suite 401
 Madison, WI 53703

Dear Chief Clerk Blazel:

Please add my name as a co-sponsor of Assembly Bill 251, relating to impersonating a public officer, public employee, or employee of a utility and providing a penalty.

Sincerely,
JANET BEWLEY
 State Senator
 25th Senate District

TRANSCRIPT OF DEBATE ON SENATE BILL 183

On Tuesday, March 23, Speaker Vos asked unanimous consent that the Chief Clerk's office transcribe the entire debate on **Senate Bill 183** be entered in the journal. The full text of the debate follows:

Speaker Pro Tempore August: We're on the fourth order of business on today's calendar, messages from the Senate. The Chief Clerk will read the message from the Senate.

Chief Clerk: Message from the Senate from Michael Queensland Senate Chief Clerk. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform you that the Senate has passed and asks concurrence in Senate Bill 183, relating to legislative oversight of federal COVID-19 funds.

Speaker Pro Tempore August: We're on the tenth order of business on today's calendar, gentleman from the 40th.

Representative Peterson (40): Thank you Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate Bill 183 be taken off today's calendar.

Speaker Pro Tempore August: The gentlemen from the 40th asked unanimous consent that the rules be suspended and Senate Bill 183 be withdrawn from the Senate message and taken it up at this time. Is there any objection? Hearing none, the clerk will read the title of the bill.

Chief Clerk: Senate Bill 183, relating to legislative oversight of federal COVID-19 funds.

Speaker Pro Tempore August: The question is shall Senate Bill 183 be ordered to a third reading? All in favor say aye, all opposed say no. The ayes have it. Gentleman from the 40th.

Representative Peterson (40): Thank you Mr. Speaker. I ask unanimous consent that the rules be suspended and Senate Bill 183 be given its third reading.

Speaker Pro Tempore August: The gentlemen from 40th asked unanimous consent that the rules be suspended and Senate Bill 183 be given its third reading. Is there any objection? Hearing none, the clerk will read the title of the bill.

Chief Clerk: Senate Bill 183 relating to legislative oversight of federal COVID-19 funds.

Speaker Pro Tempore August: Having been read three times, shall Senate Bill 183 be concurred in? Lady from the 79th on concurrence.

Representative Hesselbein (79): Thank you Mr. Speaker. Why is this bill in front of us today? If you want to run for governor, run for governor. Maybe there's going to be a huge primary on that side of the aisle. I don't know. Um, but if there's one thing that's pretty clear from the speeches today, it's that the Speaker just isn't into Governor Evers. But I tell you, Mr. Speaker, you should be, because this is just the short list of what Governor Evers and his administration did this past year. They implemented the We're All In grant program, providing nearly \$240 million directly to small businesses facing hardship during this pandemic. In phase one, \$65 million went to 26,000 small businesses across this entire state receiving \$2500 each. In phase two, \$130 million to 26,000 small businesses hit hardest by the pandemic receiving \$50,000 each. In phase three, it directed to 2,000 restaurants receiving \$20,000 each. Examples in my district include the Mustard Museum, Hubbard Avenue Diner, and I know I've talked about Hubbard Diner and their fantastic pies before, Little Strokes Swim Academy and Luna Pet Resort. In live music and entertainment venue grants, \$15 million to 96 venues to help with financial stabilization. \$131 million in targeted allocations for efforts aimed at addressing health care worker shortages and helping create capacity in Wisconsin hospitals and skilled nursing facilities. \$40 million for hospitals and skilled nursing facilities. \$30 million for post-acute admissions incentive payments for skilled nursing facilities. \$60 million for a long term care direct payment program supplement. The Out of School Support grants of \$6.6 million to 42 Wisconsin organizations. There was even a movie theater grant program, \$10 million awarded to 54 movie theater operators across the entire state of Wisconsin. There was a \$10 million investment aimed at providing economic stabilization for nonprofit organizations, providing critical services to Wisconsinites during COVID-19. There was \$5 million awarded for the expansion of high speed broadband Internet. There is tourism relief to accelerate vitality and economic lift, called a travel grant, \$8 million awarded to the travel industry. This money was spent all over the state of Wisconsin, in my district and in your district. People needed our help and the governor answered the call. Vote no on this bill. Once again, if you want to run for governor, have at it. Thank you.

Speaker Pro Tempore August: Question is concurrence of Senate Bill 183. Gentleman from the 63rd.

Speaker Vos (63): Since this is probably the most important bill that we're going to take up today, I would ask unanimous consent for a call the house.

Speaker Pro Tempore August: The gentleman from the 63rd requests a call of the house under Assembly Rule 83. It requires 15 seconds. Are there 15 seconds? Those who will second, please rise. A sufficient number of seconds having been achieved the Assembly is under the call. The Sergeant

at Arms will secure the chamber. Members will return to the chamber. The Clerk will call the roll.

(Chief Clerk read the names)

Speaker Pro Tempore August: The Clerk will pause the roll. The gentleman from the 63rd, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

Speaker Vos (63): I ask unanimous consent that the call of the house be lifted.

Speaker Pro Tempore August: The gentleman from the 63rd has requested that his call be lifted. Without objection, it is so ordered. The question is concurrence of Senate Bill 183. The gentleman from the 63rd has the floor.

Speaker Vos (63): Thank you. I could do another call of the house as people choose to leave. I could. So. So what's amazing to me is that we have gotten to the point where something that should be perfunctory, has become somehow a partisan issue. So let's just rewind the clock back to 2009 when we last had a huge amount of federal dollars that came to Wisconsin. It was under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act under President Obama. It was actually a first in a generation. United Democrat legislature, all Democrats in charge of the Assembly, the Senate, the Finance Committee – they basically controlled the whole process. They had a governor of their own party. And one of the things, I didn't vote for a lot that session, but one of the things that I did vote for in the Finance Committee was the requirement that the legislature had oversight of the funds from the federal government. Wasn't partisan. It actually was something that people stood and said the legislature is the co-equal of the governor whether or not I agree with him or her. All across the country, we see more and more power going to the executive branch at the federal level and as I said before it was wrong under President Trump. I don't support executive orders. It's wrong if you have a Republican governor, it's wrong if you have a Democrat governor. Power should not rest in one person's hands. So back then, the gentleman from the 46th, the 54th, the 73rd, the 80th, and the 20th – the lady from the 20th – did what I did, which was to support the idea that we wanted to make sure there was legislative oversight no matter if the governor was in my own party or not. Now, we vote on a lot of bills and many of which are important, some are minor, some are really important, but if you think about the basic function, just try, if I could just ask people for just a few minutes to take off your partisan collar and put on your legislator hat. Think about yourself if you were on the city council or the county board before and you gave all of your ability to make decisions to the other branch of government. That is, in essence, what we have done by allowing a governor, regardless of party, to make all the choices – right or wrong. That should never happen. I looked up the reason that NCSL exists – it's why I got involved. It is to strengthen the legislature and it is been harder and harder and harder because in states that are controlled by Republicans and Democrats, divided government, power has naturally flowed to the branch which is the most decisive. That is the executive branch. But being the most decisive does not mean that you make the wisest decisions. Which is

why the framers intended to balance power so that it could not be in the hands of a king or a dictator. It was a slow, cumbersome process to have to reach consensus. That's what we want. In this situation, we know that other states have actually passed legislation to involve themselves in the decision-making process. Arkansas, all Republican, the Republicans said to their own governor we want to make sure that we have oversight of the funds even though they have a supermajority. Colorado, all Democrat legislature with a Democrat governor. They passed legislation to actually have more oversight. Kansas, a Democrat governor and a Republican legislature – passed. Now other states have different situations than we do. In six states, they actually have a situation where all federal dollars goes to a board that is decided by both branches of government – kind of like our finance process but not the same. In twelve states the executive branch may not receive the funding without authorization from the legislature. Now other states have just decided to include their legislature in the process because it's the right thing to do. Again, Alaska, Idaho, Maine, Mississippi and Tennessee. Most of those states the governor didn't have to include them, but they chose to. So why in the world was it good enough in 2009 with a fraction of the dollars that we're talking about today. But somehow because the legislature wants to actually have input, it's micro-managing. Well, frankly, I believe that the governor's decision to take the money without any legislative involvement is unconstitutional. And let me make a very basic case as a non-lawyer. The Wisconsin Constitution provides “no money shall be paid out of the Treasury except in pursuance of an appropriation by law”. Very straightforward. Now if you actually read it, does anybody here know who Bronson LaFollette was? He was our Wisconsin attorney general for much of my lifetime. Do you know what party he was in? He was a Democrat. And do you know what he opined? That this constitutional provision requires that the “state legislature authorizes and appropriates money”. That comes to the state from a federal disaster relief bill. That's the Democrat attorney general. So you can choose to vote with us which is a very robust process where it goes through Finance. It's expedited if you actually have ideas to make the process quicker because the goal is not to slow it down but to give transparency and oversight. I would be open to those amendments. Because instead what you've chosen to do is just reflexively say I work for Tony Evers, not my own district. Now thank you to the five people who said it last time that they didn't work for Jim Doyle, they worked for the people of their districts by having legislative involvement. So we have a chance to fix it. Now if for some reason the governor chooses to veto this bill, we will have no choice but to go to court, because the Constitution is crystal clear and Attorney General Bronson LaFollette was right. The governor doesn't have the right to commit the legislature which is the organization – the constitutional body that appropriates funds. He does not have the right to put us on the hook with the federal government unilaterally. You've probably read about this goofy provision that was put in by the Congress which says that we don't have the right to cut taxes with our own resources if we choose to accept the federal dollars. Now that might have some salience if the

legislature and the governor, through statute, both agree to accept the federal dollars. But how is it constitutionally possible that a governor has the right to take money that has strings attached which binds the other chambers, that binds the other parts of state government. It's wrong. Just imagine if under a Republican governor, because don't forget this money has four years to be spent, four years, that means when Governor Evers is replaced in January of 2023, whoever that Republican governor is can choose to give all the money to causes that they care about. You wouldn't even know where it was going until the money was already spent. I can just imagine the howls and the unbelievable statements that would be made talking about unaccountability and lack of transparency and how could he do this with taxpayer money. So I'm actually bookmarking this debate in my favorites because when this happens in 2023 and the Republican governor gets to spend all this money *carte blanche* I'm going to look back and say how many of you stood with me when I intend under that Republican governor to bring the exact same bill back because it shouldn't matter if it's a Republican or a Democrat the legislature should have the ability to have transparency. So how hard would it be for you to help us avoid a lawsuit, stand up for the institution that you were elected to protect, which is the legislature. It's not that difficult. Other states have done it. Other legislators in these very chairs have done it. We should do it. If you have an amendment I would be more than happy to ask you to caucus, come back to us, we will wait because this is the single most important bill that we're going to take up in this floor period. Nothing is more important than making sure that transparency, openness, good government is protected. If you choose to vote no, you will basically be saying what's the point of having a legislature if a governor has the ability to commit all the funds, to commit a future legislature, to commit us to certain policy positions whether we agree with them or not, you are abdicating your constitutional duty to stand up and do what I think we should all be rallying around which is to have the legislature be at least a co-equal branch. At least a co-equal branch. So I hope you will take my offer seriously. I hope you will go back and say here are ways that we could copy the exact language. We could expedite the process. We could make sure that the taxpayers at least know where the money goes because even as of today we have no idea beyond press releases where the money was really spent from the first round of federal dollars. Much less the second round or the third round or whatever future round there might be. So I hope you will take some time. Figure out if you can at least offer an amendment to try to get a way to get to yes because mark my words when we are back here in two years I just know exactly what's going to happen and you will be all in favor of this bill showing that either you really believe in it by voting for it today or it is literally nothing more than a partisan ploy to stand with a Democrat when he's in the office and when a Republican follows him to somehow say it was a big mistake. So please take the time, look at an amendment, come back to us and I promise you I give you my word that we will seriously consider it to see if there's a way we can support it and get this to the governor's desk with a strong bipartisan vote in the way that it should be.

Speaker Pro Tempore August: Gentleman from the 54th.

Representative Hintz (54): Hold on a second. So Wisconsin Republicans actually want to spend federal money now? I mean, c'mon! It's already been like seven years and \$2 billion dollars of leaving money on the table. And so all of a sudden now there's this interest. I mean isn't that part of the problem? I mean the reality is lawmakers in Washington realize that there were legislatures like Wisconsin and, you know, they gave money directly to communities and directly to providers, thank goodness. With the input of Senator Baldwin and others probably and definitely tried to do that so we wouldn't have this problem because they knew there were too many states that wouldn't take advantage of, that would penalize their constituents to subscribe to ideology or to try to make the governor look bad. So I mean, in this case, I think there is a really good reason. Because time after time, since the lame duck session, the priority has been to undermine this governor and why would we expect that to be any different in this case? I mean there's very clear differences in terms of the approach, in terms of governing during the Evers administration, but also during the pandemic of what the priorities are. I mean I'm not surprised – you probably will use taxpayer money to sue, right? Because you didn't get your way. We have very different, you have very different ideas of executive power depending on who is in the executive branch and you don't seem to have recovered from that. In terms of any comparisons to 2009, you had a Democratic governor who wanted to do what was right, you had a Joint Finance Committee controlled by Democrats that wanted to do what's right. In this case, here like well, you know, we've left \$2 billion dollars of taxpayer money and penalize their own constituents but, you know, we want to have a say in not spending federal money or doing what we want with it, you know, to undermine Governor Evers. I mean, again, you took away executive power before he was even sworn in because it was him, and my guess is if, unfortunately, we would ever end up in a place with a Republican governor again you'd probably give that power back, because it was never about co-equals, it was about who is in office and who is in power and so in this specific case because of your track record, because of your lack of interest in actually utilizing resources for the public good, why would you, you know, why would you have the keys to micromanage Governor Evers response to the pandemic? Why would we even consider that? I mean, again, it's the executive branch. That's if – you want to be governor, be governor. But a bunch of politicians weighing in on a hearing over spending decisions that have largely been driven by what is in the best outcome for a public health response by state agencies who have people there who work on this, is a way to be done. And this is an executive function. The real question is you'll have the opportunity in the budget to bring in \$1.6 billion because they've incentivized and encouraged states. They've made it easy for states that have made the same mistakes you guys have to get it right and then by freeing up taxpayer dollars this budget will be able to do a lot of things that I think we all want to be able to accomplish. So. I don't know that you have the credibility you think you do on this issue and if you didn't have a track record of

undermining the governor at all costs, this governor, over the last two years including with the lame duck session, you know you don't get to be in the position you think you're in today.

Representative Spiros: Gentleman from the 39th.

Representative Born (39): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, that was fascinating. I was, I was kind of curious as to what argument the other side was going to make about turning their back on a basic function of the legislative branch. So that was very interesting that last speech. Basically, the legislature, as an equal branch that normally oversees budget operations in appropriations, should just give up on that, turn all this money over to the executive because it might make the governor look bad? And because we disagreed on a policy decision earlier. So if we're not ok with expanding welfare, it means we should just abdicate all of our oversight of money. Is that the argument that was just made? That's exactly what he just said, Mr. Speaker. It's like its ok for us, or at least members of the other side of the aisle, to say we're going to vote against a basic function of the legislature. We're going to continue to give up more and more power to the executive branch, because, oh man, it might make the governor look bad. Or, because we disagreed on policy items regarding welfare expansion. If you look at any basic text on the role of the legislature in our system of government, whether it be at the federal or the state level, it will say things like the role of the legislature is the power of the purse or controlling the state's purse strings, creating budgets and if you look at our own Wisconsin Blue Book and how it describes the role of the legislature it says specifically no money paid out of Treasury unless the legislature specifically appropriates it. Apparently, that's an exception if it's federal money that comes in and the governor wants to do it and we don't want to make him look bad so we give up our role of appropriating funds. We make sure that that federal money never touches that Treasury and just give up that responsibility if you're listening to the argument on the other side of the aisle. I find that ridiculous. I think this – earlier the gentleman from the 63rd made a good point when he asked us to think about it from a local government perspective. A lot of us come from local government experience. I sat on the city council in Beaver Dam. There is no way I would have considered, you know again that's a nonpartisan office so you don't get clouded by some of this partisan junk that we do here. There's no way I would have considered just giving up that total authority to the mayor. You wouldn't do that on a city council. You wouldn't do that on a county board but you'll do it here because we don't want to make the governor look bad. That's our big argument from the other side today. The legislature has a responsibility to make financial decisions. That's our main role – one of our main roles as a separate but equal branch of government and just because this is federal money doesn't mean that we stop that role and, in fact, we have specific examples where we continue to do that role. We have right now in the Joint Finance Committee, in a process that's fairly similar to what we're asking for in this bill, federal child care money that came in from the federal government as part of the very same bill that we're talking about. The same federal bill that is getting a review right now – a passive

review of the Joint Committee on Finance. This isn't some wild idea that can't be done or has never been done before. We did the same thing a few weeks ago on transportation money that came into the state. Those things are already set up in the statutes to come before the committee. All we're seeing here is let's follow a similar process – not a long elaborate process – not something that's brand new that's never been done before and is specifically, in this case of this appropriation, something very similar was done in 2009, with again, as the gentleman from the 63rd pointed out, a number of you on the other side of the aisle voted in support of that. It's done in other states. We do it now on the things that I've already cited. This is not complicated. This is a simple accepting the responsibility that comes with being a legislature and handling as it's frequently referred to in various different text books that talk about the legislative branch just simply taking care of the purse. The simple appropriations of money and this is a lot of money. The people's representatives, that's us, that's our colleagues in the Senate, should play a role and I encourage all of us to step up, accept our responsibility and vote in support of this legislation.

Representative Spiros: Representative from the 81st.

Representative Considine (81): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Wow. The representative from the 63rd had some interesting things to say but the very first thing he said really struck me. Legislation is a slow and cumbersome process. That's why we're standing here today in opposition to this bill. Because it must be a slow and cumbersome process because your side of the aisle didn't even bring it up until now it's a year since we got the first funds. Why didn't we do something about this in April when we met? Why didn't we see it then? Why didn't we see it in January? I don't know. It's really slow and it's really cumbersome and so I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, and I would ask the people of Wisconsin: Do you want a slow and cumbersome process during the midst of a pandemic to get the funds that you need to survive? Because I can name hundreds of businesses from my district that would not have survived had you played this game originally. Now I get that part about oversight, I get it, but you know it was interesting. The gentleman from Beaver Dam just talked about it and he laid – almost every time he used the word budget – and the budget process. Well frankly in a pandemic we can't wait for the budget process and the federal government didn't mean for us to wait for the budget process. What they meant for us was to get the hands of that money into the hands of the people of the state of Wisconsin. So that the restaurants who had to close down or almost totally closed down could pay their personnel. So that we could have extra money sent for PPE to the nursing homes of our state. That needed to happen immediately. So that we could contrary to what was said a little earlier about the allegations that we heard in January about how bad Wisconsin was doing on vaccination. It's really interesting, you know, the states that you talked about that led back then? They were giving the Moderna virus which was much easier to get. You know why we were so far behind? Because 95% of ours was the Pfizer which was much more difficult to distribute and much more difficult to get all around to the areas of the state and the minute we got another

two or three weeks we were leading the nation, or very close to it, because we had a plan and it was a plan that worked using some of the funds that were made immediately available. I had a whole list of things that I wanted to talk about but I think the gentleman from the 63rd gave us enough. You're right. It's a slow, cumbersome process and your side of the aisle will prove that. It took you a year to bring this to us after billions of dollars were put into our economy by our governor and I'm really grateful that we had a leader that was going to take charge and do the job and get that money into the hands of the people so we didn't have more people die in the pandemic, so they didn't we didn't lose more businesses, so that theater owners have a chance to survive and reopen, so that the tourism business in my area has a chance to get through this and make it back. You know it's kind of great that they sent that money because I know another engineering firm, I know several engineering firms, that took the PPE and people were condemning them because they took it but they weren't sure they were going to be able to survive. They took it and put it in the bank. Want to know why? Because they are fiscally conservative like I am and they're waiting because they're going to pay it back, they're going to find out what their tax bill is, they're going to have to pay every dime back so you bet they put it in a bank and it sat there. In the meantime, they had a chance to survive and make sure that they could survive and thrive. That wouldn't have happened if we hadn't gotten that funds to them immediately. So you're right, slow, cumbersome. And I don't – amendments? Let's get this done quickly. What happened with the attorney general and the oversight of his funds and the collection of votes – how many months did we delay millions of dollars coming into our state coffers and you can blame it on something that you didn't know was going to happen, I guess about how you're going to make him report it. That's what the newspaper said but it doesn't make any difference. Hundreds of millions of dollars sat around for a few months while you decided what to do. I'm sorry, the people of the state of Wisconsin couldn't wait a year ago and they can't wait now. This money needs to get into their hands. The vote is no.

Representative Spiros: Gentleman from the 5th.

Representative Steineke (5): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the gentleman from the 81st yield to a question? (Considine yields). Ok so for the gentleman – gentleman from the 81st can you tell me if you have any knowledge (unintelligible) the governor has to spend the money that is coming in in this latest round of stimulus money?

Representative Considine (81): I don't know exactly how...

Representative Steineke (5): Let me – let me just clarify. So the previous CARES Act dollars had to be spent by December 31st of last year. This round of federal funding – do you know the end date for when this money has to be spent by?

Representative Considine (81): It goes much longer so he could delay if he chose to. I don't see that happening because I watched as almost daily the funds came out...

Representative Steineke (5): So, ok – so you didn't answer the question. So it is December 31st of 2024. 2024. That affords us plenty of time to go through the legislative process and if the other side of the aisle was interested and, I got the floor now, thank you. I'm done with you. I asked my question, we're done now.

Representative Spiros: Gentleman from the 5th has the floor.

Representative Steineke (5): The other side of the aisle, if they were so inclined and if you were worried, Mr. Speaker, about a cumbersomeness of the process of allocating resources in ways that we've been doing it forever here in the state, I'm willing to bet we would be willing to sit down and work through a process by which we could expedite that approval process so that there is legislative involvement, there is some oversight, but it doesn't sound like you're willing to do that. You want one person to have full control over now over \$5 billion of taxpayers' money. Now remember this is federal money – sure – still taxpayers' money. Actually it's not even our money anymore. It's our grandkids money. We're stealing from them. That they'll have to be paying back in 50 years, 70 years, 100 years. If you think the legislative process is too cumbersome and too onerous quite frankly sir, you shouldn't be here. It's our job. This is what we're sent here to do. Legislating and governing is cumbersome. One of the reasons we didn't come in with this back last year because it was an emerging crisis. We didn't know what we were dealing with. \$2 billion the governor had unfettered access to. I'll tell you for the last 9-10 months, all I've been doing is answering questions about how he's spending it and you know what the answer is? I don't know, won't tell us, won't, won't involve us. You know those – some of the people that came to me that want to know how the governor was going to spend the money? Nursing homes. You know how much he gave nursing homes? Pennies. Forty percent of the deaths were occurring in nursing homes. Now we hear probably more than that because we didn't even know. Because they're under reporting the numbers. Gave them pennies. Maybe at best about five cents on every dollar that went out the door went to nursing homes when forty percent or more of the deaths were occurring in the nursing homes. It's criminal. Nursing homes across the state are underwater having spent hundreds of thousands, millions of dollars on their own to bolster their communities, bolster their facilities to make sure their residents stayed safe. What help did they get? Largely ignored. Believe me, I was fighting and I sent Governor Evers letter after letter, talking to him, trying to, trying to get him to spend more of those CARES Act dollars on nursing homes. Still to this day, hearing from nursing homes, about how far under water they are because the expenses that they've had to lay out. So when those people come to us and they say hey, Representative Steineke, we got a nursing home in your district, we're dying here. Literally, in some cases. Financially for sure. Can you help us out? Sorry. Governor won't let us be involved. He thinks he has all the answers. As a legislator, how do you answer questions to your constituents when they ask you these questions? What do you say? You say, I trust the governor. I just – this – and this isn't just a state of Wisconsin problem. You know I've said this

before, this is, this is a system wide problem where we have broken down because whoever's party is in control at the top refuses to exercise their responsibilities in the legislative branch. You abdicate your responsibilities when you refuse to demand a seat at the table. Over \$5 billion of all of our money, like I said, probably our grandkids' money, is being determined where it goes by one person and you guys think that's right, Mr. Speaker? Not you. I mean I get it. The governor is a Democrat. My friends on the other side of the aisle are Democrats. So it makes it uncomfortable, but for crying out loud it's your job, it's what you were elected to do. You were sent here to do something. Not just sit there and say, well I don't really have any say in it, so it's all the governor. Call the governor. Well you can't get through to the governor right now. How many people have tried to call the governor's office because I've got a lot of constituents that have and they've never been able to get through because the offices are dark half the time. Phones aren't being answered, people aren't being listened to. Our job is to represent the people. If the people don't have a voice in the process. Governor Evers is not their voice, we are. We deserve that seat at the table, we deserve that ability to help distribute those dollars because it is our job. It is what we are elected to do. Fifty seven thousand people are counting on you. They may agree with everything that the governor does, But if you can't answer the basic question when a constituent calls you and says, hey, I need some help, this COVID pandemic has put my business under, has put my family under, whatever it is, representative, I need your help. And if your only answer is, here's the governor's phone number and email address, ask him for help. What are we doing here?

Representative Spiros: Gentleman from the 45th.

Representative Spreitzer (45): Mr. Speaker, where was the passion we just heard? Where was the sense of urgency that we just heard? Over the past year? Over the past year that this legislature was, more often than not, not in session. From last April until this January when the leadership on the other side of the aisle did not feel the need to call this legislature into session in response to a global pandemic. So I appreciate the passion that's here today, but many of the issues that we've been debating today are issues that were most acute more than six months ago and yet the bills didn't come forward, the legislature didn't meet. So spare me the outrage today. Now, let's talk about the issue that is in front of us. The issue of how to spend the money that is coming to the state of Wisconsin from the American rescue plan. This isn't some esoteric debate about the powers of the legislature and the powers of the governor. We can have that debate some other time. We've got a state constitution we can look at it, we can decide if we think it's the right balance of powers, but that's not what this is about. This is a debate about who we trust to spend a specific pot of money that is coming to our state at a specific moment of time to help Wisconsin recover from a global pandemic. And so the question is, who do we trust to make those decisions? Do we trust a legislature that barely met during a global pandemic that turned away and continues to turn away the federal dollars to expand Badger Care and actually save state taxpayers' money. The legislature that is now turning away federal unemployment insurance money

that is both hurting Wisconsinites who are unemployed and also costing our unemployment system money that would otherwise be covered by the federal government. Do we trust that legislature or do we trust Governor Evers? Do we trust a Speaker of the Assembly who just talked about a "slow, cumbersome process" or do we trust Governor Evers? Do we trust a speaker of the Assembly who just threatened to sue and wants to risk this money entirely or do we trust Governor Evers? Look, if you have good ideas, send them to the governor. Bring them up here. Let's talk about them. All ideas should be on the table. But the question, is who do we actually trust to make the decisions to get this money to the people who need it most and the people who need it now. This is the American rescue plan. The point is that we need help now. I don't want to wait until 2024 to start spending this money. I don't want to wait for some hypothetical future Republican governor to start spending this money. Businesses and people can't wait. They need the help now and so we need to give the governor the ability to do that. Imagine if this legislature had micromanaged the CARES Act funding the way that it wants to micromanage the American rescue plan funding. Imagine the additional delays that our businesses and people who are at risk of being evicted from their homes might have experienced waiting for that money to get to them. When the legislature couldn't even be bothered to meet from April until January, sure the Joint Finance Committee might have come in, but again they haven't done much either. They refused to actually look at meaningful funding to reform our unemployment system, they've sent Governor Evers to rely on federal funding now they want to micromanage that federal funding. You can't have it both ways. Either meet and do your jobs and be a governing partner or get out of the way. And in the meantime, Governor Evers has acted. He acted not with all of the information about what this pandemic would play out as, nobody had that information, but he made the best decisions he could. He tried to keep our folks safe, he tried to help businesses survive and at the same time too many of you on the Republican side of the aisle sound like you don't want to do anything differently. Like you think we shouldn't have done anything differently for the past year. As I listen to the debate today it sounds like some of you still have gripes about masks. Some of you still don't understand why we were asked to stay home when we were still figuring out how this virus spread. When our health care workers needed us to buy time, to get PPE, to just try to control things a little bit so we could get a handle on what was happening. You act like we shouldn't have done anything differently. That it was business as usual. Look, we all got here because a virus came to our shores that we didn't know how it was going to play out. I think many of us probably hoped and assumed that just like SARS, and H1N1, swine flu, all of these different things that have happened in my lifetime that never quite became as scary as we thought they were going to, they got contained, Ebola got contained. Well guess what, COVID didn't. It ended up spreading in our communities, it's here, it's been here for a year, and we had to figure out what to do about it. And with the exception of one bill last April which, thank God, let Governor Evers spend the CARES Act money and actually act, this legislature didn't do anything until this January and Governor Evers did the

best that he could. Now, we didn't know a lot about how the virus spread or how best to contain it. We didn't have access to masks. We didn't know how important masks were. We were busy disinfecting surfaces that probably didn't need to be disinfected. There's a lot we learned in those early months and it's helped us to get back to not normal but more normal. We're able to go out of our houses and interact in ways that are safer by using basic protections like the masks that I'm wearing right now. And folks who were more vulnerable found ways to adapt and stay home. The grocery shelves weren't bare any more, people had delivery services, people helping them shop. We figured it out together. And I'm sure there are some decisions that we all would have made differently, that I would have made differently, that Governor Evers would have made differently. Hindsight is 20/20. We've learned a lot about this virus in the last year. We've learned a lot about our economy in the last year. But the other side of the aisle has sowed divisions and politicized this from the very start and now you want to say? That's not how this works. Now look folks we're almost there. The light is at the end of the tunnel. I have been worried for the past year about my elderly parents. They could die if they got this virus. And, thankfully, they are now fully vaccinated and I've been able to breathe a sigh of relief that we made it that far. I just got my first vaccine shot yesterday. So in about six weeks, I will be fully vaccinated and more and more of my friends and family are moving in that same direction and I look forward to the entire state of Wisconsin being eligible to get vaccinated very soon. So I really truly hope we're almost there. I really truly hope we don't have some setback because of another variant or something like that. But we're not quite there yet. We still need folks working from home if they can safely. We still need folks wearing masks and our businesses and people who haven't been able to get back to work yet need economic assistance to be able to actually recover from this pandemic and the American rescue plan is designed to provide that. Now I hear my colleagues on the other side of the aisle saying that they don't know how Governor Evers spent the money we got so far and so they're worried they won't know how he spends this money. What a bunch of nonsense. I know how he spent it. My district covers parts of Rock and Green County and in Rock County I know that from the CARES Act we had over \$12 million that was spent. I know that over \$1.3 million of that was spent to help small businesses through the We're All In grant program. And another \$1.3 million in farm support payments and \$1.4 million in rental assistance. Nearly \$2 million in contact tracing and another \$250,000 in testing coordination. I know that businesses that were uniquely impacted and nonprofits that were uniquely impacted, like movie theaters and museums, each got about \$150,000. And in Green County, it's a little bit smaller, so the numbers are lower but no less important. It's a big farming county and there \$1.4 million in farm support payments. \$183,000 in rental assistance. \$655,000 in the We're All In grants for small businesses. Now that's not all I've got more here, I could go on, I won't bore you with that. But the point is, this was critical aid to our communities and I know that each of you can find these numbers for the counties that you represent. You can find a list of the businesses that were helped. You can send them a

letter and let them know about the great tax benefits that we've given them as I did with the businesses in my district. So don't tell me you don't know how the money was spent. It was spent to help folks in our community who desperately needed it and that is the same thing that is going to happen with the money from the American rescue plan unless, unless, this legislature gets in the way and micromanages it, holds it up in the Joint Finance Committee or worst of all sues and stops us from getting it at all. That is the absolute worst thing that could happen to the state of Wisconsin and yet we've seen the track record on the other side of the aisle with the Medicaid expansion, with unemployment insurance, and so it's a real fear that that could happen again. Please don't let it. We cannot afford that. We will get out of this pandemic together. We will rebuild our economy together. But we have to let the governor, who has been willing to act throughout the past year, we have to let him act again, we have to let him get this money to where it needs to go. Not through a slow, cumbersome process but as quickly as we possibly can. That is how Wisconsin will recover and get out of this together, that's how we rebuild, that's how we make sure we can put this pandemic behind us once and for all, once we're all vaccinated and so I hope you will join me in voting no on this legislation and moving forward together.

Representative Spiros: Representative from the 22nd.

Representative Brandtjen (22): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Pivot. Pivot. Pivot. The last time we had an update on these funds was February 2, 2021. We don't know how the money's been spent. Give me a break. This is exactly why we're here. This is why we're having the debate. I heard laughter on the other side when somebody said this is our children's money. This is exactly your children's money. The federal government doesn't have this money. They're printing it. They're printing this money. So guess what? We want to know how it's going to be spent. Amazing. You know we don't know these numbers are estimated numbers, we don't have final numbers. I am really glad that some representatives know exactly how much because I'm telling you the last sheet that we got made it very clear that there's a difference between what was spent and what was supposedly spent. Forty five percent of those deaths, 45% came from senior living facilities and we spent \$10 million dollars on the movies? I like the movies, I get it. Should we have given them a rapid test maybe to cut down some of the deaths? We have more scientific information. Why can't we have a conversation? We do not have the numbers in. And I beg the Governor to give us a final report, have it by the end of the month, let us see the numbers. But until that point, I think our constituents are going to demand that we have a conversation about how the next dollars are spent. We have until 2024. Let's get the biggest bang for the buck and let's have, I mean inflation's going up, there are a lot of things that are going to be different from what's going forward than what we've had in the past. Our job is to work together. Our job is to make sure that we're being responsible and as I look at some of the dollars here that were supposedly spent, compared to what was actually spent, the taxpayers and this body and the Senate demand to have those answers. Thank you very much. The vote is green.

Representative Spiros: Representative from the 20th.

Representative Sinicki (20): Thank you Mr. Speaker. Yes, it is true, in 2008-2009, I did vote for transparency. But in 2008-2009, yes, we were in the majority, we controlled both houses and the governor's office but also it was a very different time. It was a time when we could actually work across the aisle and trust across the aisle. I don't, to me that's what some of this is about. From day one, even before Governor Evers was elected, you devised a plan to strip him of his power. And don't sit there and deny it because we all know it actually happened. Mr. Speaker, this is nothing but another power grab. It is nothing but another power grab. How many of you get up in the morning, look in the mirror and say to yourself, Hmmm, how can I get more power? How can I keep that power and how can I abuse that power? That's what I see happening here over and over and over again. Now when you look at what has happened the past year with COVID and what this administration has been able to do despite the fact that you tried to tie their hands. You know we are now top in the nation for getting people vaccinated. Boy I remembered it wasn't that long ago that you actually wanted to, the majority party here, actually wanted to basically take that power away from the governor and control who was going to get vaccinated. Yeah that was a really good idea because I'm pretty sure our numbers would not look so good right now. Now, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from the 5th said, and it's true, we have until December 2024 to use this money. He said there's plenty of time. There is not plenty of time. I would suggest you go through my district and see the businesses that are struggling. They cannot wait for Joint Finance or the Republicans to decide that they're worthy of this funding. Mr. Speaker, the other thing that concerns me about this if you are – if we were to give you this oversight because, let's face it, we would not have the oversight, it would be you. Mr. Speaker, let's face it, my community, other urban communities, are going to suffer because you have more than once made it very clear that you are very concerned about how much money Milwaukee is getting. So, Mr. Speaker, I cannot vote for this. You know there's times that I don't – I don't always agree with the Governor. But Mr. Speaker, he was elected governor of the state of Wisconsin – not you, Mr. Speaker, not the gentleman from the 63rd, not me. This is his call and I am, I cannot, we cannot sit back and wait for the Republicans in this chamber or Joint Finance to decide who is worthy of assistance.

Representative Spiros: Representative from the 98th.

Representative Neylon (98): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. One of the reasons our government has been able to function so well throughout our nation in our state's history is because we have something known as the separation of powers. We have a system of checks and balances built within our system to make sure that there's things like transparency and accountability and the opportunity for the public to weigh in. There is a check on our power in the legislature. When we come together and decide what we think should be a law and we send it to the governor's desk, he has the ability to veto that. When we work on our budget, he has the ability to check our power and to bring balance to the system. If we don't pass

this legislation today, where is the check on his power and where is the balance in this system? We are conceding our ability. One of the main things that is within our purview – we are conceding that and we are losing that in not providing the transparency and the accountability and that opportunity for the public to weigh in. I'm of the mind that when it comes to taxpayer money – more eyes the better. When I'm working on legislation, the more people I have involved in the process typically the better product we have at the end of the day. The governor doesn't have the ability to be everything to everyone and know what every single challenge every single person in the state of Wisconsin is facing. That's why we have representative government so we're able to carry those people's voices – the businesses in our district, the nonprofits, people in the community that are struggling. We're able to bring those voices to the table and make sure they have a seat at the table, that their taxpayer dollars are being looked out for and if we concede our ability to have some role in this, there will be no check on the executive power and no balance in our system and that's a dangerous precedent to set. We disagree on a lot of things, but I think we can all at the end of the day agree that there's a reason there are checks and balances and separation of power built into our system. Nobody ran for office because they wanted to skew our system to one side or the other in terms of who has the most power. We didn't run for the legislature to be all powerful. The governor didn't run to be an all-powerful governor. We all ran and we all talk about working together to make sure there's a system of checks and balance. Unfortunately, we're giving that away today if we're not able to come together and pass this legislation so there is some representation within how this federal stimulus money gets spent. Again, when it comes to taxpayer money, the more eyes the better and when it comes to taxpayer money the governor owes those taxpayers the ability to have some check on his power and some balance within our system. Thank you.

Representative Spiros: Representative from the 97th.

Representative Allen (97): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It was the best of times, it was the worst of times. It's a tale of two cities. Today it's the tale of two parties. We don't speak the same language. We talk past one another. We have our own heroes and we worship them. We fight not for principle or policy, but we fight for personalities. I have a fear, Mr. Speaker, that America is a country in crisis not because of the coronavirus pandemic and the challenges that we face, but by the kind of people that we are devolving into and not because of the pandemic because of other circumstances even outside of the pandemic. We can look at the glass as being half full or the glass as being half empty. Either way, you're right. We see things in different ways. We had a special session. We met here at the end of 2018 and we took some actions and many people harbor resentment for those actions, Mr. Speaker. Many people cling to that as being a representation of an attack on a personality. And I don't know, I mean maybe some people had that perspective. My perspective, Mr. Speaker, was a little bit different about the situation. Quite frankly, after eight years of a governor's reign I think that, you know, maybe we as a Republican legislature got a little too enamored with our leader. Again, personality and I

believe perhaps that we as a legislature had acquiesced all too often for the success of the governor. And then we got to post 2018 November election and we got a little fearful about, well, what would those powers mean in a new administration? Now some of that action might have been personality driven, it might have been partisanship, but I think that those decisions that we made will serve this state well long term – not during the term of this current governor – but long term. I think the more that we can rein in the power of government and control the power of government and government is represented by the executive branch, the more we can control that the healthier and stronger our country will be long term, Mr. Speaker. You go in the center of the rotunda and you look up at the mosaics, the beautiful mosaics. There's four words in those mosaics: justice, liberty, legislation and government. Legislation is meant to restrain government for the protection of liberty and the ensuring of justice. This problem is not a Wisconsin problem – this problem is a nationwide problem. Most of us on the Republican side would suggest that we do not like the execution of executive orders. And that's true whether it's, you know, a President Trump or a President Biden. We don't like somebody just simply with the stroke of a pen altering government. It's unrestrained power but that's what we're devolving into as a nation – where we attach our obsession with the ideology that we have to a personality – to an individual. Like, you know, some people might rationalize and say 'well heck as long as it's Donald Trump doing the executive orders it's ok'. Or, they might rationalize on the other side 'well as long as it's President Biden – I'm glad President Biden's in there' somebody might say. And then what do we have in the legislature? We have a legislature that whether it's on the national or, or state level that is so fanatically focused on polling data, so fanatically focused on popular opinion, which is embodied in the personality of the leader of the party, that those legislatures are really not legislating they're simply packaging stuff together in an effort to make their executive look good. And so we saw, we see, with this most recent act of Congress a very hastily put together package of pork barrel spending designed to give Biden the opportunity to shine. If the state legislatures don't own up to their responsibilities, if they don't represent the people, it's not going to happen in Congress. We know that Congress is broke. We know that. I mean it's just broken. They need – it needs fixing. We know that. So, so it's – we're the last, last stand here – the state legislature. We are closest to the people. We are most responsive to the people. If we're going to protect and preserve this country as we know it, we have to recognize the importance of protecting liberty and ensuring justice through the process of legislation to restrain the government. Our founding fathers spent, I don't know, countless hours not just writing the constitution but then advocating for it and explaining it and detailing the purposes of a legislature. This is, this is what we're here to do. And I get it, look if I – if I were a Democrat I would be like a little worried that gee you know the Republicans control the legislature right now. I'd rather, I'd rather see these decisions being made by the guy on my side. I get that. But, and I don't know, I mean somehow we have to – we have to figure out a way to communicate with the same language – that recognizing what we're here

for that we're an important part of the process and we need to engage even if we lose vote after vote after vote. I know it's easy for me to say, right? It's easy for me to say. But even if we lose vote after vote after vote you still have a voice at the table – we still have these debates. If you're on the Joint Finance Committee, you still can have your say and that can be reported in the press. We can still have the conversation, which is what we're tasked to do, that's our job. But if we just let a broken Congress just throw a whole bunch of money at an executive who can then just throw it to the, the state executives and let them do as they wish – where does this end? This is, this is not the direction that our, our founding fathers had intended – this is not the direction that will preserve this great country of ours. We will devolve into personality politics. Heck we might as well just have kings who have armies who fight one another. This principal – I encourage you before you leave here today, Mr. Speaker, walk into that rotunda, look up at those mosaics, recognize what our responsibility is as a legislature to legislate, to represent the people of the districts that we represent, to have this conversation and not to just give all of our power over to an executive. This is, this is a critical point in our history and I, look, we need to figure out a way as a legislature, as two different parties, how to find that common ground, right? And, you know, when, when you're struggling to find common ground, I think you have to go back to core principles and, I don't, if you've got another source document other than our Constitution and the Federalist Papers – if you've got another source document where we can look to for what the core principles are then, then show me. But I think that's the only way that we're going to be able to find a common language in which we can find common ground. This is a critical, critical time. It's not going to happen. Our answers are not going to come from Washington D.C. They're not going to come from there. Mr. Speaker, thank you for your time.

Representative Spiros: Gentleman from the 18th.

Representative Goyke (18): Thank you. I hope that we don't devolve into feudal states. I don't think that's going to happen in this country. We've managed to avoid that for over 200 years and I think all of us are committed to making sure that we're not ruled by the sovereign anymore. So earlier I was listening to the gentleman from the 63rd and I was reflecting on something that he used to say. A few years ago on the floor of the assembly, the gentleman from the 63rd would come out and speak and he would direct his commentary to Democrats and he would say that we, Democrats, have Walker derangement syndrome. Anybody remember the Speaker's line -Walker derangement syndrome? Now at the time, I would kind of grumble in my chair and I would say 'Man! The Speaker's got like 12 people on his staff, including multiple comms directors, couldn't he come up with something better than Walker derangement syndrome?' His argument was that Democrats on the floor of the Assembly would, issue after issue, we would always be focused on Scott Walker. It was all about Scott Walker. It was all about Scott Walker. I have a smaller staff and no such comms person so just scribbling an idea here – I think Republicans now suffer from the Tony Evers fever. That's not that good – alright, I'll

work on it. I'll get better but at least that kind of rhymes. I think it's better than Walker derangement syndrome and I try to be original and not just copy what the Republicans used to say. In 2010, Republicans in Wisconsin won a wave election and, and you guys came in – I wasn't in office yet – but in the first hundred days in 2011 you passed dozens and dozens of bills that objectively reshaped government in the state of Wisconsin. Since that first session, we have seen a slow reduction of new ideas. What is a Republican in Wisconsin and what is the Republican Party's agenda today? What is the ideology? I think the gentleman from the 97th just pointed out in a little bit of reflection in the mirror that Republicans prayed too often at the altar of the personality of Donald Trump and lost sight of the party's platform and the ideology. Since November of 2018, Republicans in this building have been obsessed with Tony Evers – either catching up with him, trying to match his budget and increase spending in health care, education and transportation or trying to block him through legislation like this bill or litigation. You sued him before and apparently, now we're going to sue him again. The Tony Evers fever. What do Republicans in Wisconsin stand for today? What is the agenda? What are the meaningful acts of the legislature passed so far this year? What has consumed the majority of time in debate on the floor of this assembly? I will tell you – it is all about Tony Evers. Wisconsin Republicans are obsessed with either chasing him or trying to block him and I know because I once suffered from Walker derangement syndrome. It gets a little cloudy in the haze. You gotta break free of it. You've got to break free of it. Your elected leader, the gentleman from the 63rd, said that this vote, this bill, was the most important thing we do today. He even made a call of the house to get everybody back in here to listen to his speech about how this bill was so important. Well, the bill's going to be vetoed so it's clearly not the most important bill of the day and he went on about wanting Democratic amendments and maybe that was because he knows the bill is going to get vetoed because it's a partisan bill, because it didn't have democratic input in its drafting. Maybe that's why he wanted us to break for partisan caucus to come up with amendments to his own bill. And then the Speaker, the gentleman from the 63rd, went on about how this bill has a robust process, increases transparency, openness and good government. Let me tell you, the fourteen day passive review process of the Joint Committee on Finance is not an open and transparent process and it is not a model of good government. And let me descend into the particulars a little bit here, it's not open, transparent and good government because any one of the sixteen members of the committee may file an objection and that objection is anonymous. You want to open the doors of government – sunshine on how these funds are being spent and yet an objection could be made in secret by one legislator. Governor Evers is accountable to over five and a half million Wisconsinites. You're going to give the power of an objection to uphold or to hold up federal funds to somebody elected by 57,000 and we know that the Joint Committee on Finance can mire in delays because we've got to work with the Senate, Mr. Speaker. They are half the committee. The Senate Republican Caucus – it's half the committee. The gentleman from the 63rd a few years ago called them terrorists because

they were holding up the budget process. Anyone on this floor had a Knowles-Nelson stewardship project in their district objected to by a Senate Republican? Did you ever get a firm answer on which one of those six held up the project? Is your project one of the eight or nine Knowles-Nelson stewardship projects sitting in the Joint Committee on Finance right now? We have a – we have a project from 2018 objected to in secret – never written, spoken about or voted on. I don't know why the person objected to the project. I have a sneaking suspicion, having served on the committee for three years, that that member of Finance has an ideological objection to Knowles-Nelson stewardship and he or she is allowed to hold up the project and object and object and object and object. So I ask myself that if this bill were to become law, what are some of the key things that the governor may do with federal funds to the people that elected me? Over the course of this pandemic I've heard from a number of constituents on the brink of homelessness and the housing assistance program that spread out all across the state was critical in preventing homelessness and helping landlords collect some form of rent. The other is food security – investments to connect farmers and food banks and food pantries so people that were unemployed didn't go hungry. I imagine the governor may send more money to these critical programs but if one of the members of the twelve Republican members on the Joint Committee on Finance has an ideological objection to helping rental assistance and preventing homelessness or preventing food insecurity, he or she may object. Now let's get into the other details. There is nothing in state statute that requires the Joint Finance Committee to hold a hearing. There's no time limit. Once an objection is filed, it's up to the discretion of the co-chairs. We have never acted on that Knowles-Nelson stewardship project from 2018. It just sits there in a drawer. Are you going to let that happen to housing assistance, to food assistance? The answer is you don't know because you can't predict what the six Republican senators will do and the blanket of secrecy, the antithesis of open and transparent and good government, it could be one of your colleagues sitting next to you.

Representative Spiros: Gentleman from the 18th, the gentleman from the 63rd would like to ask you a question. (unintelligible)

Representative Spiros: Gentleman from the 18th has the floor.

Representative Goyke (18): So we've heard questions about what is our responsibility in the role of legislators on this floor abdicating responsibility. My responsibility to the 57,000 people that elected me is to help them the best I can in getting through one of the most difficult, unprecedented and uncertain times. They need the relief now. It is my responsibility to help them get that relief and not have that relief delayed which is why I am by the voting no on this legislation. Thank you.

Representative Spiros: Gentleman from the 63rd.

Speaker Vos (63): Had the gentleman from Milwaukee had the courtesy to yield to a question I would have simply said

let's add an amendment that requires at least a member of the minority to object which would mean that a Democrat would have to disagree with their own governor. Would that be acceptable to actually say we don't want this process? But of course you didn't have the courage to say yes so I understand you don't want to actually debate the bill you just want to make talking points that are actually not in the spirit of trying to find an answer. You're just looking to defend the governor no matter what. Let's just remember two points as we conclude this debate because it now seems that Democrats are unwilling to compromise, unwilling to offer any idea besides critiques and complaints and condemnations. So I heard the gentleman from the 54th talk about the budget and that that's going to be our opportunity. Do you realize that the amount of federal dollars that Governor Evers is going to get to spend unilaterally is larger than the entire increase in the state budget? So for those of you who think the budget process is going to be superinformative and boy that's going to be our opportunity to make a difference? There's even more money on the table that you are now saying one person gets to spend unilaterally with no oversight, no control, no accountability, but you want to have this robust process where we can go through the budget which you offered amendments. Some years you've done none; some years you've offered lots. The hypocrisy in here is just unbelievable. You have an opportunity to make the process in the way that you actually could have input. Right now many of you have told me in private you don't even get to talk to the governor. They have zero outreach. They never really work with you. Well, welcome to the club because we don't get that either. So the ability for the governor to come forward with a plan that says here's where I would like to spend the money we have to have at least a Democrat object even if all twelve of the sixteen Republicans would say no. I would be open to the idea of at least having one Democrat join us so at least the taxpayers would know where the money goes because right now we have zero idea where the money goes. It's not even a Rube Goldberg contraption because at least there is a result at the end. This is a dark black box that no one understands. The gentleman from the 5th made probably one of the best points. Do we have any idea why the Governor made a decision to put money into some of the programs that he did as opposed to putting it into helping nursing homes or helping other groups? We have zero idea because there's no accountability whatsoever. So for the rest of the session when I hear all of you say you want to work with us and you want to come up with amendments and let's just figure a way to include the minority and the majority, I am offering the opportunity today and if you choose not to take it that is your right. But then do not be surprised when people on this side of the aisle who have our ideas say the same thing in return and that's not the way this process is supposed to work. If people sincerely offer an opportunity to say give us a better idea, help us find a better way to put this contraption together, let's do it. But at the end of the day, I have no doubt that you will fall into partisan line with whatever Governor Evers tells you to do which is to vote no because he wants to be dictator, he wants to be king. But mark my words and I would ask one unanimous consent request: I would ask unanimous consent that the Clerk's office transcribe from Wisconsin Eye this

entire debate to be put into the Assembly Journal because I want all of us to be able to go back, in very easy searchable fashion, when we come back with a new governor in 2023 and you hold us on this side to account for saying that we want to have oversight but we won't have that same offer to have the minority involved because the hypocrisy on that side of the aisle to say what's good for us but not for you. I'm offering it for every governor. This would be permanent. You are turning down what I think is a very generous offer to be able to involve the minority in a way that you never have before. But that's your right if you stick with the governor as opposed to the Institution.

Representative Spiros: Representative from the 31st.

Representative Loudbeck (31): Well thank you very much for recognizing me and I just want to say I think we've had a really robust debate. The Speaker said a lot of, a lot of things that I had written down and so have many others, some excellent, the gentleman from the 98th, and actually I think the gentleman from the 18th is always – always fun to kind of go back and forth with when we're in Finance and some of the things that the Speaker pointed out were really – really appropriate but I think he might have left out even a couple more reasons why this plan should go to Joint Finance. So I think Representative Goyke mentioned, or representative from the 18th mentioned...

Representative Spiros: Please direct your comments to the chair.

Representative Loudbeck (31): Yes sir. Representative from the 18th mentioned that you don't get a hearing when something is objected to. So let's just talk about the budget process for a minute. So two years ago, Governor Evers introduced a budget, sent it to the Joint Finance Committee and there was a lot of chatter, a lot of inside baseball, about what's the legislature going to do? Are they going to be able to pass a budget that the governor is going to sign, that their colleagues are going to agree with? Is the whole project going to blow up? Are they going to go to Conference Committee? Everybody was just watching and waiting for our entire legislative process to fail because we couldn't get along with the Governor. And you know what happened? We passed a budget. We passed a budget on time that you all said no to and your governor signed with all you standing behind him and we were left at home. Do you remember that? Because I was kind of reminded of that a few weeks ago. Governor Evers invited me to a virtual bill signing. We were actually the test. I don't know if any of you have had a virtual bill signing yet but I did. He invited me. I signed in and logged on. Actually a bunch of you were there – a bunch of that side of the aisle was there because you know what? Governor Evers didn't invite any Republicans to my bill signing. He invited all the Democrats and me and the Public Defender. So when everyone pops on the Zoom I'm thinking, 'Oh my gosh! I just got punked!' But you know what? I don't care because my bill got signed and I'm going to handle it with grace and I'm going to be happy for the Public Defender but wow! Petty politics. You guys, we're looking at a \$90 billion budget document. I know – no props. Ya'll have one in your offices but it's a lot of work and I'll be darned if I'm going to sit and

try to figure out as the Speaker said what part of the \$3.4 billion dollars of new gpr that is contained in this budget we're going to approve when I know that the governor has \$3.2 billion dollars at his discretion that he's not going to share any information with us about. What an epic colossal waste of four months. We're going to go all around the state and listen to people and you know what Governor Evers is going to do? He's going to go walk into a vaccination clinic and send out a press release and go home. Where are people going to find him? Are they going to go to the job center and say, 'hey can you send the governor a message about unemployment?' You know what? The job centers are closed. So maybe they'll go to the DNR service center and give their input on the DNR. Ope! They're closed too. So you know what? They'll probably call our offices, right? And you know what? We'll be there and so will our staff and that is why our plan makes sense because we're the ones that are going to be doing the heavy lifting with this budget and we are more than qualified and more than happy to be at the table on behalf of all of Wisconsin and that's why this is so important. So thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Representative Spiros: Previously, the Speaker had asked, the gentleman from the 63rd, asked for unanimous consent to have the Clerk's office transcribe the entire debate into the journal. Without objection, so ordered. Next up, gentleman from the 43rd.

Representative Vruwink (43): Thank you for acknowledging me. I wasn't going to speak but after listening to the gentleman from the 97th he made some points that I thought were very valid and I just wanted to make a couple things. I believe our federal government is broke. I believe this state government is broke. The federal government became broke when cable news came about. Fox News, MSNBC, spewing different things over and over that we know were lies and you listened to them if they favored your side. The state government here in Wisconsin, I believe, broke down with Act 10 and gerrymandering and it created distrust and hypocrisy. I'm not blaming either side for it. It's our politics and to me it makes our democracy look tired. There's something wrong with it. And when I look at the rankings around the world they say American democracy who we used to be the city upon a hill for everybody to look down upon us and look at America as the beacon of democracy. I think we rank twenty fifth in the world today. Many smaller countries are ahead of us and it is concerning to me because as the representative from the 97th said, 'I fear for our future'. I think back to the American Revolution and many you mentioned the Constitution today. You know there were only a third of Americans who fully supported the Revolution. A third were neutral and a third wanted to remain loyal and the reason that those third wanted the Revolution is they felt the British government had grown tired. They had, they had not carried out democracy the way they had wanted to. We had in the British government what was called rotten boroughs, gerrymandered districts of 500 people and some 100,000 people so that democracy was rigged and so what seems black and white to many of you today well you should vote for this or you should vote to take care of your legislative powers. It's because of the distrust at its helm with

government today. It's like American capitalism was when the Great Depression hit. That also looked tired and Roosevelt tried to fix it with his New Deal and a lot of things he did saved capitalism but didn't work or were unconstitutional, but the war revived capitalism again. We need something to revive our democracy. We need to stop the hypocrisy. We need, we need to build trust back up with each other. When we can do that, our government will work for us again. So I'm hoping that's in our future. Thank you.

Representative Spiros: Representative from the 56th.

Representative Murphy (56): Thank you, Mr. Speaker and I'd like to give a big thank you to the gentleman from the 5th and the gentleman from the 98th for their very, very strong and passionate defense of our institution. The gentleman from the 45th said that there's a lot to learn from the early days of the pandemic and I would definitely agree with that. And I think a lot of what we learned was the CARES Act came out of Washington. We felt the need for that to get out there quickly and the governor was given control, total control, of that money and so out it went. What happened with a lot of that money? Was it all wisely spent? One of my big bugaboos was the fact that we spent \$40 million to buy 1500 ventilators. Now the state had 1250 ventilators throughout the state and I think at the peak of the pandemic we used about 400 of them but now we have 1500 additional ventilators that I don't know what we're going to do with. I guess we'll probably put them in storage and I'm quite sure that they were never used. Now that's \$40 million that I think you know a lot of districts in the state could have used. The gentleman from the 81st talked earlier. I'm sure his district could use \$40 million. The gentleman from the 45th went through a long list of all the things that were, you know, that were given to his district but I think \$40 million more would have been something they could have used. The lady from the 20th said, "How much time do we have?" I would ask, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentledady from the 20th to yield to a question?

Representative Spiros: She's not at her seat.

Representative Murphy (56): Ah! So she's not at her seat. If she were in her seat to debate this issue, I would have asked her how much money is still left from the original CARES Act that we haven't spent? I don't know the exact number but I understand it's millions and millions and millions and millions of dollars and we have no time? We haven't spent the money we've been already given. Why is the time factor here so urgent? The gentleman from the 18th said that we have Evers fever. But just two years ago, in five months we were able to put together a budget that Governor Evers signed. When in the biennium before that with Scott Walker as governor, we had some problems and it took us a while and took us until late September to be able to get a budget put together. Did we have Evers fever when we were putting that budget together? I don't think so. I think we were doing the work that this body was entrusted to do. So, you know, I think there's been a lot of rhetoric today and it really doesn't meet with the facts that I see. I look at this process and I say how did this all come about? Why are we at this place at this point in time? Well we were told that a COVID pandemic was going to decimate our country and so it was important that we

borrow money from China and get it out there as quickly as we could. Don't use any legislative oversight. Just get it out there as quickly as you can. So now we have \$40 million worth of ventilators that we're never going to use. That's just one example. I'm sure that most of you could come up with other good examples of how money was wasted. But there are people out there that are hurting – some – but not most. And the question is how do we get money to the people that need it and not waste it on things that we don't need? This is exactly what this legislature is supposed to be about and it's appalling to me that members of this body will not defend it and will not stand up for the body's right to make these decisions. The Constitution says that the legislative body is here to decide what money is spent and that's exactly what we should be doing. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Representative Spiros: Representative from the 74th.

Representative Meyers (74): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I've been in this chamber for about six years and during my first term I was always surprised when the Democrats introduced an amendment and it never was accepted by the majority party. And then in my second term I was less surprised when that happened. And now I am shocked when an amendment by the Democrats is accepted. Mr. Speaker, do you know how many amendments have been introduced in the last six years by Democrats that have been accepted? I don't either, Mr. Speaker. But I did ask the Legislative Reference Bureau and, unfortunately, they couldn't get me the information this quickly; but staff said approximately twelve amendments have been introduced so far this session and one of them has been accepted. So when Speaker Vos came out to talk to us and plead with us to please caucus and bring back in an amendment and I promise you, and that may not be a quote, but I give you my word. I will honestly look at it.

Representative Spiros: Direct your comments to the chair, please.

Representative Meyers (74): I am.

Representative Spiros: You mentioned – you mentioned a name and we don't mention names in this (unintelligible)

Representative Meyers (74): The gentleman from the 63rd, excuse me. So, I cannot speak for all my colleagues on this side of the aisle, but I do not believe you. I do not have trust and faith that you will take anything we bring to you with the full faith that our amendments deserve. So maybe, to prove that to me, please prove to me I'm wrong. Let's see what happens for the rest of this session when Democrats introduce amendments that are good. Let's see if they get passed.

Representative Spiros: Representative from the 62nd.

Representative Wittke (62): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I've been patiently sitting here today and I wasn't going to speak on this issue because I think it's a no brainer that we pick up and have some oversight over these massive funds coming into our state. But, but I must say to the lady from the 31st I'm jealous – we had a half billion dollar tax relief bill that we got two minutes notice that the governor was just online signing but I did get two pens for it just to, just to let you know. But what I don't understand, and I appreciate those that

are left on the other side of the aisle, taking me back into a childhood show, *The Twilight Zone*, because I must not have been here last session when we went through a few things. I've heard comments like: where were you last session when the first round of the CARES money came in for oversight? I believe the governor himself, and I could go back and dig up the press release, said that anything in Act 185 that would provide oversight wouldn't be passed and I couldn't see voting against any or having a bill vetoed at that point in time that would have put many of our residents in peril. So I'm just going to go with the track record for this vote. I would remind people on the other side why – why is this state of Wisconsin in a better position to handle the issues around this health emergency because of the 8-10 years that the Republicans put in managing the budget and putting us into the best financial health we've been in in quite some time. I think you should not forget that we've also worked to clean up our books so that we don't encumber future generations with – with just debt upon debt and spending upon spending. So I look at the track record that this governor has had handling unemployment dispersal – not so good. And many of the other items that I have waited for him to govern. The fact that we've asked him for a plan just to bring people back to work to serve the people of Wisconsin. I go into my private industry experience. Most of my colleagues in the private industry have had plans to come back into work since last March/April and have revised them based on things that have come through in the last eight months. You mention how this governor really got to the first CARES Act and brought the funds out to really save people. Maybe you should go back and check the details and take a look at the time the Treasury provided Wisconsin with the funds and then based upon the time that they were dispersed which led the congressman from my district to ask our governor was he going to spend the money we gave him or was he going to just continue to ask for more spending. We've got to remember that if you take a look at the facts that are out here a lot of these programs were not funded until September – quite, quite, uh, quite a short period before the December timeframe to get this money spent. So based on those track records, I will vote with my colleagues on this side of the aisle believing that we should have some oversight so that we can steward this money in a responsible manner and I guess I'm just tired of waiting for the governor to do his job, which is govern. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Representative Spiros: Representative from the 81st.

Representative Considine (81): Thank you. I just want to come back and answer the second question the representative from the 5th asked me. And that was, you know, how do you know where the money's been spent? And my answer that I tried to give him was I watch almost daily, now it's probably bi-weekly, as the governor continually sends out press releases about this money is going here from the COVID relief package – and it was almost daily so that's how I track it. It seems pretty obvious that the governor's being open and transparent and telling us.

Representative Spiros: Representative from the 27th.

Representative Vorpapel (27): Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Mr. Speaker, so I'm a little confused today and maybe some of the folks over here can help me answer a question because I feel like I'm having déjà vu all over again. So, we were in this chamber, I can't remember if it was a week, two weeks ago, taking up a bill off of a special session call from the governor asking the legislature to approve money for an upgrade of the unemployment system—money that was—had already gone through the legislative process. We had numerous documents from different legislative agencies saying he had the authority to do that. So my question is: what's changed in that time? Maybe—maybe I'm wrong. Maybe the governor now decided he had a change of heart and decided that he is on board with this and would like to seek the approval of the legislature before spending some of this money. So I guess we'll see. So the reason I ran—there is—there was a lot of talk today about why we ran. Why don't folks run for governor if they want this power? But the reason I ran to serve in the legislature as a co-equal branch of government is to be closest to the people and to serve the people in Sheboygan and Manitowoc County and part of that responsibility and obligation as many have alluded to before is having the power of the purse and be able to appropriate funds through different legislation. I know we've heard a lot of talk today about—about the process and how this is a passive review process. We've talked about ways that this bill could be improved as the gentleman from the 63rd had mentioned earlier. One thing I'll point out is in the April bill that the legislature passed reserved 75—somewhere in the neighborhood of \$75 million of funds for the governor to spend that went unspent. So that brings me to the oversight—the oversight of where the money's being spent. Of course, we have a passive review process through this so for those who think that—are sort of taking what was said earlier out of context in this situation about how this is—this is a slog and that's not entirely true. If the money is spent where we—we—both sides of the aisle feel that it should be spent—then it's a—it's a fairly quick process. So what's—what's the next thing that the legislature can do to provide oversight? I don't know? Maybe open—send some open records requests over to the governor and try—and try and find out what's been going on. Well Sunshine Week, I understand, was a few weeks ago and I see a number of my friends from—who stand over behind the stanchions over there have—have left. But we've been having trouble with that haven't we? Gentleman from the 4th I think I saw a press release from you yesterday that you've been waiting—was it over a month—for an open records request from the governor to figure out what their plan was for vaccinating inmates and some other questions? A month! That—well, that's probably the first time, right? You know, he's a liberal for, you know, open government, transparency. How about the gentleman from the 37th? I seem to remember we heard in a committee that I'm on a great idea that you had about removing different adverse language from the state statute. Got bill jacked by the governor who actually made it a much longer process or tried to make it a much longer process to accomplish a similar goal. Gentleman from the 37th, I believe, sent an open records request to the governor's office and basically got back things that were undecipherable. It was so redacted that it was basically

meaningless. One final example, our former colleague, the co-chairman of Joint Finance from last session, I can't remember what the issue is—was on—I mean there's so many of them I just can't keep them all straight—but I remember him saying he had an issue that he submitted an open records request to the governor for. And it took weeks and weeks and weeks and calls and teeth pulling and teeth pulling and, actually, I lost track of it. I can't remember if he even got the information or not. So what we have before us as my colleague from the 63rd and many others have pointed out was done in the late 2000's when the ARA—American Reinvestment Act—money came from the legislature and my friends on the other side of the aisle—some of them who are here—most of them who weren't—had not only were they in power in this chamber their colleagues in the south wing had a majority and they had a governor. And you know one thing that I just thought of as I was sitting here is there's a comedian podcaster I listen to quite often and he has this theory of stupid or liars so when politicians or celebrities or things like that say something that's preposterous. The point is neither one of them is a good—is a good answer. So when statements are made that, you know, that things used to work differently back then. You know people would work across the aisle. I prefer to turn that around and look at it a little different way. That, that I expect all of you to join us because you are as equally skeptical of a Democrat governor at that—at that time so I would think you would be as equally skeptical of a Democrat governor at this time. So to my colleagues I urge you for so many more reasons, so many that my colleagues have addressed and so many more to come, the vote is green.

Representative Spiros: Representative from the 24th.

Representative Knodl (24): Thank you, Mr. Speaker and I rise to make an admission and my admission is that I've got the fever! I've got the fever, representative from the 18th. I've got the fiscal fever—the fiscal Evers fever! Whatever you want to put it but I've got the fever and I admit it. And I have thought when I came here, a long time ago it seems now, that that was priority one was fiscal matters and our oversight on spending the taxpayers' dollars and prudently spending it as a bonus. So I've got that fever and it amazes me the willingness to run away and forfeit responsibility. So it appears we have another—another fever going throughout this room—the forfeit fever and here we have the other side of the aisle just willingly running away from responsibility and forfeiting our authority—constitutionally granted authority. So if, in fact, you have that fever and don't want to handle fiscal issues, I would suggest you also forfeit your paycheck. We don't want to do our jobs, oversee fiscal matters, then it's time to forfeit paychecks. Let's see this through. Let's have the oversight that we are charged with having and let's get on with solving the COVID crisis and get the economy back open and our state of Wisconsin will be just fine if we get back up and running. So join me in the fiscal fever.

Representative Spiros: We will go to the final speaker—the representative from the 32nd.

Representative August (32): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, we've certainly established something here in the last couple of hours and that is that Democrats don't care about

legislative oversight. That's really – that's really what it boils down to. We haven't heard any real policy reason of why we shouldn't get a look at this money. The closest description came from – from my friend from the 18th. I thought we were about to agree on something when he basically said that, and I'm paraphrasing, that he doesn't think that one member of Joint Finance should be able to object to something anonymously. So one person shouldn't be able to do something in the Finance Committee but if they're in the East Wing, well, spend, spend, spend baby! Who cares about the oversight at that point? If you're in the East Wing it doesn't matter. So we were close. I thought maybe we were going to be able to say, you know what? One person maybe shouldn't have all that power. We almost got there – almost. And that's really what it boils down to. You know I – I asked the Speaker this session to appoint me to the Joint Committee for Review of Administrative Rules and if you think I did that because it sounds super interesting – I get that it doesn't sound super interesting. But that's where a lot of these decisions are made, frankly. The non-fiscal ones the Finance Committee handles that. JCRAR handles the other. But you know what my colleagues from the other side of the aisle from both houses continually say when they vote against our motions in JCRAR? Well here we have a committee of just six Republicans making all these policy decisions. We need to have a bigger amount of people involved in this. This is a job for the legislature and the Governor not just six people. Well that's a – that's a fair conversation if you're going to also apply that same standard to the East – to the East Wing where it's one person regardless of who they are that gets to spend all this money. One person just makin' it rain – just spend, spend, spend and I just don't know where those arguments – how they can logically both be made. So maybe it really is that they don't like legislative oversight. Even the members that were here in 2009 and voted for something extremely similar to this as the gentleman from the 63rd pointed out earlier. So, OK, then why did they – why did they vote for it then if they don't – if they don't support it? I don't know. Maybe it was the massive tax hike that was in that bill that they just loved. It had to be. They're not going to vote for this today. So, that – this oversight couldn't be the reason that they voted for that bill. It must have been the tax increase. So at least we've sorted that out today. So, this is – this should be one of the easiest votes anyone in this chamber makes and if the – if the JFC process – if people don't want to go through that process for this I'm fine with – let's open it up – let's vote here – let's do it in this chamber. Let's have everybody get a chance to weigh in on how this money is spent. That's fine. I think that – that we crafted this bill to go the way we did because there could be some incidents where we need a little bit of speed in the responses we end this pandemic. That's fair. But if we want to do it through having more people see it instead of fewer we can do that's – fine. So this – this really is simple and we've spent a couple hours on this and Mr. Speaker I won't belabor this any longer except to say this: this is a super, super simple bill. This vote is about as easy as it can get. When I testified in both – on this bill in both houses unfortunately I didn't have a lot of my Democrat colleagues there in either house to actually, you know, talk about the bill probably because there isn't really a good argument to be

made against it. But I said that this is as easy as it gets. Either you believe that one person in a state of almost six million people should be able to make these decisions by him or herself or you don't and if you don't believe that they should, then the vote's going to be green today and I know that that's what we're going to do and, unfortunately, I just don't think that we're going to be joined in – in that and that's really too bad because I know – I know that a lot of my friends on the other side of the aisle think that that we should have this oversight but they're not going to take this vote because you know you can't tell the governor that you need to see what he's up to and that's really unfortunate. So let's vote yes and send this – send this on and we'll move on. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Representative Spiros: All right, Senate Bill 183 having been read three times shall the bill be concurred in? The Clerk has a pair.

Chief Clerk: Representative Macco for the passage of Senate Bill 183 – Representative Shankland against the passage of Senate Bill 183.

Representative Spiros: All in favor all vote Aye all oppose will vote No. The clerk open the roll and call the roll.

(Chief Clerk read the names)

Representative Spiros: Has everyone recorded their vote? If so, the Clerk will close the roll. There are 59 Ayes and 36 Noes. Senate Bill 183 is concurred in.