38th Legislative Day

- Speaker Lang: "The House will be in order. Members will please be in their chairs. We shall be led in prayer today by the Father Ben Stern, who is with St. Theresa Catholic Church in Salem. Father Stern is the guest of Representative Cavaletto. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off cell phones and rise for the invocation and Pledge of Allegiance. Father Stern."
- Father Stern: "God of justice, You promised to defend the rights of the weak, the poor, the oppressed, the widow, the orphan, and the unborn. Open our eyes to see and hear those hurting and those who are marginalized. Open our hands to give generously. Open our minds so that we may know Your will and strengthen our resolve so that we may put Your plan into action. May our deliberations pursue peace over pardon... partisanship and sustainable, economic development that advances prosperity and dignity to all people. Amen."
- Speaker Lang: "We'll be led in the Pledge today by Representative Bourne."
- Bourne-et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Lang: "Roll Call for Attendance. Leader Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record reflect that there are no House Democrats who are excused today."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Demmer."
- Demmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please excuse Representative Chad Hays for the day."

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Sir. Mr. Clerk, please take the record.

We have 117 Members present. And we do have a Quorum. The

Chair recognizes Mr. Andersson. For what reason do you rise,

Sir?"

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

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Andersson: "Thank you. I would like to rem... remind the Members of the Body that the National Council of State Legislators are having a reception tonight. It's at 5:30 at the Statehouse Inn. The invitation, by the way, is for staff and Legislators. And our very own Senator Toi Hutchinson is the incoming President-elect. So, come meet the NCL Staff and learn more about this bipartisan organization. Thank you."

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

Wehrli: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Proceed, Sir."

Wehrli: "Today I would like to take the time to wish my wife of 24 years a happy birthday."

Speaker Lang: "Happy birthday. Representative Jimenez."

Jimenez: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "You may proceed."

Jimenez: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a quick announcement about tomorrow to all the Members. Representative Butler and I have helped coordinate some food trucks to come out to the Capitol and park on Monroe Street. Seven food trucks from 11 o'clock to 2. And so, if you're so inclined and hopefully the rain holds off to help support some of our local businesses in Springfield. This has been an effort that Representative

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

Butler and I have been working on this Session. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Representative. Mr. Olsen."

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

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Olsen: "Thank you. I wanted to introduce a friend of mine and a constituent from Downers Grove, also fellow graduate of Downers Grove South High School and University of Illinois, Dan McNulty, who is with us in the gallery. Thank you for being here."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome to the House Chamber. Thank you for joining us. Mr. Severin."

Severin: "Mr. Speaker, point of personal privilege please."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Severin: "The second state Honor Flight is going on today, and in my district, flying out of Marion... the Veterans Airport, the 127 people flew to Washington, DC today, 32 of them women. One woman from WWII, Josephine Renshaw. So, we'd like... we've made a Resolution today that this is Honor Flight Day in the State of Illinois. So, we're proud to recognize the veterans that are flying to DC today. Thank you very much. And I'm still nervous."

Speaker Lang: "Well, you did very well nevertheless, Sir. Thank you. Mr. Skillicorn, for what reason do you rise?"

Skillicorn: "Personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "You may proceed."

Skillicorn: "Today is April 25 and it is the birthday of my mother. So, I want to say I love you, Mom and happy birthday." Speaker Lang: "Happy birthday, Mom. Mr. Demmer."

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

Demmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege." Speaker Lang: "Go right ahead."

- Demmer: "I'd like to welcome to the House Gallery today a group from Focus House in Ogle County. They're here today touring the Capitol and seeing lawmakers at work. We want to welcome them to the Capitol. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Welcome to the Capitol. Page 28 of the Calendar, Senate Bills-Second Reading, Senate Bill 14. Leader Currie.

 Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 14, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Second Reading of this Senate Bill.

 No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. A state mandates note has been requested but not filed at this time."
- Speaker Lang: "Please hold the Bill on the Order of Second Reading. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Mussman, Chairperson from the Committee on Mass Transit reports the following committee action taken on April 24, 2017: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 2802. Representative Tabares, Chairperson from the Committee on Elections & Campaign Finance reports the following committee action taken on April 24, 2017: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment 2 to House Bill 512. Representative Sims, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary Criminal reports the following committee action taken on April 24, 2017: do pass as amended Short Debate House Bill 3905; recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment 4 to House Bill 270, Floor Amendment 1 to House Bill 3355, Floor Amendment 3 to House Bill 3817, House Amendment... Floor Amendment 3 to House

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

Bill 3822, Floor Amendment 1 to House Bill 3831, Floor Amendment 3 to House Bill 3903, House Resolution 77. Representative Gabel, Chairperson from the Committee on Human Services reports the following committee action taken on April 24, 2017: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment 1 to House Bill 1853, Floor Amendment 2 to House Bill 2388, Floor Amendment 2 to House Bill 2762, Floor Amendment 3 to House Bill 2857, Floor Amendment 1 to House Bill 2907; House Resolution 62, House Resolution 250, House Resolution 252, House Resolution 253, House Resolution 254, House Resolution 255, House Resolution 269, House Resolution 270, House Resolution 271. Representative Rita, Chairperson from the Committee on Business & Occupational Licenses reports the following committee action taken on April 24, recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment 3 to House Bill 2752, Floor Amendment 1 to House Bill 3528, Floor Amendment 2 to House Bill 3806. Representative Walsh, Chairperson from the Committee on Counties & Townships reports the following committee action taken on April 24, 2017: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment 1 to House Bill 169. Representative Martwick, Chairperson from the Committee on Personnel & Pensions reports the following committee action taken on April 25, 2017: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment 1 to House Bill 418, Floor Amendment 1 to House Bill 3908. Representative Ford, Chairperson from the Committee Restorative Justice reports the following committee action taken on April 25, 2017: recommends be adopted is House Resolution 248. Representative Thapedi, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary - Civil reports the following

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

committee action taken on April 25, 2017: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment 1 to House Bill 140, House... Floor Amendment 2 to House Bill 188, Floor Amendment 3 to House Bill 189, Floor Amendment 3 to House Bill 2559, Floor Amendment 1 to House Bill 2626, Floor Amendment 2 to House 3001. Representative Riley, Chairperson from the Committee on State Government Administration reports the following committee action taken on April 25, 2017: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment 1 to House Bill 123, Floor Amendment 2 to House Bill 2591, Floor Amendment 1 to House Bill 2664, House Resolution 244. Representative Yingling, Chairperson from the Committee on Government Consolidation & Modernization reports the following committee action taken on April 25, 2017: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment 3 to House Bill 607. Representative D'Amico, Chairperson from the Committee on Transportation: Vehicles & Safety reports the following committee action taken on April 25, 2017: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment 1 to House Bill 3293, House Resolution 256, House Resolution 257. Representative Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on Executive reports the following committee action taken on April 25, 2017: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 659, Floor Amendment 1 to House Bill 2878, House Resolution 261. Representative Welch, Chairperson from the Committee on Higher Education reports the following committee action taken on April 25, 2017: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 3447, House Resolution 247, House Resolution 266. Representative Flowers, Chairperson from the Committee on Health Care Availability & Accessibility reports

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

the following committee action taken on April 25, 2017: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 1955. Representative Crespo, Chairperson from the Committee on Elementary & Secondary Education: School Curriculum & Policies reports the following committee action taken on April 25, 2017: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 1252, Floor Amendment 2 to House Bill 2545, House Joint Resolution 38. Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 328, offered by Representative Severin. House Joint Resolution 45, offered by Representative Arroyo. House Joint Resolution 46, offered by Representative Ford. And House Joint Resolution 47, offered by Representative Severin. These are referred to the Rules Committee."

- Speaker Lang: "We have a series of Resolutions. Starting with House Resolution 40, Representative McDermed. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Resolution 40, offered by Representative McDermed.
 - RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ONE HUNDREDTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that we designate October of 2017 as "Dysautonomia Awareness Month" in the State of Illinois."

Speaker Lang: "Representative McDermed."

McDermed: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members of the General Assembly, I'd like to draw your attention to some of my constituents that are here today on behalf of Dysautonomia Month, Dysautonomia Awareness Month for next October. One of my constituents, Ashley Crossett, waving over my right shoulder right behind the Democrats, and her family are here today from my district. Her parents, Greg and Nancy, are here,

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

her sister, Christy, and family members, Jim & Cindy Clark. One of the things we're trying to do with this Resolution is to bring an awareness of what is Dysautonomia. I didn't know until my constituents came forward and asked me to carry this Resolution. It's when the automatic systems of your body break down. So, you don't think about your blood pressure until your body no longer regulates it. You don't think about your digestive system until your body no longer regulates it. You don't think about your heartbeat until your body no longer is capable of regulating it. One of the issues that's so important with Dysautonomia is that it's misdiagnosed. People are diagnosed with digestive issues or heart problems, when in fact it's a breakdown of their autonomic nervous system. This leads to years and years and years of trial and error and misdiagnosis and unproductive hospital visits. It's a very complex disease where sufferers may not be able to be admitted to their local hospital. Local hospitals and clinics don't want them because they're too complex. And then there's the issue of how to pay for it. It's a real struggle to get some of the sophisticated treatments and drugs that are necessary when you're a Medicaid patient. So, these are some of the struggles that my constituent and her family have endured. Ashley's been very brave. She's been struggling with this for 10 years. So, I would urge all of you to vote 'yes' on House Resolution 40. And give a warm Springfield welcome to my constituent, Ashley... Ashley Crossett and her family. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome. Thank you for joining us. Mr. Riley is recognized. Mr. Riley."

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

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

Speaker Lang: "Are you... you're not speaking to this Resolution?"

Riley: "I will speak to the Resolution, excuse me."

Speaker Lang: "Go right ahead, Sir."

Riley: "I would join my colleague, Representative McDermed, on this very important measure. Over the years, I know I've sponsored and cosponsored many of these kinds of measures that really draw attention to very rare conditions, but even though they're rare these conditions are very important. Clearly, they're important to our constituents. And so what happens is, with a Resolution like this you learn a little bit more about what people all over this state are going through and the help that they really need to identify their condition. And just like Representative McDermed says, many times someone presents with Dysautonomia and it's diagnosed as being something else. And so, they have to go through many treatments of things that don't really deal with their particular problem. So, I would join and congratulate her on bringing this very important Resolution to bare. And thank you so much for the family coming down."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. Thank you, Representative. House Resolution 301, Mr. Sommer. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "House Resolution 301, offered by Representative Sommer.

RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ONE HUNDREDTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that we join the many friends and fans of the Morton High School Lady Potters

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

in congratulating them for winning the 2017 Girls Class 3A Basketball State Championship and we wish them continued success and a repeat championship in 2018."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sommer."

- Sommer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, I draw your attention to the Republican side of the Speaker's Gallery. We have an impressive group of young ladies who we'd like to honor today. They are not only the Class 3A State Basketball Champions for Illinois this year, but for 2 years prior to that. So, they did the three peat. And as you look at the gathering up there, there are only 2 seniors. So, we're looking for successful seasons ahead. All you have to do is look at the last 3 years. One hundred victories and 8 defeats. This year they beat Chicago Simeon 56-41, then Rochester 44-37 to win their third State Championship in a row. Head Coach is Bob Becker, who's been their head coach for 18 years. Please give a warm welcome and congratulations to the Lady Potters, the 3-peat State Champions."
- Speaker Lang: "Congratulations. And welcome to the House Chamber.

 Those in favor of the Resolution will say 'yes'; opposed 'no'.

 The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 311, Mr. Sommer."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Resolution 311, offered by Representative Sommer.
 - RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ONE HUNDREDTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that we congratulate the members of the Washington Community High School Wrestling Team, the Panthers, on their first place

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

finish at State, and we wish them continued success and happiness in the future."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sommer."

Sommer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again Ladies and Gentlemen, your indulgence please. Direct your attention to the Speaker's Gallery and the young men in the orange shirts. These are the Washington Panther Class 2A State Champions for this year. You may recognize some of them because they've been here 2 years before. Last year as State Champs and the year before in 2nd place. Their coach is Bryan Medlin. You may recognize the name Washington, Illinois. Washington was in the news recently and some years back when that devastating tornado destroyed 1,000 homes including the homes of several of the wrestlers. This winter their head coach, Bryan Medlin, had his home burnt to the ground. Fortunately, no one was home. The community of Washington rallied around the Medlin family just as they rallied around everyone affected by that tornado. These are outstanding young men. These are the seniors and the team that went to the dual meet State Championship. Among the young men are two State Champions themselves, Dack Punke and Jacob Warner. I'd like to point out Jacob... Jacob won the 195 class pound... pound class 3 years in a row. Their impressive wins have been overwhelming. Please welcome, again, the Washington Panthers for their achievements as the State Champion Wrestlers for Class 2A."

Speaker Lang: "Congratulations. And we're happy to have you join us today in the House of Representatives. Those in favor of the Resolution will say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

- it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 324, Representative Hurley. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Resolution 324, offered by Representative Hurley.
 - RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ONE HUNDREDTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that we congratulate speed skater Tommy Shimoda on winning a gold medal in the 500-meter race at the 2017 Special Olympic Winter World Games."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Hurley."

Hurley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On the Democratic side of the Speaker Gallery today we have Special Olympic athlete, Tommy Shimoda. Tommy Shimoda lives around the corner from me, so that's one of his best things in the world, but Tommy also competed in the 2017 World Winter Games in Austria. And Tommy Shimoda in his speed skating prowess won the Gold Medal in the 500 meter speed skating and the Bronze Medal in the speed skating competition over in Austria. And if that's not enough, Tommy is just 1 of 9 speed skaters nationwide to qualify for the world games. And he's only 1 of 6 athletes from Illinois competing in the Special Olympics Winter Games. So, I'd like to announce the other people in the gallery with him. His mom, Barb, Cecilia, Donna Clancy, Sean Mulcrune, Ryan Mulcrune, Sandra Lang, James Champtain, and Lisa Mulcrune who is a wonderful, kind and amazing leader of the Mt. Greenwood Special Rec Association who accompanied Tommy over to Austria. So, if you'd give Tommy a round of applause for his accomplishments. And thank you."

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

Speaker Lang: "Congratulations Tommy. Thank you for joining us.

Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed... excuse me, I am sorry. There are lights on. Representative Manley."

Manley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Tommy, this one's to... I want to tell you a little something of why we're so proud of you. So, these names have graced history in speed skating: 1980 was Eric Heiden, Gold Medalist; 1992 was Bonnie Blair, Gold Medalist; 2002, Derek Parra; 2010, Apollo Ono. And now, we add the name... to this distinguished list we add your name, Tom... Tommy Shimoda, 2017 World Winter Games Gold Medalist. Congratulations."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Brady."

Brady: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Tommy, I, too, want to add my congratulations... my sincere congratulations. I represent Special Olympics in their home office in my district in Normal, Illinois. And your dedication, your perseverance, and your can-do attitude is an inspiration to all of us here in the Illinois General Assembly. Tommy, congratulations on your outstanding work. Keep up the good work. And God bless you in your future endeavors young man. Great job."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Williams."

Williams: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Proceed."

Williams: "Tommy, congratulations to you and all the athletes and everyone involved in Special Olympics. We are so proud of you. So, 5 years ago I had heard of the Polar Plunge for Special Olympics and I thought, who would be crazy enough to jump into icy waters of Lake Michigan. Well, then a Special Olympic athlete asked me to participate and how could I say

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

no. Since then, I've joined Fran Hurley and a number of others, Kelly Burke, in jumping in the lake for Polar Plunge. And I'd like to challenge any and all of my colleagues to join me, Fran, Kelly and everyone else that jumps in the lake in support of Tommy and all the other amazing athletes. So, see you next year, February or March, Lake Michigan. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Representative. Mr. Severin."

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

Speaker Lang: "Go right ahead."

Severin: "Tommy, congratulations. I'm not nervous when I talk about Special Olympics. I was the Director of Special Olympics for southern Illinois for about 10 years. And I had the privilege of having a Special Olympian... we had the first Special Olympian in the United States and also in the world to have a street named after him. We now have three streets in Benton with Special Olympians named after them. And I want to lead all of us in the Special Olympic Oath. So, if you all could pay attention. It's pretty simple, but I think you'll get the gist of it. Let me win. That was weak. We'll start again. Let me win. But if I cannot win... you guys are weak. We're gonna start one more time. Let me win. But if I cannot win, let me be brave in the attempt. All right. Let's start these games. I mean, these... the House, sorry."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Ford."

Ford: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Proceed."

Ford: "Tommy, I just want to congratulate you also and let you know that at my age I still can't even stand up on regular

38th Legislative Day

- skates. And so, congratulations to you and you're an inspiration to all of us. Thank you, Tommy."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Hurley."
- Hurley: "Mr. Speaker, thanks to everybody for telling Tommy what a great job he did. And if I could request that all Members of the General Assembly be added to this Resolution?"
- Speaker Lang: "Lady moves that all Members be added. Is there leave? Leave is granted. All Members will be added. Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. Congratulations, Tommy. Moving back to priority Bills of Members, Bills on Second Reading. House Bill 1253, Representative Tabares. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1253, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 734, Mr. Crespo. Mr. Crespo. Out of the record. House Bill 2754, Mr. Evans. Mr. Evans. Out of the record. House Bill 2622, Representative Fine. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2622, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments have been approved for consideration. A fiscal note and state mandates note has been requested but not filed at this time."
- Speaker Lang: "Please hold on the Order of Second Reading. House Bill 243, Representative Flowers. Please read the Bill."

38th Legislative Day

- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 243, a Bill for an Act concerning education. This Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Amendments 2 and 3 were adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. A fiscal note has been requested but not filed at this time."
- Speaker Lang: "Bill will be held on the Order of Second Reading.

 House Bill 3601, Representative Greenwood. Please read the
 Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3601, a Bill for an Act concerning education. This Bill was read for a second time previous day.

 Amendment... Floor Amendment #1 has been adopted previously.

 Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Greenwood, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Greenwood on the Amendment."
- Greenwood: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This
 Amendment removes opposition and does not interfere with
 local control of the Dual Credit Program. I'm asking..."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 3720, Representative Harper. Out of the record. House Bill 3260, Mr. Harris. David Harris. Out of the record. Mr. Harris is in the chamber. Mr. Clerk, please read House Bill 3260."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3260, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 477, Mr. Jones. Out of the record. House Bill 2402, Christian Mitchell. Mr. Mitchell. Out of the record. House Bill 2963, Representative Nekritz. Nekritz. Out of the record. House Bill 3298, Representative Scherer. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3298, a Bill for an Act concerning education. This Bill was read a second time a previous day.

 Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2 was adopted previously. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Scherer, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Scherer."
- Scherer: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman... Mr. Speaker, sorry. I need to adopt this Amendment. And this is addressing a huge problem that we have with substitute teachers. And it says that after 10 days they will get their state application fee refunded. Appreciate an 'aye'..."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. A fiscal note has been requested but not filed at this time."
- Speaker Lang: "Bill will be held on the Order of Second Reading.

 House Bill 737, Mr. Meier. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 737, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Meier, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Meier."

Meier: "We... we do have an Amendment to be added to that Bill."

38th Legislative Day

- Speaker Lang: "So, you want this Bill held on the Order of Second or do you want to adopt this Amendment first, Sir?"
- Meier: "Adopt the Amendment."
- Speaker Lang: "Please explain the Amendment briefly."
- Meier: "The Amendment was language agreed on with the Equip for Equality just on who is designated to watch over our CILAs during the closure process of one."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "At the request of the Sponsor, the Bill will be held on the Order of Second Reading. House Bill 3168, Representative Stratton. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3168, a Bill for an Act concerning children. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment 3 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 169, Mr. Turner. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 169, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. This Bill was read second time previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Turner, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Turner."
- Turner: "Amendment #1 actually becomes the Bill. I'd like to adopt it and... and debate it on Third Reading."

38th Legislative Day

- Speaker Lang: "Seeing no objection, those in favor of the Amendment will say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it.

 And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 682, Mr. Olsen. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 682, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Olsen, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Olsen."
- Olsen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment 2 reflects an agreement between the Speaker's Office, the Comptroller's Office removes opposition to the Bill. And I think adds to it in a more effective manner. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 3407, Mr. Sosnowski.

 Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3407, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Sosnowski, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sosnowski."
- Sosnowski: "This is an Amendment that slightly modifies the underlying Bill in regards to tax credit financing."

38th Legislative Day

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 3257, Representative Wheeler. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3257, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 3244, Representative Winger. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3244, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment 2, offered by Representative Winger, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Winger."
- Winger: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #2 further defines liability."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 2589, Representative Stratton. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2589, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Stratton, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Stratton."

38th Legislative Day

- Stratton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment 1 on House Bill 2589 simply clarifies the definitions and made sure that we are using the same language consistently throughout the statute."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Mr. Turner in the Chair."
- Speaker Turner: "House Bill 531, Representative Willis. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 531, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment 3 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Willis, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Willis."
- Willis: "I'd like to request the adoption of Floor Amendment 4.

 It names the Act the Daniel Capuano Memorial Act and clarifies some other language in there. I'd like to debate the rest on Third Reading please."
- Speaker Turner: "Lady moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #4 to House Bill 531. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. House Bill 688, Representative Zalewski. Out of the record. House Bill 2754, Representative Evans. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

38th Legislative Day

- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2754, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Evans, has been approved for consideration."

 Speaker Turner: "Representative Evans."
- Evans: "All right. Thank you... let me just pull this up. Yes, this is an Amendment that's been worked out with the Trial Lawyers and IDOT removing some... it's an agreement removing some information. I ask for your support for the adoption of this Amendment."
- Speaker Turner: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 2754. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Members, we'll be moving to Third Readings. First up we have House Bill 3806, Representative Chapa LaVia. Representative, I understand you have an Amendment on this Bill? Mr. Clerk, can you please read the Bill?"
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3806, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Chapa LaVia, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Chapa LaVia."
- Chapa LaVia: "Thank you. House Floor Amendment 2 is a page... a line Amendment which adds Director of the Illinois State

38th Legislative Day

- Police as ex officio or his or her designee to the exploratory committee. I'll take any questions. Ask for its adoption."
- Speaker Turner: "Lady moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 3806. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. House Bill 2738, Representative Ammons. Out of the record. House Bill 3519, Representative Butler. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3519, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Butler."
- Butler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3519 is a very simple Bill. It's an initiative of the State Board of Elections. It just makes sure that a signature under the Election Code means a written out wet signature or a signature on a signature pad in electronic form. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3519 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 113 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 3519, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1808, Representative Evans. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1808, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

Speaker Turner: "Representative Evans."

Evans: "Well, thank you. This Bill is an initiative of the Treasurer's Office in collaboration with the Department of Revenue. Basically what the Bill does is any amount under \$2 thousand, that's the keyword under 2 thousand, will be automatically returned to individuals. This money is not state dollars. There's no GRF money. This is individual's money, so we want to get back to them. Wisconsin... the State of Wisconsin has returned millions of dollars to individuals. And we are removing an arduous process of filling out a claim, sending the money back. I ask for your support."

Speaker Turner: "Further discussion, Representative Ives is recognized."

Ives: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I appreciate the Sponsor bringing this Bill forward. I had an issue with a constituent about 4 years ago where I filed similar legislation that would have the Department of Revenue research to find names for unclaimed property. They refused back then, 4 years ago. So, I'm glad that they're on board understanding that this property's not our property. That for no... through no fault of their own people end up having their property taken into the unclaimed property procedure and then never getting it back. This is a commonsense legislation. Thank you so much Representative Turner for providing us this tool now. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative David Harris is recognized."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Evans: "Yes, Sir."

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

Harris, D.: "Representative, just very quickly for property that's under \$2 thousand this allows the Treasurer to do a match with the Department of Revenue to... to presumably get the dollars to the recipient faster, correct?"

Evans: "Yes. In answer to your question, they will go through the process to work with the Department of Revenue to ensure a good address."

Harris, D.: "Absolutely. Good Bill. Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Evans to close."

Evans: "Thank you. I ask for your support."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1808 pass?'
All those in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The
voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who
wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the
record. On a count of 113 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0
voting 'present', House Bill 1808, having received the
Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed.
Representative Davidsmeyer, for what reason do you seek
recognition?"

Davidsmeyer: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed."

Davidsmeyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today in the gallery we have a group from the Winchester Elementary School. We actually had the 8th grade girls' basketball team who won the 2016 Illinois Elementary School Association Class A... 8-2A State Championship. They were a pretty impressive team. I believe their record was 25 and 2, which is awesome. I'm gonna list the names of the individuals that we have today. We have Madi DeJaynes, Reagan Evans, Calista Fox, Karsyn Wardlow,

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

Sydney Elliott, Summer Davis, Anna Seilers, Emma Slagle, Tristan Lashmett, Zaylei Evans, and Zoe Evans. And the coaches, Jason Likes, and Coach Nolan... or Assistant Coach Nolan Roberts. I just want to take a moment here to congratulate them on their win. I think they're... they're gonna continue to be a force when they get in to the high school arena. And I look forward to seeing their success there. So, hopefully we can give them a congratulations and warm Springfield welcome."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative. And congratulations and welcome to your Capitol. Representative Meier, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Meier: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Sir."

Meier: "We would like to welcome 29 4-H members from across Illinois who are attending University of Illinois 4-H Legislative Connections... Connection event being held today and tomorrow at the Capitol. They're up here to the right of me. These youth represent the Illinois 4-H youth Leadership Team and the Speaking for Illinois 4-H Program. And will be visiting members of the House of Representatives over the next two days, sharing the 4-H development stories with you. From community service to advancements in the medical field, you'll hear reports of belonging, independence, generosity, and mastery. These youth are from 13 different counties throughout the state and represent nearly 200 thousand 4-H participants in 102 counties in the State of Illinois. Working with the teens this week are Dr. Lisa Diaz, Patricia McClaughlin, Eric Austin, Judy Bingham of the University of

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

Illinois' Extension and Gene Hardland, Jerry Hicks and Pam Weber, Members of the Extension Partners Organization. Welcome to Springfield. Keep learning, keep working with other youth. This is a great beginning for you. I was a 4-H member many years ago and still am a leader today. Thank you for being here."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you. And welcome to your Capitol.

Representative Andrade, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

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

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Sir."

Andrade: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to... we have a good friend of ours here, a former colleague of yours, former State Representative Alderman Deb Mell is here supporting the women's march. I just want to... we're gonna have a great day today and just wanted to say she's here and welcome... welcome back home. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Representative. And welcome back.

Representative Davidsmeyer, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Davidsmeyer: "One more quick personal... point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed."

Davidsmeyer: "I also want to mention that we have the 7th grade Second Place team with the Winchester Elementary School. And I'm looking forward to them hopefully coming up into the 8th grade and... and having a good showing again next year."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative."

Davidsmeyer: "Thank you."

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

Speaker Lang: "Welcome to your Capitol. House Bill 3444,

Representative Lilly. Out of the record. House Bill 302,

Representative Martwick. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 302, a Bill for a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Martwick."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 302 is an Amendment to the Unclaimed Life Insurance Benefits Act that we passed last year overwhelmingly numbers in this chamber. So, last year we proposed a Bill here in the House that would have required insurance companies who sell life insurance to check all policies that they had sold, current, or lapsed or whatever against the death master file to see if any of the policy holders that hold... held these policies had passed away. And then, begin a process of seeking out beneficiaries and getting of the proceeds that life insurance policy to the beneficiaries. That Bill then moved over to the Senate and by agreement the retroactivity that we had passed here in the House was removed and the Bill was passed in the Senate with an effective date of January 1, 2017. So, the requirement to check policies against the death master file was limited to future policies. That Bill came back here in the House, it was passed, was signed by the Governor and became law. The Amendment that we're seeking to this Bill with House Bill 302 would allow ... so that after ... after that Bill passed last year, the Treasurer established a task force which I served on, Representative Brady served on. And that task force met throughout the summer to discuss the issue of these lapsed

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

policies. And the result of that task force, the findings were turned in to this Bill. Which basically says that lapsed or terminated policies should be checked back to 1996 to determine if when they went lapsed, meaning payment stopped, to determine if perhaps the policy holder had died. And if the policyholder had died before the policy went lapsed then instead of qualifying it as lapsed it should be then... the benefits should be paid out. And therefore, the insurance companies should then seek to find beneficiaries and pay those benefits out. So, that is the largest Amendment that we're making there. We're also making three other Amendments to it. This would be an Amendment to ensure conduct to require life insurance companies to regularly request and update policy contact information. Again, this is to ensure that as they're constantly updating their information that they will be able to find the beneficiaries of the policies when the time comes. It amends some access to records by the State Treasurer. And it changes the fee structures for individuals and businesses who seek to act as finder services for these policies. This is again a continuation of what we started last year with Treasurer Frerichs. This is about making the laws comply to the practice that life insurance companies are engaged in. Meaning that when a policyholder dies they have an expectation that their beneficiaries will receive the proceeds of the policy that they worked so hard to pay for. And we want to make that law so that we follow up on this and... and make sure that the people who bought these policies and beneficiaries that are intended get the proceeds necessary. This is a good Bill. This is exactly what

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

government was designed to do in protecting the consumers who purchase these policies. I respectfully ask an 'aye' vote. Be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Members, I understand we have a lot going on in the chamber. Can we please bring the noise level down for the debate? Thank you very much. Representative Andersson is recognized."

Andersson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Initially, just a parliamentary inquiry. Is this on Standard Debate or Short Debate?"

Speaker Turner: "This Bill is on Short Debate."

Andersson: "I would move that it be moved to Standard Debate.

It's a pretty important Bill."

Speaker Turner: "I haven't instituted the timer yet, but if we could just keep it short."

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

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

Andersson: "Thank you. So my understanding is, Rob, is the major change here... I understand there were a few others. But the major change is we're going retroactive to what we did in the 99th? Is that correct?"

Martwick: "So, that is... that is correct, Representative. What I would point out is that is the change from the Bill that became law last year, not the Bill as it passed the House. The Bill as it passed the House last year that went out on very large bipartisan numbers, actually had retroactivity to infinity, there was not a cutoff date. That was a concern, so that was... 1996 was the date was chosen to go back to."

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

Andersson: "But when it came back from the Senate on Concurrence it was made prospective only, correct?"

Martwick: "It was made prospective only, yes."

Andersson: "So, now this would bring us back to... January 1, 1996 is the date?"

Martwick: "That is correct."

Andersson: "Okay. With regard to that, I note that the language appears to say accounts in force at any time on or after January 1, 1996. To me that language suggests that it could be a much older policy as long as it apparently was in effect in 96'? Is that correct?"

Martwick: "Yes, that's correct."

Andersson: "So, we actually... we could be going back a lot further. Why did we pick 96' by the way?"

Martwick: "So, this was a compromise date. This is based off of a number of factors. It... it was a number of factors about... that... that were involved in this in terms of picking this date. Some of them were the... how far back the Treasurer could go with their audits. In other words, we didn't want to unduly punish companies with... with this law. And... and make them go back further than the companies were already auditing, right? And in fact, there are... just to understand the retroactivity let me point this out. So, 80 percent currently of the policies... insurance policies sold in Illinois, the companies that are responsible for holding those policies have already by agreement with the Treasurer checked all the way back to 1992. So, this is bringing in that 20 percent of policies... the companies that are responsible for holding those 20 percent of policies. We're not bringing them back to 1992

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

which is already what many... most of the vast majority have done. We're taking them to 1996. So, it's... it's a bit of a compromise with all the factors that were involved including what we were currently doing by agreement. The ability we had... the ability to hold electronic records. You get older than 1996 and you start to say to yourself, well how much computerization do we have at that point, how much recordkeeping is there? We wanted to not be too burdensome."

Andersson: "I understand that. But I would also think that in 96', I mean thinking back to that time, not everything was electronic. And as we have already pointed out the policies that are in effect could have been predate to that by quite a bit. So, we are talking about paper, aren't we? They're gonna have to look through paper."

Martwick: "Yeah, so the underlying Bill, Representative Andersson that we passed last year already has a waiver provision for insurance companies that didn't have the electronic records where this would be unduly burdensome. We can waive that requirement back to 1996. So, there is flexibility already built in to the underlying Act."

Andersson: "And... and... let me get back to the 30 thousand foot level for a moment. I certainly understand when we voted for it going forward, establishing a new procedure our insurance businesses could understand what the rules of the game were. Now we're going backwards. We're gonna require a lot of work out of them, I'm gonna presume it's gonna cost a lot of money on their part. My question is, why... what's the owner's requirement that somebody file a claim when somebody dies?"

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

Martwick: "I... I would say, Representative Andersson, that the not... the question is not... is... is it too onerous to file a claim as a beneficiary? That... that's not really the issue we're trying to address here. What we're trying to address here is that there has been a... not insignificant practice where... and... and this has been documented, where companies are well aware that the policyholder may have died, but because they're under no legal obligation unless the beneficiaries come forward to pay out any proceeds. They may have actual knowledge, right, so there are many insurance companies that in addition to selling life insurance policies also sell annuities. And there have been documented instances where they use the death master file to terminate an annuity for the same person that they would not classify as dead to pay out the proceeds of their life insurance policy. Now, I'm not suggesting that that happens everywhere, but when that instance has that possibility that's where I think it's our responsibility to come in. And what this is really trying to do, again, is make the law live up to the expectations. When people bought life insurance policies. When someone sat at the dining room table and handed someone a pen, an agent and said, sign this policy, when you die we'll be there for your family, that's not what they meant. And what we're trying to do is make them live up to that promise by making sure that they ascertain when their policyholder has died and just make a good faith effort to locate the beneficiaries and get the money to the beneficiaries that they're entitled to."

Andersson: "So, I understand this is a State Treasurer initiative, is that correct?"

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

Martwick: "Yes. And so, this initiative was started by Treasurer Frerichs."

Andersson: "So, an interesting corollary to your argument is that the State Treasurer manages the lost funds, you know, accounts that get transferred to the Treasurer, I don't know the name of the… the fund, but… but that's his job, right?"

Martwick: "Yes."

"He has no legal obligation to search out and find Andersson: people whose money is there. Ironically, there was a story in the paper I think yesterday or the day before where someone came to find their money. There was \$146 in the account and you know what the Treasurer required? The Treasurer required that they fill out a form, found out that there was a number of different entities... state agencies that had some claim. And as a result of that, it got reduced to \$42. But ultimately, the point here is the Treasurer himself doesn't comply with the concept of your... of your Bill. He doesn't do what your Bill proposes. And I quess that's not a question, it's more a statement. So, ultimately... Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. I liked the Bill last year because it was prospective, I think it's addressing a problem going forward. I think it's an undue burden though honestly on our insurance companies to ask them go back through paper records, even if there's a waiver I get that. I think that the compromise that was struck last year was a reasonable and good compromise. So, in my opinion and I'm not speaking for anybody but myself, I think that we're going too far on this one. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Demmer is recognized."

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

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

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

Demmer: "Representative Martwick, I appreciate hearing some of the debate that just happened. I have a couple points I want to clarify on that. One is that this Bill is pretty significantly different from what we worked on last year that was prospective versus retroactive. My question about the fact that this is retroactive is, insurance companies there were offering policies on January 1, 1996, had no expectation that records from that time were to be kept until today. So, isn't it possible that many insurance policies that were either terminated or lapsed... insurance companies would have no ability to search those because they don't have any requirement to keep those policies?"

Martwick: "So, Representative, I... good question. But... so, first of all, the Bill that we passed out of the House here was not prospective only that was what came back from the Senate. So, what passed here by broad bipartisan would have gone back forever, right? Any policy ever sold would have to be checked. So, this Bill is... when it... and when it arrived in the Senate, the agreement was to move forward on the prospective and then address this question over the summer through a task force... that was the agreement that was made in the Senate... and then introduced legislation this year. And that's what we've done to address to this question. As far as how burdensome is it. Well, remember as I said, number one, there is a waiver, right? So, if an insurance company... if this truly is unduly burdensome because they don't have these electronic records, they have the process to get a waiver to... to... because of the burden. But number two, you know, I... I heard this question

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

often, right? Well, what if they... the company... it's been... this policy has been lapsed for so long they've taken it off the books? But remember, if they've taken a lapsed policy off their books then what they've done is they've already transferred the money over to the Treasurer, okay? Why would they do that if they're continuing to collect interest? If they're continuing to collect interest on the money that they're holding then they are continuing to hold the records for it. So, those records are there, they exist. We can go get them. They're maintaining them. Right? If they're holding that money..."

Demmer: "But your... your Bill... your Bill would... would require that...

Well, first, under existing Code there is no requirement for
these companies to keep policies after they've been
terminated or lapsed. There's no requirement."

Martwick: "Right. So Representative Demmer, I'm sorry, I'm just confirming with the... from the Treasurer's Office here. Remember again, it's kind of what I'm saying is that when you say that, well, they've taken this off their books. The moment they take it off their books, the moment they decide to get rid of all that recordkeeping is when they say, okay, we don't want to be responsible for this money. So, now it's over to the Treasurer's Office. As long as they keep that money then they have to keep the records of the account that it went with. So, they'll have those records. It's... it's that simple. It's one or the other."

Demmer: "I... I appreciate that. I guess the question is, you know, at a time a policy's in place are we giving notice to an... to an insurance company that they're going to need to be able to

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

search back 20 years on this? They didn't know at the time; they haven't known for the last 20 years. Now, we're saying you have to go back to policies that were in effect... in effect in 1996 to search your policies, but let me shift gears a little bit. Another one of my colleagues brought up this question and I think this is ... this is interesting for us to know. This is an initiative of the Treasurer's Office, which administers unclaimed property today. There is a story on television about how the Treasurer's Office does not notify even other units of government when they have unclaimed property, much less average citizens across the state. People have to go through individuals or anybody across the state who has unclaimed property in the Treasurer's Office have to initiate claims on that money. There is a story, an example, in which the Secretary of State's Office... just down the hall from the Treasurer... the Secretary of State's Office had unclaimed property and they weren't even notified by the Treasurer's Office on that. Why... why require all these companies to do things that the Treasurer's Office, who brought this initiative, is not willing to do themselves?"

Martwick: "Well, I... so, first of all, what I would say is... there's a couple answers to your question, Representative. Number one, we... we just passed 1808 which will allow the Treasurer to begin to release proceeds without all of this formal process that we have. Now of course we set formal processes. This is not any different than what we're trying to do with this insurance company. We're asking them to still go through a formal process, but of course, we have the government have some sort of process before they release money."

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

- Demmer: "Yeah, there's nothing wrong with the process, but you the issue here is, and the Treasurer himself stated in an interview in order to get this property you have to initiate a claim."
- Martwick: "Well, that's... well... so first of all, 1808 will now solve that. Which is, the Treasurer's initiative, right? So, he... he is attempting to solve that problem. You're right, it's a problem that existed. He's trying to solve it. That's... the Bill... I think you just voted for it, I did."
- Demmer: "I... I just... I want to draw the distinction, this is an initiative of the Treasurer's Office to hold insurance companies to a... to... they have to go out and search and notify and be proactive about this. Yet, the Treasurer's Office didn't even walk down the hall to let the Secretary of State's Office know they had thousands of dollars in unclaimed property."
- Martwick: "So, what I can tell you is that the Treasurer's Office, regardless of what they're... what you might be reading, I know personally of stories where they have searched out and found recipients of large, large sums of unclaimed insurance money that was turned over. They sought them out. In fact, they did it through my office. Where they said, look, we've got money and we went and found that person and made sure that they filled... filled out a proper claim. But that's what it's about. It's about notification. It's about letting people know that money's out there. The Treasurer's Office is doing it, Representative. I know because they did it through my office."

Demmer: "I understand. And... and..."

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

Martwick: "And we're asking insurance companies to do the same. And the other thing, Representative, is... let me repeat what I said to Representative Andersson. Eighty percent of the policies... insurance policies sold in Illinois, the companies that have sold those policies have voluntarily, by agreement, checked their records back to 1992. Shouldn't we bring all of the rest of them into the fold, so everyone's competing on the same field? Isn't that fair for businesses? Isn't that good for business? Isn't that right for the consumer?"

Demmer: "Thank you, Representative. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. I think what we need to understand here is that we're... we're changing rules and we're making them apply retroactively by over 20 years. We have to understand the burden that comes in searching records from 1996. I imagine that if any of us were asked to go back to 1996 and find records related to your personal finances, it would be a difficult thing for you to do. And now, we're asking companies to go through the legwork of looking tens of thousands of policies. This initiative was brought by the Treasurer's Office, which themselves have not been consistent in the way that they've done that. Mr. Speaker, I'd ask for a verification should this Bill receive the requisite number of votes. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman has requested a verification.

Representative Brady is recognized."

Brady: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Brady: "Thank you. First off, Representative, I had the… the pleasure to serve on the task force and be part of at least one hearing. And my… my desire and interest, and I thank the

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

Treasurer for that appointment, was to try and bring some ideas with my background in funeral service and dealing with families in the time of the need of life insurance, et cetera, that we could try and find some ways to make some positive changes and safeguards, take care of the families who have policy money owed to them, without coming up with what I believe this... parts of this Bill has become more burdensome on the business side of things on insurance. But in particular, can you tell me where the death master file is? Where do they get the data? Where do they get the confirmation that someone is deceased?"

Martwick: "So, apparently, Representative Brady, that comes from you. A Bill that you passed regarding electronic death certificates is what allowed the Social Security Death Master File to be updated. So..."

Brady: "So, and that's... and that's... thank you for that. You did very well. That was a good answer to my question. I have... I'm sure it has nothing to do with the gentleman standing to your left. But I... I would say that that kind of goes to my point. And my point is that the funeral homes receive that information and they forward that via the Department of Vital Records which becomes part of notifying the Social Security Administration of an individual's death. And so, we have a mechanism in place called the informant section on a death certificate that already lists who is seen as either immediate next of kin or by some legal authority or family's recommendation who should be listed there. So, the information is there to contact a person regarding policies. And I'm... I'm just troubled with the fact that going to some

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

of the extent that a company has asked to go to when this information... or at least part of the information is available through other means that would be much easier electronically and otherwise has... has me very hesitant on the legislation. And the other area that I would like to ask you about was when it talks specifically, we... we try to put together legislation that would exempt out companies that produce what's called a pre-need and underwrite a pre-need policy specifically designed for the cost of one's funeral. And I was just wondering if you could try and give the Body a summary of where that ended up?"

Martwick: "So, Representative Brady, my understanding is... is that is an issue that... that the Treasurer's Office worked pretty hard with you on. And while it did not make it into an Amendment for this Bill, that it is something that they are in support of and that my understanding is that the Comptroller is in support of that. And I would think that that's something that we could run as some sort of additional trailer legislation to this."

Brady: "Thank you very much. I appreciate that pledge of support.

Let me just say... speak to the Bill, Ladies and Gentlemen. I know this is very near and dear to the Treasurer and it's an issue that I have... obviously interest in as well, but I do think that there's some other mechanisms that are now in place in the world of electronic in ways to lessen the burden and still protect the consumer and find policies. So, I will continue to listen to the debate, but I do want to thank the Treasurer and I want to thank the Representative and so many others from the Treasurer's staff that has worked diligently

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

on this. I... I'm just troubled by some of the areas that may be a little more overreaching for me. Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Scherer is recognized."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. This is a very Scherer: personal issue to me. Very personal. In that, when my father passed away maybe 7 or 8 years ago, we had this exact issue in our family. And I remember when... when I was a little kid, I remember the insurance man coming to our door... I don't remember now if it was every week or... or every month. I don't remember how often it was, but what I do remember is that was the most important bill we paid outside of our mortgage payment. So, it didn't matter if we had food to eat. It didn't matter if... if I had holes in my tennis shoes. It didn't matter about anything. When the insurance man came, it was time to pay that bill and everything else stopped until that bill got paid. And the way I remember it is it was just like such a big deal at my house when it was time to pay that man with that little book, is how I remember it. And my mom would say, whatever you do never lose this little book because this little book is our whole life, right here in this little book. Well, just as it would so happen a couple years ago we had to clean out the house because my mom had to go live in a nursing home. And as we did, I stumbled across the little book. And I... I wish I would have known this Bill would be called today because I would have pulled it out and shown you. In the little book was marked our payment every month. Some months it was written in pencil, more often than not. And this was done 70, 80, 90 years ago. Now, how do we expect little pencil marks in one little book... it was about this big, about 2 by

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

2. Now, I know that this might be an individual situation, but this was just one of many, many, many, many regular families, hardworking families in Illinois, people who it didn't come easy to make that payment. So, we paid the bill month by month by month. My mother, being the very organized person that she was, believe or not, when my father passed we actually still have all this little paperwork, but that's because it was that important. That's why we kept it. So, it comes time to collect on the premium. And guess what? It's like climbing Mt. Everest to get the insurance company to pay the premium. So, I wouldn't explain all this, but it seems to me like some of the Members here are confused as to whether they want to vote for this or not. So, I'm going to lay it all out for you and explain the whole thing. Because it appears that perhaps you don't know this information, perhaps your family hasn't been through this situation. And I'm a teacher, so I guess I am ... my job here is to educate. So, I will educate in that what happened was we tried to chase down the insurance companies. It went from one insurance man to another insurance man, of course, today on the day of women, it would all be insurance men that we were chasing down back then, but we would go from one man to another, one insurance man to another insurance man. Some of them did not even put their name in the book; they only put their initials. So, now here we are 70 years later and we're supposed to chase down the initials. I wonder how successful the people in this room would be chasing down initials in pencil that are halfway worn out because as you all know, you know, pencil doesn't hold up as long as an ink pen does. So, we're chasing down

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

initials trying to find this insurance company. Only to find out that that policy was changed to a different provider and now we have to chase it down through other means. It ... it was just such a horrific experience in my life that I'm sure I'll never forget it. And at this point, it wasn't that much money in today's dollars, but like I said, back then it was the only money that my family had. That was it. No shoes. No food. clothes. Turn the heat back. Don't run the conditioning, heaven forbid, 'cause we got to pay the insurance man. But now we have people telling us that we shouldn't vote for this Bill because of... and I don't even know ... I really can't figure out why you don't think we should vote for the Bill, but for some unknown reason, something about recordkeeping that goes back to the '90s. Well, I know I was living then and I know for a fact there were computers then, so we're talking about going back even further than that. And we're expecting people to keep their books for eternity, but we're not expecting people to keep their computer records when that's their business is to run a company. And they're not keep their records? I just think that's inexcusable and that's not a very good insurance company. When you sell insurance policies, you should know that it's not for today, it's for 70 or 80, 90 years from now, maybe 100. So, if you don't have the ability to keep those records then you really have no business being in... in business, and maybe I should take that on as my Bill next year that if you can't keep records, you really shouldn't be an insurance company. So, at the end of the day, the problem is that we're saying that we can't go back 20 years when my

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

mother, who sits in a nursing home, she's 96 years old, bless her heart. She can't see hardly at all; she can't see the E on the chart. She can't hear hardly at all. Can barely walk. Can barely find her rosary to say her rosary, which is the most important thing in her life. And somehow, my mother's supposed to find this little book written in pencil with initials? But an insurance company, that has the fanciest offices ever, doesn't have the same responsibility as my mother? I just am not sure why you feel the way you do. Why is an insurance company not responsible when the average American citizen is responsible? So, I just really need that question answered. And I'm going to leave it at that question. Why is it important for my 96-year-old mother and all the other 96 year olds in nursing homes to be able to find their little books in pencil with initials and track them down, but a big, old, fancy insurance company with 400 thousand workers and computers it's not their liability? I just don't get it and I need an explanation, please. Thank you. And I strongly urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Hammond is recognized."

Hammond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move the previous question."

Speaker Turner: "Representative, we still have many people seeking

recognition on this Bill. So, we're going to continue with the debate. Representative Welch is recognized.

Representative Welch is recognized."

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

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

Welch: "This is a very important Bill and I think we should give it the proper vetting. The other side has had an opportunity

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

to be heard. Unclaimed property and lapsed life insurance policies have a long, unfortunate history in Illinois and throughout the United States, which is why I rise in support of House Bill 309 (sic- 302) which will increase consumer protections to our most vulnerable and correct a widespread predatory practice by the insurance industry. When a life insurance policy is taken out, our constituents and their families pay premiums with an understanding that eventually their families will receive a benefit after they die... after they've paid premiums. Unfortunately, that's not always the case. It's been found that many insurance companies were not paying a significant number of beneficiaries if their policies lapsed after the insured is deceased and the beneficiaries do not come forward to make a claim, which can be for any number of reasons, but including a lack of knowledge of the insurance policy itself. This unscrupulous practice led to settlements with more than 25 life insurance companies that cover more than 80 percent of the entire life insurance market. These settlements identified more than \$7.5 billion in death benefits owed to consumers nationwide and over 550 million right here in Illinois. Insurers that refuse to pay beneficiaries is a systemic issue in our country and Illinois can do something to correct predatory practices that target consumers with low social economic status that dates back decades here in Illinois. In 2002, Unitrin, now Kemper, settled with nearly half a million policyholders, 7,689 of whom were from Illinois. The settlement was for race based premiums that actively targeted and charged African Americans and Latinos a higher premium than whites. The settlement

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

included \$27 million in compensation for race-based premiums, 6 million for people who did not receive death benefits and another 2.25 million in fines and benefits. Even those whose policies had lapsed were entitled to compensation. All toll, Unitrin had to pay back an estimated \$48.8 million including legal fees. Unitrin's CEO acknowledged the dishonest practice and apologized for using race as a factor for determining premiums. Apologies from CEOs and legal settlements are not sufficient. Illinois needs to increase consumer protections of our insured and for our most vulnerable who deserve the benefits that they are owed which is why I commend the Sponsor of this legislation and encourage all of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to join me in supporting the people of this great state in supporting House Bill 302."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Hoffman is recognized."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Hoffman: "Yes, Representative, with regard to the policies. If a policy lapses, what then happens to the interest if a... if a policy lapses?"

Martwick: "So, it's... it's kind of interesting, Representative Hoffman. So, when... let's say for instance that a policyholder dies and the proceeds should be paid to the beneficiary, but instead since no beneficiary comes forward and they qualify the policy as a lapsed policy, it sits there. And it can sit for a number of years accumulating interest, the principal amount. When they turn that over to the Treasurer or if someone comes forward and makes a claim, the insurance company is only responsible for turning over the face value of the

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

policy. So, I'm... I'm glad that you asked that question, 'cause I actually have an example that ... of ... of a person who made a claim recently that lives in Representative Demmer's district. So, Representative Demmer was asking this. So, Representative Demmer, I'd... I'd ask you to pay attention to this. You were talking about this right here. So, you were talking about what the Treasurer's Office does. Well, the Treasurer's Office just sought out and found a person who had a lapsed policy, who had proceeds due in your district. And they used your office to help locate this person and find them. And they turned over \$250 thousand in insurance benefits to this person. But Representative Demmer, here's the kicker, that person died in 2004, 2004 and they're turning over the benefits of that proceed in 2017. That's \$250 thousand that they gave to them. The interest that was lost, that the insurance company got, that your constituent did not get is \$350 thousand that did not go to your constituent that should have. That's why we need to vote for this Bill."

Hoffman: "And precisely how would... how would this Bill fix that?"

Martwick: "What this Bill would do is, in... if this had been in effect then, and it will for the future going forward, is that when someone dies that money will be turned over to them in short order after their death to the beneficiary. It won't sit in a bank account accumulating interest only to be kept by the insurance company and not to the person that it was intended to go to."

Hoffman: "And with regard to policy definitions in the Bill, there were some changes to how policies were defined. How did... how did it change the definition of the term 'policy'?"

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

Martwick: "And... and so, the definition change is... is exactly what I said. So, instead of... it... it says that, it will include lapsed policies. Policies that have been... so, 'lapsed' means that someone stopped paying on them. What we're asking the insurance companies to do, very simply, is see if they can ascertain if... when the policy was qualified as lapsed, was the person alive or dead? Because if they were alive when the policy was lapsed, meaning they stopped paying while they were alive, well, then fair enough, they've run afoul of their contract. But if they were dead then maybe the reason that they stopped paying was because they died and the proceeds should then be transferred to the beneficiary."

Hoffman: "And the... the provisions in this legislation provide a means by which the State Treasurer can determine whether or not a person is deceased. Is that correct? It provides that they can... they can get records and vital records and access the vital records?"

Martwick: "Yes. So, this would allow for some record sharing between the Department of Public Health and the Treasurer's Office."

Hoffman: "And what's the current law with regard to that?"

Martwick: "Pardon me?"

Hoffman: "What's the current law with regard to that? Is the Treasurer hamstrung is receiving those records? Is that why we need this?"

Martwick: "So, this would make the process of making the claims for unclaimed property through the Treasurer easier. Because currently, they would... if... if someone finds out they're a claimant, they have to go obtain a certified copy of the death

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

certificate in order to make that claim. This would alleviate that problem because now the Treasurer would be able to obtain that information electronically directly from the Department of Public Health. So, it would make it easier for someone to file that claim."

Hoffman: "And so finally, with regard to the fee structure, could you just kind go through that for me? I believe that there's some provisions regarding that in the Bill. You don't have to go into it in depth. I just... I'm going to support your Bill. But I want, for the purposes of the public record, everyone to understand that the intent of this Bill and why you put it forward. So, with regard to the fee structure, could you please just go through that quickly?"

Martwick: "Yeah, thank you. So, what this Bill does is this cleans up some of the fee provisions, especially as it relates to persons who hold themselves them out as a... a finder of unclaimed property. So, this is trying to curb a practice that was in its own sense somewhat predatory and make the ability... so at the same time we're making it easier to find out that they have access and rights to this property, get that to them. And... and curb some of the abuses that were caused by people who were entering into finder arrangements."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Representative. I wholeheartedly support your Bill."

Martwick: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sims is recognized."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

Sims: "Representative Martwick, this Bill is an... where did this Bill come from?"

Martwick: "So, the Bill was an initiative of the Treasurer's Office. When Treasurer Frerichs took office, as he started to realize that what was going on with this backlog of unclaimed property and... and how the process was going where insurance companies would hold this, you know, upwards of 50 years sometimes and then turn over face value of a policy. And... and then it was kind of up to the insurance... the Treasurer's Office to, you know, catalog and try and do what they could to... to make people aware of the fact that, you know, through publications and through their website, I-Cash, that there is property out there. So, this is a way of... the Treasurer's initiative was a way of trying to make the in... the practice of... in the insurance industry match with the expectation of people who bought those policies."

Sims: "So, the initiative also in addition came from the Task Force on Unclaimed Life Insurance Policies. Is that right?"

Martwick: "I'm sorry. Could you repeat that? I couldn't hear that."

Sims: "The Task Force on Unclaimed Life Insurance Policies?"

Martwick: "Yeah, so that's what this Bill was. So, after last year's Bill, we established a task force... the Treasurer established a task force by Executive Order to... to study the question of what to do with policies that had been lapsed in the past. How do we address those? How do we bring those into compliance, into the fold? This Bill is a result of that task force findings."

Sims: "Do... do you know who the members were of that task force?"

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

- Martwick: "There were... there were a good number of people and I'm... my memory is probably not going to serve me entirely, but I remember that Senator Mulroe was on the task force, Senator McCann was on the task force, Representative Brady and I were on the task force. There was... I've got it here now. Representative... excuse me, Senator Collins, Senator Haine, Citizen Action Illinois, AARP, and NAACP were all... had seats at the table in this as well as the Treasurer's Office, yes."
- Sims: "So, there... there was a broad cross section of individuals including Members of the General Assembly who were part of those discussions. Is that correct?"
- Martwick: "That is correct. And... and there were members of the insurance industry invited. I don't believe anyone ever attended. They did not."
- Sims: "Okay. Could we jump forward because it was a little loud, I could not hear completely the discussion on the fee structure. So, I want to make sure I'm clear about the... the fee structure. So, if they... under the... under the Bill, an individual would... the Treasurer is not... does not collect a fee for finding... or for finding the property?"
- Martwick: "That's correct. And never will. There is no fee associated with that."
- Sims: "So, this is... this means that those benefits go directly to the beneficiary when the unclaimed property is... is found. Is that correct?"
- Martwick: "Through the Treasurer's Office, that is correct."
- Sims: "So, I... I'm trying to understand the issue. As I have had community meetings within my district, the Treasurer's Office

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

has oftentimes set up an unclaimed property table to help constituents to find unclaimed property and they've done a yeoman's job of identifying and then getting those resources back to the public. Is that right?"

Martwick: "That is correct. That is my understanding as well.

They've done that through my district. And again, some pretty large sums of money have been turned over to people who were entitled to life insurance proceeds through the Treasurer's Office. And this is after the insurance company has turned the money over to the Treasurer's Office and then the Treasurer's Office has gone out and found the beneficiaries and gotten the money to them."

Sims: "Correct. So, is a person or company entitled to a fee for discovering presumptively abandoned property?"

Martwick: "So, what this does is between the time that the property becomes abandoned and the time that it winds up in the Treasurer's Office, we're eliminating the possibility of the insurance company turning it over to some sort of finder company that then will charge some exorbitant fee. There have been cases that... that I've been told of through the Treasurer's Office where these third-party finders charge a fee of as much as 40 percent of the proceeds. So, what they're saying is, no... no, you can't do that anymore. You just take that abandoned property, turn it over to us and then we'll do our search from the Treasurer's Office for no fee."

Sims: "So, as we... we look at this and other... other initiatives like it, we're trying to make sure that consumers are protected. So, we are trying to identify resources that families have paid for. The person who is the... who is the

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

subject of the policy then passes away. We're trying to make sure that the proceeds then get into the hands of the family. After having gone through one of the most difficult times of their lives, they've lost a family member. Now, they may not even know of this protection that the subject of the policy put in place for them. Now, we're trying to say that that money should not get into the hands of families? I don't under... I don't understand?"

Martwick: "Well... and... and Representative Sims, during the task force hearings we heard so many heart wrenching stories. And you know, I can think of examples where people talked about how their... their parent had purchased life insurance property... or life insurance policies, multiple policies, but then had through age contracted dementia or Alzheimer's and they just forgot that they had these policies. And never told the beneficiaries that they had them. And so, the proceeds that they should have been entitled to that there was that expectation when the person bought that, but they lost the mental capacity to let them know. I'm about to die and you've got life insurance coming. So, no one could make a claim. The story that struck me the most, Representative, was a woman whose... her daughter, young daughter had two young friends. And I think... I believe they were boys and a single mother. And the single mother died tragically in an automobile accident and this woman adopted these two young boys to take care of them. And meanwhile, the mother had purchased a life insurance policy. Now... to protect these... now, imagine these two young boys having their mother lost in a tragic accident. That money... the woman who adopted these two boys had no need

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

for that money personally. And she told us that when she received... finally received the proceeds after the Treasurer's Office found her, she put that in a trust account for the boys so they could care for themselves because they had so little family support. This was all that they were going to have. But we go back to that issue I talked about with Representative Demmer. All of that interest that was lost that went to the insurance company, because these two young boys did not know to make a claim on their mother's life insurance policy. That's what we need to fix."

Sims: "So, Representative, you just verbalized my... my concern. One of my main concerns with this... with the... the tone of the debate we're having. We have individuals who are out there who invest in these policies, their children may not know what... what they've done to protect them. And then, the policy... it comes time to pay the policy out and the families are then... are then... are hurt because they don't have the ability to go back and claim the property. So, what this Bill as I read it does, this Bill would allow for the Treasurer to go back and make sure that the money gets into the hands of the families who don't necessarily know that they were there in first place. So, that the families are protected. Those young people that you talk about are protected. I've got a situation right now in my district where there is a woman who has worked all her life, she got... she got ill. It's the same situation. And now, we're trying to make sure that we identify the resources necessary to care for her in her... in her old... in her elderly... in her old age, but as she is not able to verbalize what all ... where all the things that's she's put in place before. Now

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

her family has to... has to try and come together and piece this puzzle together to figure out how we're going to take care of this... this lady, who has done... who did everything right, who's tried to take care of herself and her family. But now, she's unable to verbalize the challenges that she's experiencing. She's not able to tell people the things that she did to prepare for this day when she knew it was coming. Because she cannot communicate that. But now, if we... so if this... if this were not in place then family would be at a loss because the Treasurer could not then go out, identify those funds, get those back to the family. Representative, I... I appreciate you bringing this forward. I support it. I support you because this is... it's necessary to make sure that we are protecting families and protecting consumers. Thank you, Representative."

Martwick: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Costello is recognized."

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

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

Costello: "So, Rob, I'm a financial advisor. I have been for over 20 years and one of the products that I sell is life insurance. And I think what people lose at times is the difference between life insurance and other products because it passes to the beneficiary tax free. It... it's a very key and essential part of estate planning for families. It's something that people should be cognizant of when they're voting for this Bill. I view this Bill as a consumer protection Bill. I actually think of... of any of the Bills that I've voted on probably in the five and a half, almost

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

six years that I've been here, this is one that's a classic case of an individual versus big business. And I think it's imperative that we in the General Assembly and we as lawmakers look out for individuals and their rights. I... I've heard a lot in the discussion. I think the discussion's gotten a little bit convoluted. And I'm... I'm looking just for some simplicity. So, at its very basis, what does this Bill do?"

Martwick: "What this Bill does is it... it ensures that the beneficiaries of a life insurance policy will timely be paid the proceeds of a policy when the policyholder dies. And what it... the second thing that it does, and this is really what we're getting to at the heart of the Amendment, is it says that if people have died in the past and the insurance companies are holding on to that money because the beneficiaries for whatever reason they did not know that the policy existed, you know, whatever the reason is they haven't come forward to make this claim. This is going to require that the insurance company policy... the insurance companies ascertain who those people are and make good faith efforts to contact them so that they can make the proper claim and the proceeds can be paid to them. That's what it does."

Costello: "Proceeds for a product that someone in their family has bought, made them the beneficiary of. So, all we're doing is notifying potential beneficiaries, correct?"

Martwick: "That's correct."

Costello: "Secondly, I'm sure you've heard opponents to this Legislation claim that it violates the contract clause of the provisions in the Illinois Constitution and the U.S. Constitution? How... how would you respond to that?"

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

- Martwick: "So, thank you for the question. There's no constitutional violation here. The United States Supreme Court rejected constitutional challenges by a group of insurers back in 1948 when they claimed that New York's Unclaimed Property Law unconstitutionally violated their contract rights. The case was Connecticut Mutual Life Insurance Company et al v. Moore. So, that question has been decided by the United States Supreme Court."
- Costello: "So, does this Act... does it substantially impair the contractual relationship between a life insurance company and the person that's insured?"
- Martwick: "It... it does not impair the contractual relationship at all. It's just... it's just coming up with a requirement that they seek out... ascertain whether or not a policyholder has died and then notify beneficiaries instead of waiting for them to file a claim on their own."
- Costello: "Rob, I want to thank you for bringing this piece of legislation. And as I said, literally, in the five and a half years that I've been here this is truly a... a classic case of standing up for people, our constituents, individuals. Thank you. And I recommend an 'aye' vote."

Martwick: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Martwick to close."

Martwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, thank you very much for this robust debate and discussion on this Bill. I'd like to thank the Treasurer's Office for their hard work in crafting this Bill and attempting to... well, it's been two years of negotiations on this Bill, subject matter hearings, task force hearings to

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

come up with this legislation. And I... I'd like to point out what has been said by a couple of my colleagues here. This is truly what government is supposed to do. Right? I mean, if... if government is not supposed to do this, if this is not where we are supposed to step in and protect an unwitting consumer, well, I... I'm not really sure I know what our role is any more This is an example where insurance companies systematically went to people and said... they sat at their kitchen table, they said sign for this life insurance policy, pay your hard-earned dollars into this, we'll be there for your family and... and that's not what happened. In many cases they did, but in far too many cases they did not. And they systematically held this. And we... I talked about that case. You look at the constituent from Representative Demmer's district, they should have received \$250 thousand back in 2004. Instead, we had to wait for the Treasurer's Office to find them 13 years later and they lost \$350 thousand of interest. That is not good policy. There's where government should step in, that's what we should do. This Bill makes the law equate to the expectation that people had when they purchase life insurance. That's what government's supposed to do. I respectfully ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Members, Representative Demmer requested a verification. So, all are asked to be at their seat to vote their switch. The question is, 'Shall House Bill 302 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 68... 47 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. Mr.

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

Demmer, would you like to proceed with your verification request? He has rescinded the verification request. And on a count of 68 voting 'yes', 47 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present, House Bill 302 having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, House Bill 40. Representative Feigenholtz. Please move this Bill back to the Order of Second Reading and read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 40, a Bill for an Act concerning abortion. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day.

No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Feigenholtz, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #1 is clarifying Amendment. I'd appreciate if we could support it."

Speaker Turner: "Lady moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 40. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. A balanced budget and fiscal has been requested but not filed at this time."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Feigenholtz on a Motion."

Feigenholtz: "I'd like to move to rule the notes inapplicable."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Breen on the Motion."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Breen: "Thank you. Representative, the notes seem pretty well applicable unless we... because it sounds like we don't have an agreement on how much your Bill is going to cost?"

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

Feigenholtz: "Representative Breen, the balanced budget note only applies to Appropriations Bills. And also, if you take a look at the underlying Bill, a balanced budget note from OMB has already been filed."

Breen: "Well but..."

Feigenholtz: "I'm happy to read it to you."

Breen: "Well, but what... but I... as I understand it, Representative, you don't agree with the... with that. I mean, how much is your Bill supposed to cost?"

Feigenholtz: "An accurate cost assessment for this Bill cannot be completed at this time because it does not mandate the state to fund these services. However, by removing these prohibitions, it opens the state up for significant cost liabilities to incur. It is unknown how often these services will be utilized, et cetera."

Breen: "Right. But... but..."

Feigenholtz: "So, it..."

Breen: "...I'm asking you, how much does your Bill cost?"

Feigenholtz: "GOMB filed this, Representative."

Breen: "But how much does your Bill cost?"

Feigenholtz: "I believe... well, it depends. If you look at the first time it was filed, it was 0. But magically with House Bill 40, GOMB has decided it's 1.8 million."

Breen: "But... but how much... what do you say your Bill costs?"

Feigenholtz: "I'm sticking to what GOMB says."

Breen: "So, 1.8 million or what... what do you say it costs? Because I... I'm... I'm confused and I'd like..."

Feigenholtz: "I answered the question, Representative."

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

Breen: "Well, my... my problem is this. How many abortions are going to be paid for under Medicaid with your Bill? Do you have an estimate of how many new abortions will be paid for?"

Feigenholtz: "There's really no way of knowing that."

Breen: "And... and Representative, the reason I ask is because I...

I went to the Guttmacher Institute and as best I can tell
from their numbers roughly 75 percent of women who get
abortions are below 200 percent of the federal poverty level.
And then I compared it to our Medicaid eligibility in Illinois
which sets the level at 213 percent. And so, I'm wondering is
that an accurate estimate, 75 percent of abortions in Illinois
will now be covered by Medicaid? Is that what your research
or data has... has shown?"

Feigenholtz: "My answer, Representative Breen, is the same. There is no way of knowing."

Breen: "Okay. So, but... do you have any data..."

Feigenholtz: "Period."

Breen: "...so you have no data to counteract that 75 percent of the abortions in the state will become Medicaid eligible after... if your Bill were enacted?"

Feigenholtz: "I already answered that question, Representative."

Breen: "Well, how... how much..."

Feigenholtz: "I already answered the next question also."

Breen: "I mean, I'm so glad that you're being so instructive and thoughtful in this debate over a very important state issue since you guys just spent well over an hour of floor time so that you could be out at a rally. Here's the problem. I'm looking at data showing that it costs us roughly a thousand dollars per abortion under... under Medicaid, under the few

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

abortions we cover currently. And I can't get a straight answer from you as to how much... do you agree that it's a thousand dollars an abortion that we're going to be paying? Is that what we're going to be... is that what it's going to cost us going forward if your Bill is enacted?"

Feigenholtz: "I'm going to reread what is on the fiscal note, Representative Breen, from the Office of Management and Budget. An accurate cost assessment for this Bill cannot be completed at this time because it doesn't mandate the state to fund these services. However, by removing the prohibitions it opens the state up for cost... significant cost liabilities to incur. It is unknown how often these services would be utilized by Medicaid enrollees or state employees. The exact cost to health insurance plans or how many new grant requests the Department of Human Services would receive as a response to this in future related legislation."

Breen: "Again, I'm not asking about what the specific... that specific note said. I just want to make it clear so that I'm... I'm understanding. You're taking no position. You've got no evidence on how many abortions would be Medicaid eligible and if your Bill were enacted, that's correct? That's what you've just done. You're taken no position. You've got no evidence. And you've got no evidence on how much each abortion will cost under your Bill. Is that correct?"

Feigenholtz: "I believe that the Medicaid reimbursement rate for an abortion is \$198."

Breen: "Okay. That's... now, that's the only number you've given at all. But you've got no... but you have no evidence for how many Medicaid abortions will occur, correct?"

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

Feigenholtz: "Correct."

Speaker Turner: "Representative, she's answered your questions.

You're being repetitive at this point. I mean..."

Breen: "Okay. Except I'm trying to... I'm trying to just get this clear 'cause she's being evasive in answering the questions."

Speaker Turner: "That's fine, but I think she's..."

Breen: "Reading me back statements from before."

Feigenholtz: "I'm not being evasive, Representative."

Breen: "You're being quite evasive."

Feigenholtz: "I'm reading the answer to your question that was provided to this Body by the Office of Management and Budget verbatim. You are asking a question that has been answered twice."

Breen: "Except I... I keep hearing... read your public comments about the costs or lack of costs of your Bill and I'm trying to get that clear to whether we have a disagreement or not. Because as best I can tell, your Bill is going to have a 60 million dollar impact on the Medicaid system. So, I'm trying to figure out how... how to get to the right number. You've... you've ruled that these financial notes are inapplicable and it seems like the finances of this are very applicable and very much subject to dispute. So, I'm trying to get clear on it."

Feigenholtz: "You should direct your questions to the… you should read the fiscal note. Maybe if you've read it..."

Breen: "I've read the fiscal note..."

Feigenholtz: "Have you?"

Breen: "...it's about a line."

Feigenholtz: "So, if they..."

Breen: "Yeah. And it has no explanation."

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

Feigenholtz: "...if they don't predict and I'm following what they say. I am not going to guess."

Breen: "But again..."

Feigenholtz: "I'm going with what they say. When House Bill 4013 was filed in the 99th General Assembly, there was a 1.3 million dollar fiscal note. It was corrected to 0. And now, in... with House Bill 40, it is 1.8 million. So..."

Breen: "Well, again, okay."

Feigenholtz: "...let's just say it..."

Breen: "Well, to the note."

Feigenholtz: "...that this is the best OMB can do."

Breen: "All right. Well, to... to the note. What's clear is that the Representative has no evidence in any way or even taking a position on how many abortions this is going to cost, what the average actual cost... full cost. Whether it's the \$1 thousand in abortion that we pay today or whether it's a smaller number. This is something that should require a proper fiscal note on her Amendment so that we can properly debate this on... in a full, fair measured way. Because as best I can tell, you're looking at 30 thousand new abortions, \$1 thousand an abortion. You're not getting a federal match. That adds up to \$60 million impact on our Medicaid system because of this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Wallace, are you seeking recognition on the fiscal note? Representative Wallace is recognized."

Wallace: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the note. The previous speaker has grossly misrepresented the cost to the termination of pregnancy in the State of Illinois. The highest

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

estimate is \$450 per termination, not 1 thousand. And in his remarks, there was the not so subtle vilification, if you will, of women who live in poverty. If we would do our job and make sure they have greater access to birth control and reproductive health care in general, perhaps we won't be talking about terminations, but this Bill is more than that. But in terms of this particular note, we need to stand by what the estimate says which is it's indeterminable at this particular time, or it could cost as little as \$1.8 million. Let us not stray from what the truth and the facts are. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Wheeler on the fiscal note?"

Wheeler, B.: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, on the fiscal note."

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed."

Wheeler, B.: "It was just recently pointed out by the Illinois Policy Institute that last Session we passed over 900 Bills. And there were only a couple dozen that we understood the fiscal impact... what those 900 Bills... what the fiscal impact is on the state. We just had security take a woman out and she pleaded us... pleaded to us for help. The state is in a terrible budget crisis. And the fact that we can't quite... we're unsure what the fiscal impact of this Bill or most of our Bills is quite frankly negligent of our duties. And this is just yet another indication that we're in big trouble and we continue to go down the tube."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Feigenholtz moves that the fiscal note be deemed inapplicable. All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

take the record. On a count of 61 voting 'yes', 54 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', the fiscal note has been deemed inapplicable. Representative Feigenholtz for an additional Motion."

Feigenholtz: "Is there another note, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Turner: "There's a balanced budget note attached to the Bill."

Feigenholtz: "I move that it be ruled inapplicable for the same..."

Speaker Turner: "Lady moves that the balanced budget note be moved inapplicable. All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'.

The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 61 voting 'yes', 55 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', the balanced budget note has been deemed inapplicable. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "No further notes have been requested at this time."

Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 40, a Bill for an Act concerning abortion. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I'm sure that many of us are familiar with the contents of House Bill 40. The subject that the legislation covers is the repeal of trigger language that is in the Illinois Abortion Law of 1975. The Bill also removes restrictions in State Law on Medicaid coverage for abortion. I'm happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Breen is recognized."

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

Breen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as you had heard in the debate on the fiscal note, the Guttmacher Institute has done studies on the income levels of women who get abortions. This is stuff... we've been collecting this data for decades. And the fact is that 75 percent of the women in the country have under 200 percent of the federal poverty level. And that makes them in Illinois, because of our generous treatment... in fact, you may not know this, but we have very generous treatment of women who are pregnant. We count women who are pregnant as family size two. And so, they can make up to 213 percent of the federal poverty level and we cover them. We cover them for outpatient procedures to take care of them and their baby. Under this Bill, because they are family size two they are now eligible for an abortion under this Bill. So, that would make roughly 75 percent of our 40 thousand abortions Medicaid eligible. If you look at the Guttmacher study they also say in other states with Medicaid... the Medicaid percentage once you legalize Medicaid abortions, it skyrockets. It's over 50 percent of that state's abortions. And as you heard from the gentle Lady there was not unanimity on the amount of costs per Medicaid abortion. I can just give you the numbers from HFS for these last 10 years or so. And there's an LRU study on it. It's over a thousand dollars an abortion, that's what we're actually paying. Do some simple math: 30 thousand times a thousand, it's \$30 million. Again... and we don't get a federal match on this money. So, that's \$60 million of impact to our Medicaid system. And the question that you're going to have to answer, depending on how you vote on this, is where that

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

money should come from? Should it come from cancer screenings? Or legitimate medical expenses, like heart medicines or insulin? Or come from necessary surgeries? And how are we going to deal with this after the Federal Government which it looks like it's about to block grant Medicaid. So, our Medicaid dollars are going to be reduced further. But now there's another issue here that has been clouding the debate over this Bill and this is... this business of the policy language from the 1975 Abortion Law, which frankly had been a footnote in legal history except that it has now been used as the main reason for this Bill. The reason I have a little bit of familiarity here is that because of ... for over the past 10 years I've specialized my law practice in Constitutional Law, including related to abortion. And I can tell you that those of us who practice in this field know full well that this policy language has no effect. And you know, you don't have to take my word for it. You can take the word of Colleen Connell, Director of Reproductive Rights Project of the ACLU who said, 'There are no enforceable laws on the books in Illinois about abortion.' This is from a 1991 article. She's immediately followed in the Tribune article by a quote from Attorney Paul Linton, Counsel for the Anti-Abortion Americans United for Life who agreed, 'Abortions will not be illegal because there's no statute in Illinois that makes abortions generally criminal.' The Tribune continues, the Illinois Legislative Research Unit of the General Assembly also shares that view. It would take a new law to outlaw abortion here, the Research Unit concluded in a 1989 study. I've got extra copies of the 1989 study if you'd like to look at it. It's

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

our own LRU report. Says right here, a decision by the Supreme Court could not reinstate repealed provisions on abortion in Illinois. Any stricter Illinois limits on abortion would come about only if enacted by the General Assembly. Ladies and Gentlemen, that is... this... this business that there's somehow risk of Illinois abortion law changing when Roe v. Wade is overturned in the next few years is false. It is, in the words of today, fake news. It's a smokescreen. There's no one who practices in this area that actually, seriously believes that. The entire purpose of this Bill is to bring more money, millions of dollars from the Illinois State Treasury to the abortion industry. And you know, it was funny... it's not really funny, it's a shame. You know, I wore black today 'cause I wanted to mourn. And I'm mourning the death of the sensible wing of the Democrat Party. 'Cause you know, just this weekend the head of the Democratic National Committee said and issued a statement that there could be no dispute within the Democrat Party on abortion. He withdrew the endorsement of a pro-life Democrat who was running for mayor of Omaha, Nebraska, specifically because he was pro-life. There's no room in the Democrat Party anymore for people who are pro-life. You know, the Republican Party we've got both positions. We're more pro-life than pro-choice on abortion, but we certainly don't say you're not a Republican because of it. So, I look at this Bill, I look at the smokescreen and the various back and forth that's happened. And really, it's very, very simple. Do you want taxpayer funding of abortion of healthy babies or not? And then you've got the kind of the ... the backdrop of if you're a Democrat, are you even allowed to vote against this Bill?

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

Can you be a Democrat anymore and be pro-life? It's a real shame. It's... it's sad that a major Party in our country would take such a hardline position and remove support from anyone who's pro-life just because of that position, that deeply felt and sincere position. So, Mr. Speaker, that... for that reason today, I rise in opposition to this Bill. I know there are plenty of other people that want to talk about it. But really, look. I mean, we... we can't afford a 60 million dollar hit to our Medicaid system. And frankly, we can't afford intolerance of people of their different positions on abortion. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Currie is recognized."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. fundamentally believe that abortion should be a woman's private decision, hopefully in consultation with her loved ones and her faith community and that decision should not be impeded by government. This principle should apply to all women, regardless of income level or location of residency. I will work to ensure equal access to contraception and abortion services. It is my hope that by increasing access to reproductive health services we can reduce the incidence of abortions in Illinois while ensuring that women who do make this decision receive services in a timely manner. My highest priority in this area will be to ensure effective administration of the laws regarding access to contraception and provide that access regardless of income. I dislike the Illinois law that restricts abortion coverage under the State Medicaid plan and State Employee Health Insurance because I believe it unfairly restricts access based on income. I would

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

support a legislative effort to reverse that law. Yeah, you're right, those were not my words. Those were the words of a Republican candidate for Governor a couple of years ago, his name was Bruce Rauner. I think he was right then... I think he was right then and I think that is the right answer today. I do not think this should be a partisan issue. There ought to be access to contraception, to abortion, to health care for all women with respect to reproductive rights, regardless of income, regardless of economic status, regardless whether they are a state employee or someone who is on the State Medicaid program. Bruce Rauner got it right a few years ago. And unfortunately, he's apparently failed to see the light in 2017. I hope the rest of the Members of this chamber will agree with him then and me now that a 'yes' vote on House Bill 40 is the right vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Jesiel is recognized."

Jesiel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. House Bill 40 will force every Illinois citizen to pay for abortions for those on Medicaid and for state employees done at any time, through all 9 months of pregnancy, for any reason even when the unborn child can feel pain and survive outside the womb. In addition to this, the Bill will strike out the original text of the 1975 Illinois Abortion Law which expressly states, 'Without in any way restricting the right of privacy of a woman or the right of a woman to an abortion under those decisions, the General Assembly of the State of Illinois do solemnly declare and find in reaffirmation of the longstanding policy of the state, that the unborn child is a human being from the time of conception and is, therefore, a legal person for purposes

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

of the unborn child's right to life and is entitled to the right to life from conception under the laws in the Constitution of the state.' My question here is just simply, why is it necessary to remove from our laws that being an unborn child is... or removing that an unborn child is a human being? Currently, three state statutes rely on this definition. Under Illinois Revenue Statute 720, Section 5, if a pregnant woman is murdered and her unborn child dies, we recognize the death of the child as a homicide. Under that Section, we also recognize the death of the unborn child as a reckless homicide in the case of a motor vehicle accident. And finally, also, if the unborn child of a pregnant woman is intentionally murdered, with the exception of abortion, then the person is convicted of voluntary manslaughter. To... to address the issue of the humanity of this child: at 21 days gestation, before most women know that they are even pregnant, an unborn child's heart is beating over 100 times a minute. At 5 weeks, their brain waves are detected and the child's brain continues to develop from here until age 25. At 9 weeks, the unborn child has fully formed fingers and toes and at 10 weeks, there are fingernails and toenails. At 16 weeks, the child can hiccup in the womb and at 17 their skeleton is formed. At 20 weeks, the child can feel pain. They can also suck their thumb. This is a 20-week child... unborn child who can suck their thumb. Science regards it as fact that the unborn child is a human being, but in removing this language through House Bill 40, we as a state are denying science. We are changing the culture in our state. A culture that has always recognized the humanity of those in the womb. Who are

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

we as a state, who are we as a culture when we can't even recognize the humanity of an unborn child. Rather than explain... expanding this availability, why don't we spend those dollars on taking care of pregnant women and adoptive families who wait months and compete with many other adoptive families to be able to welcome children in their lives. I know of a few personally who have waited over 2 years to get children in this state. Why don't we instead demonstrate respect and compassion for those who find themselves in this situation, but also for... respect for life for every Illinois resident. I urge an 'aye'... or a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Ford is recognized."

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

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

Ford: "Sara, I know we've fought a lot over this Bill and the day has finally come. And I told you during our conversations that this was one Bill that I never wanted to take a vote on. And it was one Bill that I said when I got elected that it would probably drive me out of the House if I had to make a decision on something like this. So, today is here. I just want to ask you a few questions before I get to some of the facts about the Bill. And for the record, I want to make sure that it's clear to everyone and we can't pass up an opportunity to make these facts known to the public. Sara, you are aware that blacks make up about 13 percent of the population in the United States and about 34 percent of abortions are form of black women, per say? Are you aware of that?"

Feigenholtz: "Yes, I am."

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

Ford: "And would you say that in Illinois our budget stalemate and our inability to appropriate funds in those communities may lead to many of those unwanted pregnancies?"

Feigenholtz: "Yes, sadly."

Ford: "Are you aware that at this time the Chicago Public Schools may be closing and... early as a result of our inaction to fund Chicago Public Schools?"

Feigenholtz: "I am aware."

Ford: "Do you think that's a pro-life stance or do you think that that is against what we should be standing for when we talk about being pro-life?"

Feigenholtz: "I think the... the issues and the problems that you bring up, Representative Ford, are common problems that people on our side of the aisle agree with you on and are trying to address."

Ford: "Are you aware that blacks make up about 13 percent of the population, but blacks are also 40 percent of the prison and jail population?"

Feigenholtz: "I am."

Ford: "And Chicago, 75 percent of the murders are of blacks. So, that being said, that's why it's a struggle for me as an African-American man to be excited about voting for a Bill such as this. Because I ask myself, where is the black race going to go if we continue to have abortions in this country and this state? So, that troubles me, but that's me and my moral sense of judgement. But as a Legislator, I have to put aside my own decisions and make a decision based on the people that sent me here to represent them. So, I conducted a poll. I did it and met with people in the community for months

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

because this is one that's kept me up at night. And about 17 hundred people voted for me to vote for House Bill 40. That's 97 percent of the people that voted in the poll. So now I have to ask myself, what do I do? I'm supposed to represent the people; they sent me here. I asked them the question and overwhelmingly they asked me to vote for it. I think about the church and I think about the government. I know the church has a moral obligation to make sure unwanted pregnancies are prevented so that we don't have to be dealing with abortions as much as some may expect. And I put the two together, I think about abortions and I think about the capital punishment where we have people that compare abortions and capital punishment. And when we think about capital punishment and putting people to death, that seems more of the ... it's different than a moral debate of a personal matter. So, you have capital punishment and you have government saying one thing and then you have abortion and we want to make sure that government imposes morality on an individual. And I don't know if that's right. What I think is most important is that our church and our government does everything possible to support women so that unwanted pregnancies are not happening. As a Catholic, I know I spoke with my Cardinal and my Cardinal of course opposes this. And my thought about the Cardinal opposing it, he has every right to oppose it and that's what he's supposed to do. How could he be the Cardinal of a Catholic Church if he didn't oppose it? But I also have a charge for the Cardinal that represents me and that is to come into the black communities, come across the city, come across the state and work with women, work with families so

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

that we can prevent unwanted pregnancies. I think that's where the work starts. And that's where the work should be. I don't know if we could depend on this Body to legislate morality for personal issues. So, after consulting with Sponsors and ... with the Sponsor and others, I sought this Amendment ... Amendment #1 that we adopted so that we can be absolutely clear without a possible ... any possible confusion that House Bill 40 does not make changes to Illinois's law regarding when a woman can or cannot have an abortion. During the course of the discussion running up to the consideration of House Bill 40, some have suggested that the Bill will allow a woman to decide to have an abortion late into her term up to the final month. Well, the law in Illinois says that that's simply not true. All of the laws govern abortion care in Illinois remains unchanged by House Bill 40. And this Amendment simply that reality. If legally reflects а woman can constitutionally seek an abortion after consulting with her physician and her family and loved ones, she still will be able to do so if House Bill 40 becomes law. This Bill and its Amendment are both simple things ensuring that women in Illinois have the ability to make their medical decisions for themselves with their doctors and their family members and their loved ones and removes the question as to whether or not an individual can have an abortion at late term. So, Sara... Sponsor, I want to ask you, what does Amendment 1 do to House Bill 40?"

Feigenholtz: "Representative Ford, it's, I believe, Amendment 2.

And after lengthy discussion with you... and there has been a lot of infor... misinformation and I appreciate you bringing it

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

to a question about the Illinois taxpayers paying for elective abortions through all nine months of pregnancy. And... and the Amendment makes it clear that nothing about House Bill 40, amended, changes the law as it relates to when a person cannot have an abortion in Illinois."

Ford: "So, some of the concerns that... I want to make sure because even advocates and supporters of House Bill 40, they were concerned even while meeting with them that House Bill 40 would allow late-term abortion. If this Bill passes, the Amendment that I worked with you on will ensure that late-term abortions will not take place in Illinois?"

Feigenholtz: "As I said, Representative, this Amendment makes it clear that nothing about this Bill changes the law as it relates to when a person can or cannot have an abortion in Illinois. So, yes."

Ford: "Yes. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Bryant."

Bryant: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. To the Bill. Just a, I don't know, couple years ago when I was very new here, a Representative from the other side of the aisle stood up and called several Members from this side of the aisle out by name and said, just do the right thing and then repeated a name. Do the right thing and then repeated a name. So, I'm going to ask a couple of the folks from the other side of the aisle who I've built friendships with and... and believe that they have deep convictions in regard to... to this Bill. And one in particular who came to my office personally and... and we talked about some beliefs that he has that are because his grandmother helped raise him and... and so on. But

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

you know, understanding that and knowing that even a previous speaker who said that he's, you know, talked to the Bill Sponsor and did some polling in his district and... this is a Bill that doesn't really have anything to do with polling. And it really doesn't have anything to do with the difference between whether someone believes in abortion... or excuse me, does not believe in abortion but also believes in capital punishment. There's a real distinction between an innocent life being taken and someone who has violated a law that clearly says that you forfeit your life for violating that law. For approximately 36 years it's been the policy here in Illinois and in our country that our citizens shouldn't be required to pay for other people's abortions. And currently, Illinois Medicaid programs cover abortions in rare cases such as rape and incest or for those that threaten a mother's life. In current form, House Bill 40 expands the Medicaid coverage for all abortions at any phase of pregnancy. And you know, I... I was thinking about what I've experienced in my lifetime. You know, women don't like to give away their age, but I was born in 1963. During my lifetime, we have moved from allowing abortions at the first trimester to allowing abortions in the second trimester to allowing abortions in the third trimester to allowing partial birth abortions. Until just a few years ago, I read a quote from George Soros that said that he believed you should be able to get rid of a child all the way up to age 2 because they couldn't feed themselves and they weren't potty trained. And you know so, it's an... it's an ongoing progression that we're becoming desensitized to ... to whether or not a life begins at conception, where you know

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

clearly we could argue what scriptures say about when life begins, and... and that would be an ongoing argument I'm sure. But even if we take this outside of that realm and use some of the quotes by a previous speaker who talked about the Chicago Tribune and some quotes from some leaders in the ACLU and one ... one I don't think that was mentioned, legal expert Lorie Chaiten, and I'm sorry if I mispronounced that name, also with the ALCU told the Chicago Tribune in 2006 that a court... a court has held that the trigger law has no effect in its statement of intention. It doesn't say that we'll go back to concrete law that actually bans abortion. So, there's two aspects in this particular Bill that the Representative is carrying. One really goes to the core of who, many of us are that is outside of polling and is outside of... of... of what another person can tell me to believe. It goes to the very core of ... of our faith in being ... in saying that ... that a child... that a life begins at conception, and no one has the right to take that life. But it'll also goes to the core of many of... of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle who want to able to use Medicaid money to help the most vulnerable among us. And when we're going to spend millions and millions of dollars to allow an expansion of Medicaid to... to fund abortions, then I don't ... I guess I really just don't understand how we can say that we do care about the most vulnerable among us when we have limited funds anyway and we're going to be spending money to increase something that goes not only... not only is opposed by many of us but is considered to be an abomination. So, half of this Bill is a waste of time because attorneys on both sides of the aisle

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

and a judge have concluded that there's no trigger law that bans abortion in Illinois. But the second half of the Bill is a ridiculous policy that expands abortion in the State of Illinois and shouldn't be part of abor... of providing free abortions to whoever wants them, at any stage of a pregnancy, for any reason. I stand in opposition of this Bill. I'll stand in opposition of any Bill that looks anything like this. And I challenge those of you who are on the other side of the aisle who claim to be people of faith to oppose this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Fine is recognized."

Fine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to thank the Sponsor of this Bill for bringing forward this important legislation. This Bill is not just an opinion or an issue, it could literally be the difference between life and death for women. Prohibition doesn't work. This is about access to health care and reproductive rights. I had a conversation with a retired doctor in my community. This doctor devoted his 40-year career to women's health care. He will tell you that this procedure is a medical procedure that needs to be performed in a safe environment, just as any other medical procedure. He is concerned and I am as well that if Roe v. Wade is no longer the law of the land and women in Illinois no longer have safe and available access to abortion, women will die. He told me how at the beginning of his career in the 1960s he worked at Cook County Hospital before abortion was legal. He talked about the room they would set up in the hospital every morning to take in the women who had suffered from a botched abortion. He said half the women who came in would die from septic shock

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

or other unintended consequences of these botched attempts. He is concerned and I am concerned that if this option is no longer available to women, the clock will turn back to this punishing time. It is my choice and my body and no law should take away that opportunity for a safe medical procedure for women."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Winger is recognized."

Representative Sims is recognized."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I not going to rise to speak today. However, as I'm sitting here listening to the debate there are challenges on both sides, but to challenge and question my faith, I am offended. I am offended that I am... my faith has been questioned on this floor because I support a woman's right to choose. It is not my place to make a decision for another. That decision must be between that person and their family and their God. But for us to sit here and to have a discussion where some have made up facts, said that the ... on one hand, a fiscal note that we've outlined doesn't make sense. It doesn't add up. The fiscal note came back, it was done. Either you agree or you don't. However, we have the ability to continue to discuss this policy. We are making sure that this policy and the women's... women who will be protected by it have the ability to have these procedures in a safe environment. But to stand here and over and over again question our faith is offensive. And I remind everyone of Matthew 7:1-3, Judge not, lest ye be judged. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Morrison is recognized."

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

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

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

Morrison: "Okay. Representative Feigenholtz, current State Law restricts abortions for Medicaid patients and state employees and this is what you intend to change. Is that correct?"

Feigenholtz: "Correct."

Morrison: "Okay. Do you believe that it's appropriate to restrict abortions in any case?"

Feigenholtz: "No."

Morrison: "Okay. So just to be clear, a mother who is pregnant with triplets could reduce via abortion one or more of those babies even if they are healthy. Is that correct?"

Feigenholtz: "Representative, can you ask questions about the Bill that's in front of you, please?"

Morrison: "This... this absolutely has to do with this Bill. Can you just answer that question? Would that abortion procedure be covered?"

Feigenholtz: "No."

Morrison: "Under... under what grounds? On what grounds would the state or the Medicaid system deny that abortion? You just said that there shouldn't be restrictions for any reason."

Feigenholtz: "You asked my opinion on the first question, not what was in the Bill."

Morrison: "Okay."

Feigenholtz: "My response was my opinion, not what is in law or in the Bill."

Morrison: "Okay. If your Bill were to become law, would a... an abortion that reduces... what's called a reduction abortion from triplets down to a single or twins down to a single, would that be covered if your Bill were to become law?"

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

- Feigenholtz: "Representative, the Illinois Statutes already has laws around viability. And it is already defined."
- Morrison: "Representative, in respect to viability..."
- Feigenholtz: "This is about pre-viability abortion care. That is what House Bill 40 addresses."
- Morrison: "Okay. So, if your Bill were to become law, and we're...
 we're trying to remove the restrictions that currently exist,
 I'm asking would one of those restrictions be a reduction
 abortion from triples... triplets down to a single or twins
 down to single?"
- Feigenholtz: "I'm going to repeat my answer. It's about... this is a Bill about pre-viability. It doesn't address what you are asking me."
- Morrison: "To... to the Body, it would be covered. It would be covered. Would your Bill include abortions for reason of sex selection?"
- Feigenholtz: "That is not the intent of this legislation."
- Morrison: "I... I... Representative, I understand that's not your intent. But if your Bill were to become law, could it..."
- Feigenholtz: "This is about pre-viability abortion care, Representative. Anything... the only terminations that are permitted after viability are... they're called a delivery. So..."
- Morrison: "Representative, I have... I have four children and we have many Members of this Body who are parents as well, we found out the sex of our children pre... before they were viable. So, I'm asking again. Would your Bill... if it were to become law, would it cover an individual who goes in and says, I want an abortion because I am unhappy with the sex..."

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

Feigenholtz: "This Bill makes..."

Morrison: "...of the fetus?"

Feigenholtz: "...no changes. I... I think I answered a similar question when Representative Ford was talking about how this is... this... the Amendment we just adopted clarifies that there is no change in current law."

Morrison: "Okay. Representative, I know that abortions are accessible right now if the individuals decide to pay for it on their own. But if your Bill were to become law, this would be... this would be a procedure covered by Medicaid for virtually any reason pre-viability, which could include sex selection. That's what I'm... I'm trying to..."

Feigenholtz: "This Bill does not change how abortion is covered in Illinois currently."

Morrison: "Okay. To the Body. If an individual who is on Medicaid wants an abortion due to the... the sex of the fetus... of the child, we would be covering that and in addition, state employees. Representative, according to the United Nations Population Fund today somewhere between 100 and 200 million women across Asia are missing and many other... others are missing in Eastern European countries as well, largely the result of gender bias sex selection, a form a discrimination. Further, in this United Nations report, it also indicates that in the United States and other industrialized countries this is an issue. There was a 2011 gallop poll. This was the question: If Americans could have only one child, which would you prefer, a boy or a girl? Forty percent answered that they would prefer to have a boy versus 28 percent preferred that they would have a girl. And these numbers are similar to a

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

poll that was done in 1941 to show the consistency: 38 percent back then preferred to have a boy, 24 percent preferred to have a girl. Representative, do you believe it's in the best interest of the State of Illinois to require that taxpayers pay for abortions for the reason that the couple would prefer a boy to a girl?"

Feigenholtz: "This doesn't... this Bill doesn't change current statute, Representative. And I am not..."

Morrison: "Representative..."

Feigenholtz: "...I refuse to answer that question."

Morrison: "Okay."

Feigenholtz: "You're being so dilatory."

Morrison: "To the Body. We're talking about an expansion of taxpayer funding for Medicaid, taxpayer funding of abortions for Medicaid and for state group and health insurance. Just to remind the Body, current practice is that right now... current law, we cover abortions in the case of the life of the mother, the health of the mother, which is pretty broad, rape and incest. What we're debating right now would be an expansion for virtually any reason, including the reasons that I cited. And the Representative's failure to answer those questions... I understand that's not her intent, but that is the result of what would happen. I... I would like to go to the Bill. This is a sobering moment in the history of this Body. Representative Ford, you alluded to the debate about the death penalty. And I appreciate that you brought that up. And you and I have talked about that over the past couple of weeks. That was a similarly controversial Bill. It involved the state's role in taking human life. Some of you here today...

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

some of you who are sponsoring this Bill, you voted to abolish death penalty. The Center on Wrongful Convictions contributed to this effort. There was a powerful moment that happened in 1998, there was a forum during which they had over 30 former death row inmates now exonerated who stood up in front of a podium, they walked up to a microphone and one after another stated, my name is 'blank'. If the state had its way, I'd be dead today. I want you to think about that. If the state had its way, I'd be dead today. We are repulsed by the thought of the state sending an innocent man or woman to his death or her death. What are we doing here then? Now many of those exonerated had committed lessor crimes, but they were innocent of the charges that had sent them to death row. I want you to please tell me what is the crime that these unborn children have committed that they would deserve to be discarded? Not recognized as persons, they're just medical waste. Is it that some were unplanned? That some are inconvenient? Is it because some were born to a poor family or would be born to a poor family? What about the millions of those children who are born under those same circumstances? Some in this General Assembly have stated in... in... on previous Bills that they were born under these same circumstances. Ronald Reagan once said, 'I noticed that everyone who supports abortion has already been born.' But no, we're not going to recognize that right for those who can't speak today. They're too small; they're too weak. And besides, seven U.S. Supreme Court judges said it was legal, so that must make it okay. Just like they said in 1857 when they declared that former slave Dred Scott was not a legal person either. Or in 1927

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

when eight justices legalized the forced sterilization of those the government deemed unfit to reproduce, 'for the protection and health of the state.' Planned Parenthood is celebrating 100 years. This Bill would fulfill the aims of eugenicists like Henry Goddard and Margaret Sanger, who supported for sterilizations and as a last result, abortion. La Shawn Ford brought up this point, and I'm glad he did, 13 percent of the population is African American yet 34 percent of the abortions are in that demographic. In some... in some cities there are more African-American children who are aborted than born. That is a travesty of justice. A 'yes' vote today would fulfill the eugenicists dream of a better America, devoid of any undesirables or anyone they believe would be a drain on society. And believe me, I'm getting those emails just like you are from constituents who say vote 'yes' or vote 'no'. And I respond to the ... I respond to both. But those who told me I should vote 'yes, I replied back my reasons and I got some replies back. If you're really a fiscal conservative, you would vote for this, because it's far less expensive to abort than to pay public assistance for the next 18 years. How callous? If the state had its way, I'd be dead today. There's an endless list of individuals who would not be here today if Representative Feigenholtz's Bill had been law over the past decades. Lives have been saved because of current practice. We... most of us watched the Olympics last summer. Did you watch Simone Biles, World Champion gymnast? She was a child of poverty and misfortune. She was born to a poor, drug addicted and alcoholic single mother. She was bounced in and out of foster care for 5 years. Finally, she

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

was adopted by her grandparents. Today, she's an Olympic Champion. If the abortion industry had had its way, she would never have made it to the podium. She never would have seen the light of day. She wouldn't even have a name. Each one of us is made by God and we are one of a kind. Every life matters: mother, father, child. Life goes on. Steve Jobs is another example. His birth mother was a college student and had an unplanned pregnancy. Steve Jobs said in his autobiography, I wanted to meet my birth mother and to thank her because I didn't up as an abortion. She was 23 and went through a lot to have me. You know what, sometimes unwanted children defy expectations, sometimes they don't. Sometimes they just have a normal existence, but every life is created by God and is unique and has value. I had a very interesting experience this morning down in the rotunda. I was talking to a colleague, the Reverend Jesse Jackson... Reverend Jesse Jackson walked up. I'd never meet him. I'd seem him on television; I'd heard a lot about him. I shook his hand. And it just occurred to me, I remember that the Reverend Jackson used to be pro-life. I looked up an... an article that the Reverend Jackson wrote. I want to quote from some of it. 'The question of abortion confronts me in several different ways. First, although I do not profess to be a biologist, I've studied biology and know something about life from the point of view of the natural sciences. Second, I'm a minister of the Gospel and therefore, feel that abortion has a religious and moral dimension that I must consider. And third, I was born out of wedlock and against the advice that my mother received from her doctor; and therefore, abortion is a personal issue for

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

me. From my perspective, human life is the highest good. Human life itself is the highest human good and God is the supreme good because he is the giver of life. That is my philosophy. Everything I do proceeds from that religious philosophical premise. Reverend Jackson went on, 'In the abortion debate one of the crucial questions is, when does life begin? Anything growing is living. Therefore, human life begins when the sperm and egg join and drop into the fallopian tube and the pulsation of life takes place. From that point life may be described differently. But the essence is the same. The name has changed, but the game remains the same.' Some argue, suppose a woman doesn't want to have the baby? They say the very fact that she does not want the baby means that the psychological damage to the child is reason enough to abort the baby. Reverend Jackson said he disagreed, 'The solution to that problem is not to kill the innocent baby, but to deal with her values and her attitude toward life. Deal with the attitude that would allow her to take away that which she cannot give. Some women argue that the women... that the man does not have the baby and will not be responsible for the baby after it's born; therefore, it is all right to kill the baby. Again, the logic is off. The premise is that the man is irresponsible. If that is the problem, then deal with making him responsible. Deal with what you're dealing with not the weak, the innocent, and the unprotected baby.' He went on, you can look up his article. There's more to say. I'm sure other speakers will have more to say. I... I want to conclude, but I want to ask this Body. Do you even know what you're voting on? How many of you have ever... have seen an

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

abortion? When I think of some of the ... the travesties throughout human history, from slavery... basically, since the camera was invented we've had a window into some of the grave injustices in the world. I have in my mind the image of the ... of the former slave with the scars borne on his back. I have images of ... of bodies stacked like cord wood in World War II. And I have the images of those ... of those children. I read a powerful book recently, The Blood of Emmett Till. Do you know this story? Emmett Till was brutally murdered in the south. His body was sent north to Chicago. His mother insisted that he have an open casket so that the world would see what was done to him. This is not... this is not just euphemisms that we're talking about. This is a child. At some point a mother goes to an abortion clinic, she is pregnant and hours later she is unpregnant if you want to call it that. What happens in the interim? If you're going to vote 'yes' on this, do you have the courage to look at those images and vote 'yes'? I would beg the Body, please vote 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Christian Mitchell is recognized."

Mitchell, C.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to go straight to the Bill. So, let me start off these remarks by saying I'm very clear that everything I'm about to say next is not reflective of all Republicans. I know there are some of you who are not speaking today who have to take this vote for reasons that have more to do with Party than with personal belief. So, I'm not talking to you. To the Representative who just spoke from Palatine, you sit pretty close to somebody who once extolled the Confederate Flag and talked about baby

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

daddies and who should be identified. And despite that, what you just said is the most ignorant and possibly racist thing I've heard in this General Assembly. So, let... let's start at the beginning. First of all, the Gentleman from... you noted that Ronald Reagan who invented the Southern Strategy and Richard Nixon who invented Benign Neglect, you've cited as folks who were heroes and champions of the inner city. That ... that belies all fact, Representative. Your crocodile tears about the poor and about African Americans are not reflective of your voting record or in many cases the voting record of many Members of your Party. If there were Republicans who were standing up today and saying, I'm not voting for this Bill, but in fact, I am going to be more supportive going forward of child care. I'm going to be more supportive of the women infant, and children's programs. I will go to my Governor who cut Teen REACH and other services and say, we need to make sure that for women... poor women to have the best choices possible, we're going to strengthen the social safety net. That would be a different conversation, but that's not the conversation today. The conversation that perpetuating, Representative, is that you want to make a comparison between slavery and segregation and the Supreme Court and... and all of the things that your Party has historically stood against. But today on this Bill, suddenly you're a liberal. You must be outside of your mind. Now, let me also say... address something that another Representative mentioned at the beginning. He mentioned that the chairman of the DNC said that you could not be a pro... a pro-life Democrat. And that comment was ridiculous. Tom Perez should be rebuked

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

for that comment. Whatever your moral fiber or your personal conviction quides you to be, you ought to be as a Democrat, but you also ought to be consistent. So, if you believe that poor people are just as good as rich people, then poor women ought to have the same choices as any other woman in our society. And if that's the case, then you ought to be supportive of this Bill. Because abortions are happening right now. And they're happening in your community. I know, I grew up in the western suburbs. Everybody knew where to get one if they needed one, but the difference was daddy or mommy could pay for it. And for these women, they can't. And... and if you were supportive of the services that would make their lives better that would be a different conversation. If you were saying, you know what, go on have this child. We will do all we need to supply the financial support necessary to take care of your child, you might have a case. I might still not agree because I would still say that based on due process, equal protection under the law, things that many on your side of the aisle would say you stand for, you are still not offering poor women the same life choices as you are for women in other communities, many of which you represent. But since you're not saying that, please do not presume to lecture people who represent poorer people on moral values because you don't stand for them consistently; you stand for them when it's convenient. That is about the first time I've ever heard the word black come out of the former Representative's mouth. In the context of this Bill, but on every other Bill, while we're cutting Medicaid, while we're cutting child care, while we're cutting in-home care, all it is about is about

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

money. Now, it's about race. So, please Representative, just save me the crocodile tears. This is a Bill about equal access. This is a Bill about making sure that poor women have the same choices as every other woman. And if... it's interesting to me how conservatives always want government to stay out of their house, but never out of their bedroom. So, for that reason and many others, anyone who says they are a small government conservative and believes in the values of people being able to make their own choices, you ought to be 'yes' on House Bill 40. And if you're not, please don't presume to lecture us on race. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Gabel."

Gabel: "Thank you... thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. So, first, I would really like to thank the Sponsor. Thank you, Representative Feigenholtz for this Bill. Forty years ago I was fighting against the Hyde Amendment because I felt like that would create a two-tiered system. It would allow women who had private insurance or had the funds to have an abortion and for women who were on Medicaid, it would be impossible or very difficult for them. And the Hyde Amendment did pass. And we've had that system for 40 years. I am so thrilled that today we will, hopefully, end that... end that disparity. The interesting thing about the Hyde Amendment is that it still allowed Medicaid to pay for sterilization. So, it was okay for a poor woman to be sterilized and to never have children again, but it wasn't okay for them to end a pregnancy that they could not support. I also thank you for the second part of this Bill, which protects women and their reproductive rights from the Trump administration's attempt to overturn

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

Roe v. Wade. It would make abortion illegal, in this country. Just because abortion is illegal doesn't mean that it doesn't exist. What it means is that it will become incredibly unsafe and dangerous. During the time that abortion was illegal in this country, there were 10 thousand deaths of women each year, 10 thousand deaths of women due to botched abortions. I never want to go back to those times again. Reproductive rights are important for women to be able to control their economic security, to be able to control their lives and to be able to control their own bodies. And this Bill really should not be a partisan Bill. If you're a woman, if you have a child... if you have a... a daughter, if you have a wife, if you have a sister, if you know a woman, you should be voting for this Bill. This Bill protects women's lives. And I urge everyone to vote 'yes'."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Bellock is recognized."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. And just to the Bill. Starting off by... I think... I respect everybody's opinion in this House and chamber. And we know that the ethics of abortion is a topic that has debate... been debated all over the United States, all over the State of Illinois and in this House on both sides of the aisle. But for 36 years the State of Illinois has had the policy... and I'll just be brief. The policy has been that we have not had taxpayer dollars used to fund abortions. That has been the policy not only of our state, but of the majority of states around the United States unless that's changed in the last couple of years. Representative Gabel did bring up the Hyde Amendment. That was an Amendment that did prohibit federal tax dollars for

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

paying for abortions and that's an Amendment that has stood, as Representative Gabel said, for over 40 years. Henry Hyde was one of the most respected Legislators from the State of Illinois and he brought the both sides of the aisle, Democrats and Republicans, to that issue to agree on that issue that still stands. I think that issue alone is what held up part of the Affordable Care Act for people that still felt that federal tax dollars should not go to the funding of abortions. The only reason this issue stands today, I think that stands out, is that there are people in Illinois that are opposed to abortion. And what this Bill is doing is asking those people to pay their dollars to pay for those abortions. And that is something that we have never asked the citizens of Illinois to do before except in the cases of rape, incest, and the life of the mother which we all felt that was something that had been decided upon. Thank you. And I want to say to all of you, this issue, again, the ethics of abortion is really not the issue here today. The issue is what has been brought up in this Bill, House Bill 40, as to taxpayers paying for abortions in the State of Illinois now because the Federal Government under the Hyde Amendment cannot do that. So, this match, as far as I understand, will be totally paid for by the State of Illinois. Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Williams."
Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. First of all, let
me reiterate my appreciation to the Sponsor for all her hard
work over the past several months, really appreciate all
you've done to get us to this point. Over the past several
months, women in Illinois and all over the country have felt

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

under siege between attempts to defund Planned Parenthood, rollbacks civil liberties, the discriminatory and offensive discourse that we're hearing on the national and local scales. Women have become active and engaged at unprecedented levels, but the right to access safe and legal abortion has been under siege for much longer. Even though Roe v. Wade has ensured women access to this procedure since 1973, the ability of women to access it safe and legally is under attack every single day and it continues. Yes, it's 2017 and we're still fighting. Today we're fighting for the very heart of reproductive freedom. And what that means is the ability to control our bodies, our lives, and our destinies. We're fighting against unreasonable restrictions on clinics, onerous and invasive requirements for medically unnecessary procedures such as vaginal ultrasounds, informed consent requirements not based in medical fact, violence harassment at clinics, threats, including death threats, against providers and an array of otherwise, although sometimes bizarre, often punitive and always designed to decrease the ability of a woman to access a safe and legal abortion. In 2016, there were 353 State Laws designed to restrict this right. They were introduced at the state level around the country. And the anti-woman rhetoric associated with these laws, it's quite stunning. I've removed couple of the quotes because I frankly don't feel comfortable talking about them and saying them out loud on the House Floor. But we can go back to 2012, remember Todd Akin, who talked about abortion in the context of rape and said, 'If it's a legitimate rape, the female body has ways to

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

shut that whole thing down.' Greg Brannon, GOP Senate nominee in North Carolina in 2013 described pregnant women as just girls who don't really understand what's happening in their bodies. One of my personal favorites, 2017 Oklahoma State Rep, Justin Humphrey, arguing in favor of a Bill to require men who impregnate women to get permission before a woman can access legal abortion, called women... pregnant women, 'hosts'. I think many of you read about that. And of course, most recently we've heard our President, who seems to have evolved on the issue, talk about the fact that women who seek abortions should be punished. One of my colleagues on the House Floor just used the phrase 'when' Roe v. Wade is overturned, not if but when. And that's where we are today. Here in Illinois, though, we can fight back. We can fight back against these unreasonable restrictions and this dangerous rhetoric. We can help all women in Illinois continue to have the right to control our bodies, our lives and our destinies. Vote 'yes'."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Batinick is recognized."

Batinick: "I'm going to go straight to the Bill. I had a lot of constituents call me on this particular Bill. And one thing that I've always been clear on with everybody is I do not support taxpayer funding of elected abortions. And you know, people for... people oppose this Bill, people are for this Bill. But I chose to get back to everybody. And I found something interesting, the people that supported the Bill talked about Trump, they talked about overturning Roe v. Wade. As soon as I talked to them about the fact that this was taxpayer funding of... of elected abortions, they were no longer proponents of

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

the... they were no longer proponents of the Bill. And I feel like this whole debate has been kind of a smokescreen for the reality of what the Bill is. And I... I feel great disappointment that this Body is going to be voting on a Bill that I think wasn't marketed to what the Bill really does. That's what's disappointing to me. I can tell you that that's what... what my constituents have said. So, I'll simply say and if... if we're going to be honest with our constituents, we should have told them what the Bill is really about up to that \$60 million a year of taxpayer funding for abortions. Enough reason to vote 'no'. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Drury is recognized."

Drury: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in strong support of this Bill. There's a saying that goes, you're entitled to your opinions, but you're not entitled to your facts. And there just been a lot of misstatements and blatant misrepresentations made about what this Bill is, what this does, and comparing it to things that are not remotely like this Bill. The death penalty was the state mandating that someone be killed. The death penalty was a state mandate that we kill somebody. This Bill does not force anybody to do anything. This is not the state saying that if you're on Medicare or Medicaid, you have to have an abortion. And it's not the state saying if you're on Medicare or Medicaid, you don't. It is saying that a women... woman and her doctor can make the right decision for herself. For those of you who are arguing strenuously about the death penalty, this Bill does exactly what we got rid of. It takes the state out of forcing people to do things. This Bill picks winners... the state right

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

now... what you want on the other side is to pick winners and losers. You say that if you have the means to have your own insurance, okay fine, but if you don't, the state says you have to have a child. That's what you're arguing. So, you can have the opinion that you think that no one in the State of Illinois should have an abortion. You're entitled to that. But you're not entitled to manipulate the facts to make an argument that just doesn't exist. And in fact, the mere fact that you have to misrepresent the facts shows that you can't defend your position on the facts. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Welch is recognized."

Welch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I rise today in strong support of a woman's right to choose. I rise today as a proud chief cosponsor of this Bill because I am not a woman, but a woman I respect gave me life. I am not a woman, but a woman that I respect I married. I am not a woman, but I am trying my best to raise a beautiful three-year-old girl who men will respect someday. I believe it is disrespectful to tell a woman what she can or cannot do with her body. And I don't know a single woman, not one, who has an abortion for fun. Do you? Not a single woman has an abortion for fun. This is about health. This is about access to doing the right thing. Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg once said, 'The emphasis must be not on the right to an abortion, but on the right to privacy and reproductive control.' That is how we respect a woman. And I believe everyone who votes 'yes' today is showing the proper respect to a woman. Vote 'yes'."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Ives is recognized."

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

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

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

Ives: "Thank you. Representative Feigenholtz, from my perspective when I've looked around we know that when you're using taxpayer money you cannot use it for anything other than a public good. So, I want to know what is the public good in taxpayers funding abortion?"

Feigenholtz: "Representative Ives, right now if I work for the City of Chicago or if I work for the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District, if I was a student at the University of Illinois or possibly even a member of the county board in Will County, I would have abortion care included in my insurance plan. But because of egregious Hyde language in Illinois statute, I am discriminated against as a state employee. Removing that provision is the public good. Removing a provision that's discriminatory against women who use Medicaid as their insurer so that they can access a full spectrum of reproductive health care, in my eyes, is the public good. Does that answer your question?"

Ives: "Somewhat. Let's go on to the fact that this Bill is actually embedded in the State Group Insurance Program, it's embedded in part of Medicaid. So, it is, in fact, not just an expansion of the Medicaid statute but also State Group Insurance. And that's whether or not you are a current employee or a retiree or even a retiree who hasn't met the 20-year mark where you're paying premium support for yourself. So, this is not just Medicaid public funding of abortion. It actually goes to all of our folks who are eligible for any level of support to State Group Health Insurance. Isn't that correct?"

Feigenholtz: "If they need it, I believe it is."

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

Ives: "Okay. So, when we talk about a public good and what we're
 doing, you've basically in this statute... in rewriting... in
 writing this Bill, you essentially simply deleted Sections
 from the State Group Health Insurance Act. Is that correct?"
Feigenholtz: "Yes."

Ives: "Okay. So, in one of the parts where you deleted language and you did this three times. You did this on page 7, page 33 and page 34. And the language that you specifically deleted is that the Illinois Department, by rule, shall prohibit any physician from providing medical assistance to anyone eligible; therefore, under this Code, where such a physician has been found guilty of performing an abortion procedure in a willful and wanton manner upon a woman who is not pregnant at the time such abortion procedure was performed. currently, the statute says that if you're a physician and you are convicted, found quilty of performing an abortion willfully and wantonly on someone who's not pregnant, then you cannot therefore participate ever again in the state reimbursement for this procedure. You specifically deleted that language in three different Sections of the statute, which now means that we can have folks provide abortions when they have been found guilty of doing such horrendous acts against women. Why would you delete that language?"

Feigenholtz: "Because it's in another part of statute."

Ives: "Well, you're deleting it."

Feigenholtz: "This is already an illegal procedure, Representative Ives."

Ives: "Well, I... as far as I can tell, we are now going to allow folks who have provided abortions on people... well, you can't...

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

on people that truly don't even... aren't even pregnant, and we're going to allow them now to service folks again. I just don't understand why you would delete such language?"

Feigenholtz: "I answered the question."

"I think the Bill is really poorly formed from that standpoint. But let's move on to another item. First of all, I'd like to correct a mis... a misstatement here where somebody had stated that there have been 10 thousand botched abortions. In fact, former abortionist Bernard Nathanson exposed the lie of the American pro-abortion movement. He himself was an abortionist or was involved in the abortion movement. And he actually claim... says that, we claimed that between 5 and 10 thousand women a year died of botched abortions, he said. The actual figure is closer to 200 or 300. So, the 10 thousand figure has been found to be false by someone who actually participated in that pro-abortion movement. But we need to correct some other falsehoods because there was also testimony given today that essentially says that you're going to have abortions that are botched if you per... fail to provide this in any meaningful way. One moment."

Feigenholtz: "Is that a question?"

Ives: "No, it's not a question. I'm finding my next note here, if you don't mind for a moment. Actually, I'd like to, though, point out that... the tragic case of Tonya Reaves. Tonya Reaves was an African-American woman, age 24, who had a botched abortion at a Planned Parenthood in 2012. And Mr. Hoy says, 'In my opinion Planned Parenthood is guilty of criminal negligence, depraved indifference and gross medical incompetence. Now that the case is settled we'll never know

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

how a jury would have reacted.' But in the end... this happened in Chicago, Planned Parenthood settled for \$2 million, \$2 million, botched abortion, taking her life and depriving her young son, then 18 months old of any... having any mother in his life. So, when you talk about botched abortions all you're going to end up is... is additional money going to Planned Parenthood which has a terrible record in this regard. Additionally, I find it interesting that while we're... while you're Bill wants to spend more money in this industry, much of it would end up in Planned Parenthood hands. You guys have done nothing to forward Bills and Resolutions that we have asked for that actually would look into Planned Parenthood, check on if they're actually medically compliant with other rules that you would find in a surgical center and actually inspect them. In fact, Planned Parenthoods in... in Illinois have... some of them haven't been inspected for 15 years. Looking at the broader level, we had a huge problem with Planned Parenthood and there were six alarming findings in a House Panel's Planned Parenthood probe that they did at the Congressional level. In one case, a National Planned Parenthood executive, interviewed by staff investigators for the House Panel said, it doesn't bother me that one vendor, StemExpress, said the ... said Planned Parenthood paid \$55 for an aborted baby's intact brain and then sold it to a customer for more than \$3 thousand. In fact, the findings that they had were first that several Planned Parenthood affiliates made a profit from the transfer of aborted baby parts and other fetal tissue in violation of Federal Law prohibiting that. Number two, it didn't bother that... like I just said ...

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

that they profited at 2800 percent from harvesting a baby's brain. Number three, Planned Parenthood abortion doctors would huddle with a tissue procurement technician to learn what aborted body parts that outside person was searching for that day. Number four, Planned Parenthood doctors appear to have altered their techniques to increase the chances of success in harvesting tissue from abortions that day. Number five, Planned Parenthood's consent form is inadequate compared to other entities consent forms. Number six, Planned Parenthood affiliate clinics routinely violated privacy regulations imposed by the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act in 1996, seeking to ease the process of harvesting body parts and other fetal tissues. So, while you're talking about the expansion of using now taxpayer money to go to entities like this that are completely and wholly unregulated and for which we have had a number of Bills presented... sent in and not been heard in committee, to allow better noticing to the patients on the risks with abortion, better patient protection on their information, better inspection procedures, an investigation on whether or not the harvesting of body parts happened in Illinois. All of those have been denied. And at the same time, you were pushing forth a Bill that required taxpayers to participate in something that they wholly disapprove of. And in case if you're wondering, there was a poll conducted just recently. In fact, from March 22 to 24, there was a poll conducted in the State of Illinois. So, there was a poll conducted March 22 through 24. Now in this poll, only 31 percent of those polled identified even as pro-life. And over half of them, 51 percent

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

of them in fact were women. And yet... and yet, 58 percent of those polled said that they opposed taxpayer funding of abortion, which is really the root of your Bill. So, even those who are pro-choice, who are women largely oppose taxpayer funding of abortion. So, to those who say, you know, we believe in a women's right to choose. We believe that they should have ... to make their own choices and all of that. That's fine. We're not... we're not saying that you don't have abortion with your Bill. We're just saying, we don't want to pay for it. The state's broke. We've heard testimony today that it would cost essentially \$60 million for this program which could be better... meet the needs of women who... who need help in other ways. And yet, you know, you're all... your emotional debate here is totally disregarding the taxpayers and what they want. Fifty eight percent of the people, even those who are pro-choice, are opposed to taxpayer funding of abortion. This is a bad Bill at a bad time. Illinois's broke. Thirteen point four billion dollars in back bills. Businesses fleeing, people fleeing. This gives them another reason to say goodbye to Illinois. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Ammons is recognized."

Ammons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield for a few questions?"

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

Ammons: "Thank you. Representative, first of all thank you for championing this Bill. But we've heard a lot on the floor. Can we just go back for a second, for those who may have just tuned in to this debate, what else does the proposed legislation actually protect?"

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

Feigenholtz: "The... the two elements to the Bill, Representative Ammons, is of course striking the trigger language that is in Illinois Statute. There have been former speakers who have claimed that they feel or they have read that some legal experts think it's unnecessary to strike the trigger language. But I personally feel and I'm sure many agree that after the new President clearly stated that he is anti-choice, that he wants Roe v. Wade to be overturned, and that abortion could possibly be illegal in some states that we people who support a woman's right to choose and want to keep abortion safe, legal, and accessible in the State of Illinois and affirm that, must strike the trigger language that's in Illinois Statute. The other portions of the Bill strike a discriminatory provision about funding for people... for women who have state health insurance whether that be a state employee or someone on Medicaid, it is a discriminatory practice for those of us who work for the State of Illinois. Fifteen states have struck this language and are moving forward and there are many, many states who are moving forward on cleaning up their statutes to protect the women in their state from the Trump administration and the Supreme Court."

Ammons: "And just a... just a couple of other very quick Bills... I mean, questions for you. Is it your intention to mandate that women who may get access have abortions? Is that the intent of this legislation?"

Feigenholtz: "Certainly not."

Ammons: "And is it your intention to make available services that are currently not available under this legislation to public employees and low-income women?"

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

Feigenholtz: "Yes."

"Thank you. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. This has been an Ammons: interesting debate. It's brought up questions that I had to ... because I am a junky of history I had to walk back through. A couple of things that I do want to highlight that the Bill does is it's an economic access in equality Bill. Why do I say that? And I want to read this for those who may not have read this portion of the income inequality gap or how we got here, especially for some of our colleagues who have decided that utilizing African-American stories is how you will defeat this Bill in an unprecedented way that we've never actually experienced in this House on other Bills. And so, I thought I would share this for you and for your history. As a remnant of history, a century and a half ago at the end of slavery through emancipation, white families averaged 113 thousand in wealth, but black families at the time just had under \$5,600 in income wealth. I can fast forward that for you to see if things have changed substantially for black folks and white folks. Fast forward that today the Pew Research put out, just last year, their income inequality graph. And on that graph it suggests that 141 thousand for white families' medium income versus just 11 thousand for the average black family. And only \$13,700 available to the medium income of Hispanics. This Bill provides financial access for many women of color and low-income women in the State of Illinois. Now, the ... the interesting thing about the income inequality is often because of a lapse of memory for our unfortunate colleagues on the other side, they don't understand exactly how this came to be that black people don't

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

have access to the same things that you have access to. So, I suggest that you read more carefully the Dred Scott Decision that was brought up in this Body. And the response from the justices really highlights why that is a real pivotal point in this discussion. And I appreciate him bringing it up. Because the Supreme Court did say that a black man has... it says, 'So far inferior that they had no rights that a white man was bound to respect, ' and that included black women. So, all future American politics and practice were inculcated with this timeless wisdom and has produced a level of Illinois and in the country that inequality in unprecedented. And so, when we attempt to pass Bills that would change and shift the inequality in income so that you don't have to pay for child care for those poor people and you don't have to pay for access to abortions for those poor women, we would rather you redistribute the wealth that you stole or your ancestors did. So, there is a question of equality that is in relationship directly to House Bill 40 that we have to continue if you're going to use black people as your example as to why we should be voting 'no'. So, let me just further expand your horizon when it comes to the history here of how we got here. There was something called the Homestead Act that took land from people that looked like me and gave it to people that looked like you on the other side and some of my colleagues here. There was a Southern Homestead Act that denied black ownership of land in the United States of America. So we have a huge wealth inequality that is a direct result from the lack of ownership of land in the United States. How about the FHA loans that were not given

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

to a single... single... single person who served in World War II. After they came home, not one black loan was given to a black veteran from the FHA. So, if you want to know why we are pushing for a Bill that will give just simple access to low-income women and women of color, I suggest you get rid of the problem of memory and read your history and it will tell you why we have to do what we are doing today. Let me just close, Mr. Speaker. Thank you for your indulgence on this matter. I'm going to close just by saying, this Bill would expand simple access, simple access. It does not mandate that anyone has to do anything, but it will correct some historical wrongs for people who don't currently have access. I also want to just jog your memory just a little bit about the issue of pro versus what we... I believe I am also pro-life. I am believe that. I believe I am pro-choice. I believe that because I believe the life of every individual whether they choose to provide it through birth or not is their choice. And to be pro-birth and against people pro-life or child care, housing, jobs inequality, access to education doesn't make much sense to me. So, even if you're going to vote 'no' and we know you will, it won't be based on the fact that you believe in life because every Bill we passed in the last several days tell me you don't. What you believe in is controlling the access to resources to poor people and women of color. And you are completely against that because child care is an example of it. And you continue to do the same thing on this floor every single week. I Representative Feigenholtz for taking the heat on this Bill that she has been taking for months from her constituents,

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

some for and some against. But it is the right thing to do in this moment in history. And I thank the Speaker for his indulgence."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sommer is recognized."

Sommer: "Mr. Speaker, I yield my time to Representative Morrison."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Morrison, you were previously acknowledged in debate. Would you please try to keep your remarks brief? Thank you."

Morrison: "I will. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Morrison."

Morrison: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Gentleman from Chicago, many people are watching this debate who are not from this Body. I.. I resent some of the comments that you made. If you look at my voting record, the Bills that I have cosponsored. It's true we disagree on some issues. We disagree on some issues on what would be best for all the people of the State of Illinois or by regions in the State of Illinois. I am proud that I have worked with Members on your side of the aisle on issues like access to education, on issues on making it easier for individuals who have been given a hard break early in life for one reason or another to get back on their feet. And those of you in the Body know that, if you know me, I'm going to continue to work on doing those things because I believe in them. And everything I said, every single one of my remarks was said with the utmost sincerity. Lastly, I just want to say, you know, one of the issues that I have tried to champion since I've gotten down here is trying to bring more children into the world. Trying to make it easier because it is expensive. Or there are those who have crisis pregnancy

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

center... crisis pregnancies and they want to bring those children into the world. I've sponsored a 'Choose Life' license plate. Why is that important? It exists now in something like 25-plus states around the country. It has raised tens of millions of dollars to helps support adoption efforts among every demographic to bring more children in the world, connect children to parents who want them. I haven't been given a chance to bring that Bill up for a vote. Other specialty license plates have been given a chance, but I've not been given that opportunity. I hope one day I will. Thank... I thank the Body for the additional time."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Stratton is recognized."

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

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

Stratton: "Thank you to Representative Feigenholtz for sponsoring this Bill. For my colleagues who have chosen to invoke references to slavery, Dred Scott, and Emmett Till, none of these examples are analogist to what we are considering today with House Bill 40. You know why? It's because all of these stated examples relate to what happens when people... people in power abuse that status and decide that they have the right to decide what they will do with someone else's body. What we have before us today is an opportunity to reject that notion and ensure that women, including low-income women, have equal access and the opportunity to decide what is best for her own body and for her own future. Now, to those who wish to question the faith of their colleagues if they support this Bill, as women God did not just give us a uterus. God also gave us brains and the ability to use our brains to make a

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

reasonable consideration of our circumstances, of our health, and our future to decide what is best for our bodies. The decision to terminate a pregnancy is not to be taken lightly. Women who have thoughtfully considered the totality of their circumstances and have decided that it is the best course of action should not be dec ... denied access to a safe and legal abortion simply because they were not born with a silver spoon in their mouth. Now, to the Bill. Women's rights are human rights. And historically, especially for women of color, there has been an effort to legislate our bodies and this reeks of the notion that women cannot be trusted with our own bodies. As a woman, as a woman of color, and as the mother of three daughters, all of whom deserve the right to autonomy and the ability to decide in consultation with their doctor what is best for their bodies, their health, and their future. I am a proud Sponsor of House Bill 40 and strongly urge that we stop telling people who are either living in poverty or women of color or others who may fall in this category that they cannot make the best decisions for their bodies. I strongly urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative McDermed is recognized."

McDermed: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. A constituent asked that this be read during the debate today and I want to make sure that her voice is heard here today. We haven't really heard a voice like this on the floor this afternoon.

'Young, afraid, and alone I walked into my worst nightmare when looking for a pregnancy test as well as seeking help and support from Planned Parenthood. They sold me an abortion with no other options given. My beautiful boys, Maximillian

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

Joseph and Marcus Levi, are among the 55 million children and counting of those who have died at the hands of abortion and the big money-making business of Planned Parenthood. I became bound to drug and alcohol addiction, anything to numb the pain and forget what I had done.' I want to add that this particular constituent has since gotten her life back on track. But I... I would draw our attention to the fact, as several others have here today, that this is a very difficult decision for a woman to make. And I'm going to suggest that it needs to be a difficult decision that takes some time and takes some money which brings me to the other point I'd like to make. We knew... we learned during the discussion of the fiscal notes that an abortion that is paid for on the open market costs about \$450 in the State of Illinois. That was the number that was given today; I had heard about \$400. So, we know that the number... if you're purchasing your own abortion and not receiving a subsidized abortion, which is available, that it costs between 400 and 450 dollars. And yet, we know because we have this state data that it costs the State of Illinois to deliver an abortion almost approaching... right around a thousand dollars. So, we'll say \$1 a thousand dollars for purposes of debate here today. So, I question whether we need to be involved in subsidizing this. We know when we subsidize something we get more of it. We know from the letter that I wrote that having more abortions is not necessarily desirable. We want... it's a very difficult decision; it needs to be thoughtfully taken. Because it's free it can't... it doesn't necessarily need to be an easier decision. It needs to be thoughtful decision by each woman

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

taking it. Do we want to make those decisions and pay \$60 million for it? The cost of subsidizing abortions, as opposed to letting the free market take care of those abortions, which are occurring, no... no woman in the State of Illinois is denied an abortion who seeks it. The cost of subsidizing those abortions with tax... taxpayer dollars is \$60 million. I don't think we really mean that. I don't think we want to do that. I don't think we want to take \$60 million out of the funds that we have available for us today for things like Medicaid and education and paying our pensions, for heavens sakes and double the cost of available abortions in the State of Illinois. I'm going to suggest that from a financial standpoint this is a very bad decision. And there are no abortions being denied in the state, as other speakers have referred. There's... that's... that's false news. Therefore, it's bad business. It's unnecessary from a constitutional standpoint. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Lang is recognized."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. So, I think in many ways this debate has gone farther than it needs to in terms of the discussion of abortion, no abortion, pro-life, pro-choice. This Bill came about because the United States Supreme Court is likely to make some changes in their views regarding what was known as Roe v. Wade. And so, the first part of the Bill, crafted by Representative Feigenholtz who has done a brilliant job on this Bill, is designed to say, well, wait a minute. We should decide in Illinois what we're going to do here. We shouldn't let a ninth Supreme Court justice just simply make that decision for us. And make no

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

mistake about it, during the campaign then candidate now President Trump was very clear that he was going to appoint a ninth Supreme Court justice who was predetermined to overrule Roe v. Wade. We weren't in the meetings with Justice Gorsuch, but we can imagine what the conversation was all about. And so, the first part of this Bill is just to say that this is a decision we ought to make in the State of Illinois. That we should not allow one person on the United States Supreme Court to determine that for us. That person does not represent our state, that person was not elected to our state. We should determine these issues here in this Body. The second part of the Bill deals with state payment for abortions for those on Medicaid. And I understand the point of view of those who say we shouldn't be using state money on this; however, we have a responsibility to all 13 million people in the State of Illinois to make sure they have access to health care. Access to health care doesn't mean only if you have insurance. Access to health care doesn't mean only if you can write your own check to pay for your health care. But access to health care means access to health care for all. And to say, well, if you have insurance or you have the ability to write a check you can have health care, but if you're poor, you don't have the acc ... the right to have access health care seems to me is inappropriate, discriminatory, is not a good direction morally or ethically for the State of Illinois to take. That's really all the Bill does. Much of this other conversation is beside the point, but I think we need... need to make it clear that a person can support choice, but not support abortion. I'm not a fan of

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

abortion; I don't think people ought to do it. But I support the right to choose. And that choice should not be made by the government of the State of Illinois. That choice should be made by an individual woman with her own conscience, her own reasonings, and her own doctor. This is not a choice that ought to be made by government. I also find it interesting that some on the other side of the aisle have spoken about a fetus even before doctors would say it was viable as a person. You can say that it as you wish, but then, why don't we celebrate three... the first birthday of a child three months after the child is born? Why don't we count the child in the census when it's still in the womb? You know the answer to that question. And I find it interesting that for all of those who were so concerned about the unviable fetus, as soon as it becomes born some of you who are yelling so loudly about those... the rights of the fetus today are unwilling to help provide meals or housing or shelter or health care or child care or good K-12 education or MAP grants when they become of college age. So, you're perfectly willing to have this debate about the viability of a fetus when and if, but you're not so willing to have a debate about the viability of people after they're born and what happens here in the State of Illinois and how we treat them. And what our budgets look like. And what our health care looks like. And what our systems are in place... whether our systems are in place to take care... take care of people after they're born. Many of you that have spoken out on this voted against the lifeline budget which would have helped many people after they are born. Many of you who have spoken today against this Bill have voted time

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

and time and time again over the last two years, since we haven't had a real budget, against any measure put up on the board that would help anybody after they're born. And so, the discussion of the viability of a fetus begs the question of, how come you're not so interested in the viability of a human being after it's born? How come you're not so interested in whether that person can eat? Whether that person has shelter? Whether that person has clothing? Whether that person can go to college? Whether that person has a good education? Whether that person has parents who love them? Some of you vote against foster care for these children. Some of you vote against health care for these children. Some of you vote against funds for autistic children. Some of you vote against mental health funds. Some of you vote against rehab for drug addicts. But you're so worried about the pre-viable fetus and not so worried about the living human being after it's born. It's time that you took a look at your consciences, not about whether you believe in abortion or not believe in abortion that's a personal issue of conscience for all of us, but if you're so worried about the unviable fetus and not so worried about that person when it's a child then I think you're missing something. And to continue to vote over and over and over again against state budgets and viability of how we take care of people in the State of Illinois and not put the two of those together, I think is actually pretty appalling. And so, we have a responsibility to protect all citizens of the State of Illinois not just the insured, not just the rich, but all people in the State of Illinois. Women, in case you didn't know it Ladies and Gentlemen, are people too. And I

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

also find it interesting that some of you who today are planning to vote against this Bill are some of the very same people almost all of you are prepared to vote against the Equal Rights Amendment when it hits the floor. And so I say this to you, you're not anti-abortion, you're just simply anti-woman. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reis is recognized."

Reis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Many of you... there's not a lot left in the chamber that remember when my younger days when I used to stand up and ... and passionately talk about this just as the other side has talked about it, but you know, that's my district. I have probably the most pro-life district in the state, hands down. And you know, I... I just want to point out some... some contradictions today, some hypocrisy. You know, the previous speaker said we don't want a ninth Supreme Court justice to let us decide what we do here in Illinois. Sure fine when same sex marriages were approved a couple of years ago by a ninth Supreme Court justice and many times that's happened. But it still should be up to the individual states to decide what they're going to do here. And that's what you're trying to do here. By the way, this was... the Bill was introduced before Trump even won. Secondly, all afternoon we've heard people... Representatives stand up and passionately talk about what's proper respect for women, women's right to choose. I support the right to choose. Women are people, too. The question that no one has ever been... able to answer me over the years, what about the 20 thousand girls that are aborted each year just in Illinois? What about the 750 or 650 million... or a thousand girls that are aborted each

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

year in the country? What if their... what about their rights? They're people too. But they're never given the basic right to life. The right to choose. The right to do with what their bodies they want to. That's the real issue here. And the third thing is, it was mentioned that this is such an egregious Hyde rule that we're trying to get rid of. What's really not egregious about asking pro-life people to fund taxpayer abortions? That is egregious. We... we... the Hyde Amendment has protected that not only for the funding issue but for the religious freedoms. But we want to throw it out because it's egregious. We feel it's egregious on the other side. So, there's a lot of topics today and a lot of things have been brought into this debate, but when it comes right down to it, we really don't care about the 20 thousand girls that are aborted each year. Life snuffed out with the help of taxpayer funded money. I encourage a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Cassidy is recognized."

Cassidy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We've covered a lot of ground here today. I want to lead off by saying I am not pro-abortion, I am pro-choice. I am pro-woman. I trust women and their doctors to make their decisions together. To this ongoing question of whether we want our tax... tax dollars to go for something somebody disagrees with, frankly, I am anti-war. My tax dollars fund war. I'm fighting against over incarceration. My tax dollars fund a prison system full of my black and brown neighbors that our policies have put in those buildings. Heck, my tax dollars fund Viagra prescriptions. Yeah, they're okay with that. That's right. That's not how this works. This is health care. This is access to the full

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

range of health care of our state employees and for poor women. It's really that simple. People talk about people of faith. My faith calls on me to support the poor and to support equality for all. And more importantly, my faith calls on me not to question the faith of others. To the question of ... of partisan politics and which Party is more supportive of diversity of thought, there are a lot of Members in our caucus who disagree with me on this issue. I respect them, I work closely with them, and I understand that they come from a different place when they think about this issue. The ... the Majority Leader cited our Governor... he tried to be a pro-choice Republican. He learned a very... clearly has learned a lesson in... in intolerance of diversity of thought. This caucus reflects the reality that people have different viewpoints that one does not. Fundamentally, this personal. I was a county employee when we were trying to build our family. I am infertile. And after years of trying, we joyfully found ourselves pregnant. And that joy turned to sorrow and terror fairly quickly when we learned that the embryo that had been implanted in my uterus had no heartbeat. But inexplicably, I remained pregnant. My hormone numbers kept going up, we kept looking, we tried to figure out what was going on. We couldn't understand what was happening. And each day that ticked by was more heartbreak and more fear. And finally, the doctor said I can't put a finger on exactly what's happening here, but the best choice right now is to stop doing all these diagnostics, stop putting you through more heartbreak and have an abortion. And because I had county insurance, I was a county employee, I wasn't a state employee,

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

I didn't have to stop and think about whether or not I could do that. And I was able to utilize the method that allowed me to become pregnant within six weeks with my beloved eldest son and go on and have the other two boys and you all have met all of them. They're regular fixtures here. And without access to safe, legal abortion that preserved my fertility, preserved my life, they wouldn't be here. You all wouldn't know those three young men that so many of you compliment me on. A 'no' vote on this Bill is not anti-abortion. Let's be clear. When you push that red button, it's a vote against poor women. Period. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Feigenholtz to close."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And thanks everyone for Feigenholtz: their comments and thought-provoking testimony on this very historic Bill. The intent of House Bill 40 is to protect women from a President who has been very, very clear on his desire to overturn Roe v. Wade and make abortion illegal in some states. Health care advocates who respect a woman's right to choose in Illinois want to affirmatively say that in the State of Illinois no matter what the Federal Government does that women should have access to safe, legal, and accessible abortion, no matter what their insurance is. I'd like to talk a little bit about something one of the physicians who testified in committee about... in the Human Services Committee some of us were there. He was a physician who was a resident at Cook County Hospital before 1973, before abortions became legal. He told the story about a woman who came into the 17bed septic abortion unit at Cook County Hospital. He talked about how she died in his arms after bleeding out and left

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

seven children orphaned. I and many of my colleagues never want to see a septic abortion unit at Cook County Hospital ever again. This is a Bill about fairness. This is a Bill about equality. It says that a state employee or a woman who depends on Medicaid is entitled to the same rights as any other woman under any other insurance plan. Stop shaming women. This is a Bill that undoes an injustice. This rights the ship. Let's pass this Bill."

- Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 40 pass?'
 All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting
 is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
 Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record.
 On a count of 62 voting 'yes', 55 voting 'no', 0 voting
 'present', House Bill 40, having received the Constitutional
 Majority, is declared passed. House Bill 3215, Representative
 Wallace. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3215, a Bill for an Act concerning education, which may be referred to as the Learn With Dignity Act. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Wallace."
- Wallace: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a Bill that simply states that in our education facilities, public, private or charter, we will provide in the restroom feminine hygiene products for girls in school. I encourage..."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. Representative Lang in the Chair. Pardon me, Mr. Clerk. Those in... Now, Representative McDermed's light is on. Are you speaking on this Bill?"

McDermed: "Yes, please."

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

Speaker Lang: "Please do. Your light wasn't on when I started, I apologize."

McDermed: "I know. I... you're quick, but I was quicker. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to speak to the Bill. I've been approached several times about this Bill. And I do think this is a great Bill. I'm a woman. You know, there's nothing worse than being caught without your needed feminine hygiene products when the moment strikes. But what I told the constituents that called me and the folks that visited me in my office and what I'd like to say here today is we don't have a foundation. We don't have a floor. We don't have walls. We don't have a roof. And we're discussing the contents of the medicine cabinet. Let's deal with essentials before we deal with something that's nice to have. Let's deal with the budget; let's deal with pension reform. Let's deal with some of the big issues that we were elected to handle and then let's talk about these things which are good things. It's not a bad thing. But it's not an important thing when we don't have a budget, when we don't have pension reform. When we have how many billion are we up to in unpaid bills today? Let's handle the big things first. Let's have a floor. Let's have a foundation. Let's have a roof. Let's have walls then we'll talk."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves, Members. Feigenholtz, Gordon-Booth, Thapedi. Please take the record. On this question, there are 64 voting 'yes', 51 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3084, Mr. Breen. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3084, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Mr. Breen."

Breen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is some cleanup language on the... to... to bring into accord our aggravated driving under the DUI in the same place with the reckless homicide statute. So, this is where folks... someone has been killed in an automobile collision and... and with... with the, you know, finding that there was fault by the driver. And so, what we're trying to do is clean that up so that it all gets in the same place that the Secretary of State will treat it the same way, whether it is an aggravated driving under the influence of alcohol or a reckless homicide. It should have been fixed a while ago. We've now got it here. An initiative of the DuPage County State's Attorney. All the relevant parties are either agreed or neutral. I want to thank the bipartisan support, Representatives D'Amico, Moylan, Bellock and Reick for supporting this measure. Glad for any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor vote of the Gentleman's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Ammons, Mitchell, Sims, Wallace. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2738, Representative Ammons. Out of the

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

record. House Bill 3922, Representative Kelly Burke. Out of the record. House Bill 2665, Mr. Davis. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2665, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davis."

Davis, W.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 2665 will require that the State Guardian... State Guardian Office develop and implement a training program for guardians appointed for adults with disabilities under the Probate Act of 1975. House Bill 2665 also outlines the requirements for the Governor's designation of the Office of State Guardian as interim public guardian of a county in which a vacancy for that position has occurred. Be more than happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andersson."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Andersson: "Thank you. Representative Davis, we had a good discussion about this in Jud Civ. A couple of questions. One, we had discussed the concept that the City of Chi... or that Cook County is exempt from this requirement. Is that correct?"

Davis, W.: "That is still correct."

Andersson: "Okay. And what's your logic for exempting the City of Chicago?"

Davis, W.: "Well, in part, the logic is that as we stated in committee the resources available to private guardians in Cook County are enormous, both from the public and private sources. And we feel that Cook County has the most extensive and complex Probate Department in the state. So, we start

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

there that the needs... so the idea is that they have sufficient resources. They have sufficient things that they need to be able to offer support for those who want to become guardians. And so, the objective here is to start where the need is most great. And that's in other counties of the state."

- Andersson: "So, it's sort of a means test, if you will, to determine if they have sufficient ability to administer this.

 Is that correct?"
- Davis, W.: "Well, I don't think it's a means test. A means test would imply that's something that has to be done. I think it's already recognized that Cook County has sufficient resources for this process."
- Andersson: "Per... perhaps it's an inverse means, in other words.

 That... that they have it so they're not required to do it, but others apparently do not. Is that correct?"
- Davis, W.: "Well, I think that was made clear in our debate during committee that other counties do not have the resources that Cook County. And then, as I just indicated, there are several counties where the Governor has yet to appoint a public guardian. So, those positions are unfilled and this is an opportunity for an existing agency... the Guardianship and Advocacy Commission to be able to step in and provide that support for those counties that don't have public guardians at this point."
- Andersson: "And... and I think we also discussed in committee that, and I would respectfully disagree, that other counties don't have the means to handle this. Counties like Kane County, DuPage County, Lake County, McHenry County do have the ability, do have separate probate courts. Do have calls that

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

run the… exactly this and do have public guardians, by the way. So, I'm curious why we've said Chicago is good to go, but not, for example, and I'm just using those as examples why those are… aren't exempt from this Bill as well?"

Davis, W.: "Well, again, the Advocacy and Guardianship... the Advocacy and Guardianship Commission that presented this Bill... I don't think would necessarily disagree that there are not some resources in the counties that you mentioned. And again, we're not talking about Chicago, we said Cook County."

Andersson: "Cook, correct."

Davis, W.: "Of which I live in southern Cook. So, again, we just feel that... that things are at a point there where at least at this point this type of effort would not be necessary. I mean, you indicated of your work in other counties, so maybe you have a knowledge that they don't. But based on their examination of other counties in the state this is the Bill that they presented."

Andersson: "And then, again, to the… to the actual substance of it. So, what we're… we would be doing in the counties it does apply to is we'd be mandating this guardianship training for all guardians of all shapes and sizes. Right? Guardians of disabled adults, plenary, temporary, et cetera. Correct?"

Davis, W.: "I'm... I'm... can you repeat your question? I... I'm missing..."

Andersson: "Sure. Just... who... who's mandated to take the training?

Let me ask it that way."

Davis, W.: "Who's mandated?"

Andersson: "Who's mandated..."

Davis, W.: "Those that... those..."

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

- Andersson: "...who's required? Maybe I shouldn't use the word mandate. But who's required to take the training?"
- Davis, W.: "I guess you could say ultimately this belongs to the courts to make... to make that decision. But anyone moving forward who seeks to become a guardian could be subject to this training."
- Andersson: "Okay. So, it's prospective only in nature? In other words, existing guardians do not have take the training?"

Davis, W.: "Correct."

- Andersson: "Okay. And you mentioned that the courts have some discretion. Can you explain how that discretion is utilized?"
- Davis, W.: "Well, I think the discretion is utilized as... as I can say every... every situation may be different in some respects. So, when someone presents, again, and it's kind of ... I won't say it's contradictory to the idea of making everyone do it, but it's simply saying that the courts can make the decision as to whether or not someone should or should not take the training. Maybe an example could be that, you know, I could have a disabled child that I'm not the guardian of but that I have been intimately involved in taking care of for a number of years. So, at the point in which I decide to become that person's guardian, I could make the case that since I have been intimately involved with that individual for x number of years, the court could say yes you do have a significant knowledge base, therefore you may be exempt from the training. So, I think there's... that's an individual circumstance of where the courts can make that decision."
- Andersson: "And I... I thank you for that. I guess my point was that... I didn't make my point very well. Is... is the court's

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

discretion unfettered? In other words, can the court just, you know, make that evaluation you just described? Or are there standards by which the court may or may not grant the waiver?"

Davis, W.: "Repeat your question, I want to be certain."

Andersson: "Is the… does the court have unfettered discretion to make the decision to waive this requirement? Or are there standards that must be met in order to waive this requirement by the court?"

Davis, W.: "It's our feeling that because the courts do these cases often that it is indeed ultimately their discretion.

And we think that they will make a competent decision in that case."

Andersson: "All right. Thank you. Just briefly to the Bill. And thank you, by the way, for the answers to the questions. To the Bill. One of the things we have discussed in committee, I don't think this is a bad Bill. I do question why the City of Chicago is exempt or why we didn't more carefully validate which counties need to be exempt. But if there is the... the level of discretion that is just been described by the courts, what I would suggest is a better version of this Bill which is less of a mandate. Is that we add it as one of the tools in the courts toolbox that it can assign. So, instead of it being automatic and mandated, the court simply has the ability to assign or require this as needed. In fact, I would suspect, that a court could go that right now. So, with respect, I appreciate what you're trying to do, but thank you for the answers to the questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Meier."

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

Meier: "Will the Chair yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Meier: "Would you consider a nationally certified guardian as somebody able to speak for people with disabilities?"

Davis, W.: "A nationally certified guardian?"

Meier: "Yes."

Davis, W.: "Certified by whom?"

Meier: "Whichever groups you need to go to school and training so that you can be a guardian of somebody who has disabilities."

Davis, W.: "But if I'm not mistaken, in order to become a guardian that is a designation by the courts, correct? So, are you suggesting that an organization can make that decision and not the courts?"

Meier: "No. I'm suggesting that we have people out there that have been certified, gone through the training and that the Illinois State Guardianship does not recognize these people as being qualified guardians. These people may have a brother in a CILA and a... and a member in an institution, but they do not recognize this. You're saying they need training. Do you tell me that a brother or a sister of a person with disabilities is not better to make those decisions for that person than a state-appointed guardian?"

Davis, W.: "Well, as I'm reading the analysis of the Bill, one exception are certified guardians. I believe may be the people that you're referring to."

Meier: "Maybe you should tell that to our Illinois State Guardianship because we have people who are that that they are not recognizing. This... this is a terrible Bill. We have state guardians in this state that over the last few years

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

have never went in to even look at the CILA where they're going to have residents, their wards that they're taking care of. They don't know that when that resident's being moved that their wheelchair won't fit down that hallway. Their paid to just fill out that report that they've taken care of them every month. They don't check on them. You're putting a lot of power in non-family member's names. These people care for their child. They want nothing but the best for their brother or their sister. We've had some terrible state quardians. And when you're taking that right away only because they've had the misfortune of having a developmentally handicapped child... maybe every parent in the State of Illinois should have to go through training to raise a child, not just our disabled parents. You're zeroing in on a group of people who are trying to do the best that they can and will do the best that they can. And to have the right for the state to come in and take that quardianship away and maybe one person being in charge of 35."

Davis, W.: "This Bill doesn't do that, Representative. We don't take guardianship away from anyone. So, again, the point that you mention about certified guardians maybe that's the way it is now. But clearly, the Bill states that those individuals would be exempt. So, the reality I think you're actually making the case for what I'm trying to do. Because the Bill is designed to make sure that people have the tools to make the right decisions. So, we're not suggesting that anyone's guardianship is going to be... I want to clear about that. Because that's a misconception of this Bill. We are not taking guardianship away from anyone. If you don't get anything else,

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

please get that point. We're not taking guardianship away. We want to make sure that individuals have the tools necessary to make the decisions. So, when they become that person's guardian that they know exactly what to look for. So that when the visit the CILAs and they see the conditions of it, that they'll have information about how to address those situations. That's what training is for. A lot of people think that we're trying to take something away from individuals. And we're not. I want... again, I want to be real clear about that. We're not. That's a misconception that a lot of parent associations who are doing this and think they do it better than everybody else, and maybe they do do it well, but this is prospective. So, it's moving forward. So, all of those parents that are already the guardians this does not apply to them. Only those people moving forward."

Meier: "This Bill seems to go very much with what is happening with a lot of people right now. Their family members are being told for them to receive these services for their loved one, they have to give the State of Illinois the guardianship. They have to give the State of Illinois..."

Davis, W.: "Told by whom?"

Meier: "...the guardianship."

Davis, W.: "Told by whom, Representative?"

Meier: "They are told that by people working in the DHS Department."

Davis, W.: "Well, I'm not... this has nothing to do with DHS. Again, this is the State Guardianship and Advocacy Commission, not DHS. Now, again, if they're getting bad information from DHS and they're your constituents then that's your job to go to

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

DHS and say, why are you telling my constituents bad information. That's what we do as Representatives. We represent our constituents. So, again, just focus on where I am with this. The State Guardianship and Advocacy Commission, this is an initiative of them to make sure that those who want to be guardians have adequate tools, know... and adequate information to become guardians of the individuals that they want to. So, I... I... as I've heard, people feel a certain way about this. So, I'm hoping that our dialogue is clearing up the misconceptions. Now, if you're talking about something that happened at DHS, unfortunately, I can't speak to that because this is not a DHS Bill."

Meier: "This is coming through our state guardianships as it works its way through. You're starting on a slippery slope that's not there yet, but you're starting on a very slippery slope. All advocacy groups out there who say they represent everybody does not always represent everybody. Remember, we have people out there who don't want their brothers, their sisters or their child to be wards of the state. They may be were only 16 or 18 when their older brother or sister was given wards of the state. They're not allowed even with training to go back and become the guardian of their brother because of the state guardianship and the way it's set up with the court system. This is a slippery slope that you're starting that will take... will take some people away from their loved ones."

Davis, W.: "Representative, I... I wholeheartedly disagree with what you're saying. Again, if you're reflecting on situations that have happened in the past then I can only ask that as a rep... as their Representative you work to try to correct those

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

situations, which is the same thing that I would do if I was brought those situations as... as you indicated. But again, we're not trying to take anything away from anybody with this Bill. This is just suggesting... we want to make sure you have all the necessary tools and information. So, again, maybe you are talking about some situations that happened. And if you're talking about the State Guardianship Office, I'm a Commissioner on the Guardianship and Advocacy Commission. We should sit down and talk about it. We should."

Meier: "We should... we should sit down and talk because..."

Davis, W.: "But... but just make..."

Meier: "...we have two different..."

Davis, W.: "...but you're..."

Meier: "...sides that care for a lot of people and we have our heart in the right place, both of us do."

Davis, W.: "I'm not saying that we don't have different sides."

Meier: "Right."

Davis, W.: "...but some of the things that you stated are incorrect in terms of what this Bill is attempting to do. That's all I'm saying."

Meier: "I'm... I'm afraid we've watched too much in the last few years to... to put the word trust in here and to believe anything that's trying to force. We should offer training for all. But when we start trying to mandate it, we have a problem. And that's... that's my beliefs only because it has shown up. And I can take you to family members that are not allowed to be guardians of their loved ones and they're very decent, wonderful people. I urge a 'no' vote."

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

Speaker Lang: "Ladies and Gentlemen, this Bill is on Short Debate.

We're switching to the two-minute timer at this time.

Representative Bryant is recognized for two minutes."

Bryant: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Sponsor yield for a question?" Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

"Representative, I noticed in our analysis of this Bill that there are some opponents. Two of them in particular, Misericordia and the Murray Parents Association. Now, both the previous Representative and I have been closely association with the Murray Parents Association and in all that they've tried to do to make sure that we have the ability to keep facilities open for the developmentally disabled. So, in their fight to... to do this, they've become real advocates and experts on what goes on with the developmentally disabled. So, my question to you is, why are they in opposition and... and have you spoken to them? And then, since we're on Short Debate, I would also ask, I noticed that your... your Amendment which becomes the Bill provides that the training program shall only be limited to counties of less than 3 million. So, why only for the counties of less than 3 million and have you spoken to the Murray Parents and to the other... other organizations that are in opposition to this Bill?"

Davis, W.: "Well, I think we at least attempted to answer the Cook County question from Representative Andersson's question about that. So, we've tried to answer that question. And I get many don't agree and some will be 'no' simply because Cook County is exempted. So, we've answered that question. But relative to the other association..."

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

- Bryant: "Hold on... could... could I ask for order? This is a very, very important and significant Bill that affects a lot of people's lives. And although I applaud you for what I think... your heart is in the right place, but I think everyone should be listening to the direction that this going. So, thank you. Go ahead."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen for two minutes. Oh, excuse me Representative, did I cut you off?"
- Bryant: "I just wanted to hear the remainder of his answer."
- Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Mr. Davis, if you haven't answered."
- Davis, W.: "I probably have answered part of the question. She asked about the... well, I've gotten letters from the Murray Parents Association. I've not sat down and talked to them. They've not tried to schedule an appointment with me to sit down, but they have sent me letters. But it seems like the tender of their letters is making it sound like for those that are already quardians that if they don't do this training I'm trying to take their guardianship away. And I think we made that very clear that we're not taking anything away. In the situation like I described earlier where someone probably has been taken care of their child for a number of years and at the point in which they decide to become their guardian, otherwise they will be subject to this unless the judge who has the discretion does... to recognize the years of service that that mother or father or sister or brother has provided to that individual can say, you are no longer exempt from this. So... so, again, that's ... that's what I'm getting from the folks that I think you're referring to. Is that, (a) we're

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

trying to take something away, which we're not trying to do. And there are provisions that allow for the discretion of the judge to look at situations like I think the ones that you just described and then to determine that they do not have to do the training."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen for two minutes."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I was in committee for this and I just want folks to recognize what this is about. So, if you have your loved one, your mother, your father, your spouse becomes disabled today the court appoints you a guardian, it puts you in charge of their affairs. The court takes care of that situation. This Bill would inject the General Assembly into that sanctum... it's just that holy and sacred family relationship. And in committee, it was said outright, testified, that judges in counties other than Cook County didn't know how to handle probate cases. So, if you live in Sangamon County, your judges aren't competent. If you live in Lake County, your judges aren't competent. You're Kendall County, your judges aren't competent. DuPage County, judges aren't competent. There's no exemption in this Bill for family situations. As they've said, Cook County gets a great big exemption because Cook County knows how to do the work and everyone else in the state should follow along. You know, I noticed most of us are here today and we haven't had a good shot at getting the century club recently. I know we almost got it the other day on a... you know, Bill that required you to turn on your headlights on the... on a highway. But this is one that I think folks, no matter your partisan affiliation, you can come together... we can come together to

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

oppose this... impose this... oppose this imposition on our family relationships, on our judiciary and on our system of guardianship in the state. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Nekritz for two minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Nekritz: "Representative, am I correct in understanding that this has two components? A training component and then an appointment... an appointment for a vacancy for the guardianships in counties where there are vacancies?"

Davis, W.: "Correct."

Nekritz: "So, it seems to me that if you're going to become a guardian, in this day and age there's a whole Section of law on guardianship. Am I understanding that correctly?"

Davis, W.: "I'm sorry?"

Nekritz: "There's a whole Section of law in our Illinois Statutes on guardian... to govern guardianship?"

Davis, W.: "Yes."

Nekritz: "There's probably a whole Section of law that covers like financial obligations for a fiduciary?"

Davis, W.: "Correct."

Nekritz: "And would there be a whole special... Section of law on special needs and... and what they're rights and respons... rights may be?"

Davis, W.: "Yes."

Nekritz: "So, that's a lot of law for someone who just comes into this role as a guardianship that will need to become an expert in and understand in order to become the best guardian that they can for their loved one?"

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

Davis, W.: "That is true."

Nekritz: "So, it seems to me that this is a fairly straightforward Bill requiring some training in some very arcane and probably very... not probably, very technical areas of law that a guardian who is a loved one probably... not likely a lawyer might want to become an expert in and that a training program might be a really good thing. And Cook County is exempted because they're offering this. And as I read the analysis, the Bill allows other counties to also opt out if they develop their own training program. So, I don't really understand the debate on this at all. I think that this is a really good step forward for the State of Illinois to make sure that our vulnerable citizens are protected and that the guardians are doing the best job that they know how. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Davis, W.: "Thank you very..."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davis to close."

Davis, W.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The... prior to Representative Nekritz, the previous speaker made a statement that characterized judges as incompetent. Well, what he failed to tell you was that the characterization was not made by me. It wasn't made by advocates of the Bill, but people who are opposed to the Bill. So, maybe they feel judges are incompetent. But we trust that judges can make the right decision relative to guardianship. And I think the very previous speaker laid it out best. There are a ton of laws, a ton of statutes that speak to this. And we're simply trying to make sure that folks are aware of what those rights and responsibilities are. Again, this does not take anything away from individuals who are already guardians. It's prospective

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

in nature. And then let me also add that this is supported by the Disability and Mental Health Committee of the Illinois State Bar Association as well as Equip for Equality. So, organizations that we trust and recognize are in support of... of this legislation. So, I ask... with that being said, I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 65 voting 'yes', 49 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Chair recognizes Representative Williams."

Williams: "Thank you. Point of personal privilege, please."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Williams: "Just wanted to give a warm welcome to St. Andrews seventh-grade class who is here in the gallery visiting us today. Welcome, St. Andrews and go Bulldogs."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you for joining us today. Enjoy your day in Springfield. Representative Hammond is recognized."

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

Speaker Lang: "Proceed, please."

Hammond: "If you would, above me in the gallery... if you would give a warm welcome to the members of the Illinois Home Care and Hospice Council. And in particular, to my constituents, Susan and Brian Platt, of the Spoon River Home Health Services. Please recognize all that they do for the disabled and our seniors and sick. Thank you."

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

Speaker Lang: "Thank you being here and for joining us today.

House Bill 2377, Mr. Davidsmeyer. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2377, a Bill for an Act concerning

State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davidsmeyer."

Davidsmeyer: "So, as many of you know, I've talked to many of you and we'll actually have visitors tomorrow from the Illinois School for the Deaf and the Illinois School for the Visually Impaired. This Bill actually provides an opportunity for them to operate a little bit more like a school where they can hire accredited staff that are accredited and credentialed by the Illinois Department of ... or Illinois School Board. What ... the problem that they're having is we have one school for the deaf and one school for the visually impaired in the State of Illinois. And so, they are competing nationally. So, when they go to hire new teachers, they are competing nationally. And when it takes six months, these teachers are going to other states. So, what we are proposing here is to extend the sunset. This is a Bill that we actually passed last year, I... or two years ago, I believe. We are going to extend the sunset to two and a half years from now, August of 2019 and... and allow the schools to continue to hire this staff. We are also adding... adding in..."

Speaker Lang: "Please complete your remarks."

Davidsmeyer: "Yep. We are also adding in rehabilitation and mobility instructors for the Illinois School for the Visually Impaired because that is a competitive position as well. This has been agreed to by the IFT and AFSCME and everybody. And

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

that's where the sunset and all this comes from. So, I request a 'yes' vote."

'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Williams. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1685, Mr. Hoffman. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1685, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill, as amended, would allow the State's Attorneys to use civil penalties as damaged funds not awarded to a private party as a result of prosecution under the Insurance Claims Fraud Prevention Act for general applicability. Current law states that in an action to prosecute insurance fraud a portion of civil penalties or settlements shall be set aside to be used to investigate, prosecute insurance fraud. This would open it up so the local state's attorney could use it for other items. I know of... I know of no opposition."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves, Members. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'yes', 1 voting

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

- 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2580, Mr. Phelps. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2580, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Phelps."

- Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2580 is an initiative of the Farm Bureau and Mid-West Truckers. Allows the Governor the ability to declare an Emergency Harvest Declaration to allow our farmers and employees to more or less get their... haul their agriculture commodities more efficiently. It reduces costs. I just... no opposition. Just ask for an 'aye' vote."
- 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Chapa LaVia, Feigenholtz, Rita. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3342, Mr. Sims. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3342, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sims."

Sims: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3342 is a Bill that we've worked pretty... very hard on. And it does a lot of the criminal justice reform issues that we've been talking about to make sure that we're continuing to invest in communities and give individuals a

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

second chance. Requires the Division of Professional Regulation of the Department of Financial and Profession Regulation to consider certain mitigating factors when the applicant has prior convictions. We've worked... again, we've worked very hard to make sure that we are giving individuals a second chance. And I know of no opposition to the Bill. And ask for its favorable passage."

- 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Members, record yourselves. Zalewski, Welter, Jeisel. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 61 voting 'yes', 52 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3904, Representative Stratton. Please read the Bill. Representative, you have an Amendment on this Bill. So, Mr. Clerk, please place this on the Order of Second Reading and read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3904, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Stratton, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Stratton on the Amendment."
- Stratton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Amendment. It simply makes sure that all of the language is consistent with the remainder of the statute."

38th Legislative Day

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 649, Mr. Turner. Out of the record. House Bill 2527, Mr. Sosnowski. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2527, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sosnowski."
- Sosnowski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill basically allows not-for-profit entities to offer a local high school diploma. It's an alternative to a GED coursework. This is something we worked with the State Board of Education on, ICCB, et cetera. It's an initiative of a local Goodwill chapter in which they really are seeking to, especially in Rockford initially, but it's open across the state, again, to allow individuals to obtain that high school diploma. In addition, they're going to also offer skilled-trades certificate programming. It's a great opportunity. It just allows some flexibility for adult learners. I'm available for any questions. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Drury, Morrison. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. There are 114 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

passed. House Bill 270, Representative Wallace. Out of the record. House Bill 768, Mr. Welch. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 768, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Welch."

Welch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 768 is identical to a Bill I ran in the 99th General Assembly, House Bill 397, and it stalled in the Senate for some reason. House Bill 768 removes provisions allowing the State Charter School Commission to reverse a school board's decision to deny, revoke, or not renew a charter. House Bill 768 is not an anti-charter Bill. It is a pro-local control Bill. This Bill specifically empowers the local school board to make the decision with regard to whether or not the district wants a charter school or not. In the suburbs, those school boards are elected. These are issues that I am certain will be the topic of many elections to come. However, those should be decisions made by the local school boards. This Bill does not eliminate the Charter Commission as some people are saying. That is a misstatement of facts. And I ask for approval of House Bill 768."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andersson."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Andersson: "So, Representative Welch, you said it doesn't eliminate the State Charter School Commission. What's the function of that Commission assuming your Bill passes?"

Welch: "Upon the passage of 7... House Bill 768, the Charter School Commission would still have an important role to play when it

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

comes to charter schools. When a charter is proposed jointly by other districts... by multiple districts, not one single board can make that decision. So, they would go straight to the State Charter Commission. When a charter is... someone applies to a school board and the school board just for some reason fails to act in accordance with their policy, the Charter Commission has a role to play in that regard. You know, the point I'm making is the Charter Commission still has a purpose. And it is not being eliminated. But the emphasis of this Bill is certainly on the local board making decisions with regard to whether or not they want a local... a charter school in their district."

- Andersson: "Thank you. Do we know how many charters the Commission has actually approved?"
- Welch: "Do we know how many they've actually approved?"
- Andersson: "Approved. Or how many... or how many they've... applications they've received and how many they've approved?"
- Welch: "I know they've had 11 hearings and I believe they've approved 8 out of the 11."
- Andersson: "So, our understanding is out of 49 applications, 6 were approved. So, I'm... I'm kind of struggling to understand what the difficulty is with having this appeal process. I'm kind of a fan of appeal processes. We use them in court; we use them everywhere. What's inappropriate about having it here?"
- Welch: "Well, I... I think the first thing we should really underscore, Representative, is that we're talking about a local school district making a decision on where a huge bulk of their local dollars will end up. That is a decision that

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

should be made by the local school, not the State Charter Commission. And we know..."

Andersson: "Well, I..."

Welch: "...we know that three years ago the Commission approved two concept charter schools which the CPS Board had rejected. And we know that that particular charter network ended up under federal invest..."

Speaker Lang: "Please bring your remarks to a close."

Welch: "...and we know that that particular network ended up under federal investigation."

Andersson: "Thank you. I will bring my remarks to the close. In my opinion, charter schools and the… this appeal process is simply a part of the due process of anything. Local… local control is important, but so is the ability to review those things. I urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Moeller for two minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Moeller: "Thank you. Representative, I know you brought this Bill I believe two years ago. Is that correct?"

Welch: "Yes."

Moeller: "And you... you stated that this iteration is different from the Bill that you originally introduced?"

Welch: "I did not state that. It is identical to the Bill that I originally introduced and passed this chamber."

Moeller: "Okay. But you... you mentioned that this would not... this would not get rid of the Charter Commission, but essentially it eliminates the current function of the Commission, correct?"

38th Legislative Day

- Welch: "Correct. It doesn't eliminate. There's still a role for the Charter Commission as... as it provided for in House Bill 397. And... but the emphasis now... is now placed on the local school board."
- Moeller: "Okay. So, I have a group of... a community organization in my district that has been trying to bring a locally governed charter school to U46 for the past 5 years. And they went through the process, they were denied by their school board initially. They appealed to the Charter Commission, the Charter Commission denied their application initially. And they are, again, seeking to be authorized in... in the school district that I represent. If your Bill were passed and... and signed by the Governor, would the parents and the community organization in my community have the ability to appeal a school board decision... an adverse school board decision on their application?"
- Welch: "If House Bill 768 were the law and your school district were to reject that application..."
- Speaker Lang: "Please proceed and bring your remarks to a close."
 Welch: "...they would not have a right to appeal directly to the
 Charter Commission via denial."
- Moeller: "Okay. Thank you. So, to the Bill. I think that parents and those interested in... in bringing a charter application to a community have the right to due process and to appeal if a school board rejects an application. There are many factors that may go into a rejection and the Charter Commission was created to provide that appeals process. It works. I think it needs to be maintained and remain an option for those who are

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

interested in bringing school choice to their communities. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sosnowski for two minutes."

"Thanks, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I think the fundamental problem with this Bill is that in many aspects, hopefully most aspects of government, both local, statewide, regional is that we want to have some form of appealing a decision. And what this Bill, whether you like charter schools or not, it eliminates the opportunity for local individuals to just simply ask for an appeal. As Representative Andersson mentioned earlier there's been nearly 50 appeals processed at the State Charter School Commission and only 6 have been overturned. There's not a broad based problem. The Commission is doing a good job. They're handling it properly. It allows local community members to have an appeal process. You're basically, with this Bill, stripping away what we like to put into all forms of government, a check and a balance. We want checks and balances in our system. And by eliminating this you're basically saying no. It's going to be a local decision only. It doesn't matter. You can't appeal it. You can't have further discussion about it. It's very undemocratic. And why we're targeting this particular form of check and balance and not every other form of check and balance that we have in State Government is truly unfair. Again, if you're against charter schools you know that's fine you have that opinion, but we should allow the application process to carry on. We should allow folks to have due process. We should allow them to be able to appeal decisions. And again, the Charter School Commission has been doing a good job in those hearings. And

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

there's... there's... we're trying to correct a problem that does not exist. I'd ask for everybody to please vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Hernandez for two minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

"Representative, can you tell me why... what's the purpose of the Bill? Why did you bring is forward? What is..." Welch: there's multiple purposes for the Bill, Representative. And first and foremost, I come from a locally elected school board where I spent 12 years. And you wrack your brain and stress about how you're going to spend local dollars every day. And so, I think it's important that we give local school boards that authority. They are elected. They are responsive to their communities just like we are. If someone brings a charter proposal to them, they take an enormous amount of time in vetting those proposals. And... and those decisions should have some weight. If people don't like those decisions, people can run for the board. They can change the board, make those issues... make the charter school an issue in local elections. They could also, under this Bill, run a referendum. If a local community wants a charter school, there's many avenues through this process in House Bill 768 where they will be allowed to get that charter school. This... this Bill is not anti-charter. It's about empowering the local school board to make those decisions."

Hernandez: "But wouldn't you say that your Bill will scale back...
will eliminate sort of this appeal process so that... I... I would
think that this... this is an option actually a charter could
be complimenting a school district who's been struggling in

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

matters of keeping their standards up. They can view this as a way of working together and building on it. Have you visited any charter..."

Speaker Lang: "Please bring your remarks to a close."

Hernandez: "Have you visited any charters? Would you consider this to be a complimentary to a district that is struggling?"

Welch: "I have visited several charter schools and I have found them to be doing some good work, the ones that I have visited. That's not the issue in this case. The issue here today is whether or not the General Assembly wants to respect local school boards and the decisions that they make. And that's what House Bill 768 is about."

Hernandez: "Well, I just... I... I respect your... your steps... your... your approach on this, Representative. But I am encountering where, if this Bill should pass, it would take that appeal process with a potential charter that may be opening in my district. So, I'm going to have to vote 'no'. And I just wanted to make that clear. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Pritchard for two minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Pritchard: "Representative, in committee when we talked about this I mentioned I had a case where a charter wanted to come in to some 12 to 14 school districts who all turned it down. And then they appealed to the State Charter Commission. In that particular situation, the Charter Commission also set them down. So, when we look at the 48 applications that have been made and only 6 awarded, are we worried about things we don't need to be worried about?"

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

Welch: "Well, to answer your question, I believe that the local school board should be respected. And when we look at Chicago Public School recently trying to close three schools that they deemed to be poorly performing and the data showed that they were poorly performing, the Charter Commission overturned CPS's decision. The local board should have been respected. Outside of Chicago, 15 charter schools have been approved by the Commission. And recently local elected school boards of Waukegan and Chicago Heights both rejected Learn Charter School proposals. The appointed Commission by the Governor overrode those elected school board decisions and approved both of those proposals, despite strong community opposition and school board denial. What this Bill would do, would reverse that. And it would put the power in the hands of the local school board and respect their decisions."

Pritchard: "So, are you... are you concerned with the high standards that the charter school may have or not have? I mean, the Charter School Commission may have or not have?"

Welch: "Well, if you look at the CPS decision, you would say they don't have very high standards because everyone..."

Pritchard: "So, one... one..."

Welch: "...said that those schools were poorly performing."

Pritchard: "One final quick question. Are the courts ready to handle these kinds of appeals that you provide for in this Bill?"

Speaker Lang: "Please bring your remarks to a close."

Welch: "This Bill provides for judicial review and I do believe our legal system can handle cases that are brought before judicial review. They're happening now in other matters."

38th Legislative Day

- Pritchard: "Well, that may be questionable. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Demmer is recognized for an announcement. You have a Member that has returned, Sir? Apparently not. Excuse me. Barbara Wheeler for two minutes."
- Wheeler, B.: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Sponsor."
- Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."
- Wheeler, B.: "Representative, you had mentioned in your opening remarks the investigation of concept schools. Could you tell me a little bit more about that investigation?"
- Welch: "Well, what I do know is that three years ago the Commission approved two concept charter schools which the CPS Board had already rejected. And we know that concept schools was under federal investigation. What was the outcome of that investigation, I don't know."
- Wheeler, B.: "Well, that's why I bring it up, Representative. The outcome was there was no findings for any misuse or any problems with the charter schools. So, I wanted to make sure the record was correct when you mentioned there was a federal investigation of a concept school. I want to make sure the record is clear that... that... under investigation... after find... that there were no findings or any problems with those schools. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hoffman for two minutes."
- Hoffman: "I just have a quick question of the Sponsor. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."
- Hoffman: "Are there ways to... to open up a charter school if the school board denies a charter school?"

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

Welch: "Absolutely. If a school board denies a charter school proposal and the community wants one, Representative, they could put it on a ballot. This Bill provides for a referendum, put it on a ballot. And if the voters of that community decide via referendum that indeed they want a charter school and it passes, it has to be respected. And oh, by the way, that's one of those instances where then the State Charter Commission comes in and they would implement the results of the local referendum not the local school board."

Hoffman: "So, the arguments that somehow we're limiting the ability of a community to have charter schools simply by a school board vote is inaccurate? You can actually go to the voters by referendum, correct?"

Welch: "That is correct."

Hoffman: "I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Costello for two minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Costello: "Chris, can you tell me do you know of any other elected bodies that can have their votes and decisions overturned like Charter School Commissions can do to our locally elected, locally accountable school boards?"

Welch: "I am not aware of any."

Costello: "I... I think that's an extremely important point to note.

And I would recommend a 'yes' vote."

Welch: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Demmer for two minutes."

Demmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I request a verification should this Bill receive the requisite number of votes."

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

Speaker Lang: "Your request is acknowledged. Mr. Welch to close." Welch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 768 is identical to House Bill 397 that I presented in the 99th General Assembly. This Bill passed the House in the 99th General Assembly and I would respectfully ask my colleagues to pass it in the 100th General Assembly and that the Senate takes it up. This is very important. I regularly hear my colleagues on the other side talk about local control. But it seems like local control is only important when it's an issue important to them. And I would ask my colleagues who really believe in local control to take a hard look at this one. The school boards in our communities they just recently went through elections. Those candidates take their jobs seriously when they become school board members. These proposals are vetted. They take a considerable amount of time from the administrations and the local school board members. They go through public hearings. They hear these proposals. They hear from everyone on every side, including people from their communities. And it is up to those local boards to make a decision. If they do something wrong and don't follow their own policy, that's why we've built in here judicial review. We're not eliminating the Charter School Commission. Whoever is going around in this building saying that today is not telling the truth. We're not eliminating the Charter Commission. We're limiting their role from what it is currently and placing that power in the local school boards hands, but the State Charter Commission would still have a role. Specifically, when there's multiple districts involved, they would have a role. If a community decides the local board made the wrong decision, let's put it

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

on a referendum and the referendum passes, the State Charter Commission has a role. If the local school board decides that we're just going to ignore this proposal, then the State Charter Commission has a role. I think it's extremely important that we respect the decisions of those local boards that are elected. Even local boards that are not elected. We've talked about here today five instances where the Chicago Public School vetted... looked at issues, vetted them properly, rejected charter school proposals and five instances where they were overturned by the Charter Commission. We have to empower these local school boards to make these kind of decisions when this kind of money is involved. I don't understand. Local control is the biggest issue on the other side. And that's why I believe that this Bill should be passed here today. It is not anti-charter. It is pro-local control. And I would ask that at a minimum all of those who voted for this Bill two years ago vote for it here today. If you replaced a Member who voted for it, I'd ask that you vote the way your predecessor did and vote for this Bill. And we'll take all newcomers. Those who have changed their mind. And you want to get on the right side of this issue and empower your local school boards. I would ask for an 'aye' vote in favor of House Bill 768 and in favor of local control. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman's moved for the passage of the Bill. Mr. Demmer has asked for a verification. Members will be at their own chairs, vote their own switches. Staff will retire to the rear of the Chamber. Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves, Members. Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Burke, Hurley, Mitchell, Wallace, Zalewski. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 57 voting 'yes', 47 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'. And the Gentleman asks for Postponed Consideration. Mr. Welch."

Welch: "Place it on Postponement, please?"

Speaker Lang: "I just did that for you, Sir."

Welch: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you. House Bill 2778, Representative Willis. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2778, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Willis."

Willis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is an initiative of the Fire Caucus. What it does is it makes sure that we clarify those areas, most of them are in the rural part of the state, that do not fall under fire protection. The Fire Marshal's Office allows... is allowed to assign fire protection, but he is not allowed to put in an annexation so that these rural areas can actually pay for their fire service. And this is what the... this clarifies and allows them to do an annexation to these areas so that they can have adequate fire protection. I urge an 'aye' vote, please."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bellock, do you rise on this Bill, Representative?"

Bellock: "No. Thank you. It was a point of personal privilege and..."

Speaker Lang: "We'll get right back to you."

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

Bellock: "Thank you very..."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andersson for two minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

- Andersson: "So, Representative Willis, so my understanding is that now the fire protection district can unilaterally annex property. Is that right?"
- Willis: "No. What happens is most places are already put in on fire protection district... through the 9-1-1 Act and the Fire Marshal can do it. What happens is that there are certain areas that fall in these in-between spots that are not necessarily in an area that's been assigned prior. So, the Fire Marshal's Office can assign it, but there's no way to reap the taxes or to decide which fire protection district they would go for. This clarifies that and allows that. It's not necessarily annexing into a municipality; it annexes into what fire protection district they're going to be covered by."
- Andersson: "Right. So, I think I'm understanding. The distinction is they receive fire protection service, but they're not paying for it via tax. Is that correct?"
- Willis: "Exactly. And so, this just goes and says you're going to be in our fire protection district. Therefore, we're going to annex you under that fire protection district so that you can receive the coverage."
- Andersson: "But the residents themselves, they don't have an option of saying, no, I don't wish to be annexed. They're required to be annexed?"

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

- Willis: "The fire department has no option as to whether they're going to put out the fire or not either. So, they have to do it one way or the other."
- Andersson: "Certainly not, but again, the point is, is that the residents don't have a choice. Is there... is there a... is there a choice as to which fire protection if there are multiples?"
- Willis: "The Fire Marshal's Office makes the best determination on that as to who is closest and has the best ability to cover that area. So, if there is someplace that's in-between two, he will make... a he or she, though right now it is a he, will make the best determination at who has the manpower and the accessibility to that area the best."

Andersson: "Thank you very much. To the Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Please complete your remarks, Sir."

Andersson: "Thank you. To the Bill. This is an involuntary annexation process. You're adding a tax burden to those residents who are being involuntary annexed. I have no problem if they wanted to go it voluntarily. I urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reick for two minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

- Reick: "Quick question. People who are not in the district but are being served by these fire protection districts, how do they compensate the fire protection district for their coverage?"
- Willis: "There isn't anything in there right now. And that's the problem. They may... some may or may not have a system where they can charge per call. But many of these are volunteer

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

departments and they don't have that ability. And they're not set up that way. Some of their budgets are as low as \$18 thousand a year to run a volunteer department. One of the things that this could mean for some of those smaller departments, it could actually be as low as an annual cost of only \$65 a year is what we're looking at when they figure in what the cost could actually be for these annexations."

Reick: "The reason I ask is I used to live in Missouri and I was... lived in a volunteer fire protection district and we paid \$25 a year for the privilege of being covered by them. If we didn't, it was a fee of \$600 for the first half hour if there was a call which I don't think is a bad... I thought it was a great thing. I once watched a house burn down because a guy didn't pay his bill. But... so, what you're saying is the only way that these fire protection districts really have to be compensated for serving unit outside the district is to annex because they don't have any other way of getting this money?"

Willis: "Correct."

Reick: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives for two minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ives: "So, Glen Ellyn is currently a volunteer fire department.

Would they be annexed into the nearest fire protection district? Because actually I think they're pretty much surrounded by municipal fire departments. So, would your Bill affect them at all or anybody else in that same situation?"

Willis: "Most... most of these... it's such a small amount that's going to be affected. This is mostly in rural areas. It's not

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

necessarily affecting those that are municipal departments because those guidelines have already been set. And they're usually border to border. You have fire protections districts that have come in. So, it's just those few spots and most of them are in the rural state... rural area of the state that have not been assigned fire protection coverage. And this came through a couple years ago when we did the Emergency Telephone System Act that required the 9-1-1 Board to actually have the Fire Marshal's Office already assign. So, they're already assigned. What this does is it allows the annexation so that the assigned fire protection district or municipal department can then put in their... get that person officially in there so that there's coverage."

Willis: "Glen Ellyn would not be..."

Ives: "...or Wheaton fire district protection since they're
 voluntary."

Willis: "No. They... it would not affect Glen Ellyn or Wheaton. They already have defined boundaries. So, it would not be affecting that area. It does nothing to take away from volunteer fire departments. It still allows them to work at the capacity that they are doing, but even volunteer fire departments do run on a fee-for-service or a taxation type of thing."

Ives: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Willis to close."

Willis: "I urge an 'aye' vote, please."

38th Legislative Day

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Switches are right where they were. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 69 voting 'yes', 40 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Demmer is recognized."
- Demmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please excuse Representative Tom Morrison for the remainder of the day."
- Speaker Lang: "Thank you very much. House Bill 3328, Representative Ives. Before we go to that Bill, Leader Bellock has had her light on. I apologize, Representative."
- Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Leader Durkin and I would like to ask the Body to say a welcome to all the DuPage Mayors and Managers who are down here today and been patiently awaiting through the last three Bills. So, can we give them a round of applause? Thank you very much."
- Speaker Lang: "Thank you for joining us today. Representative Gabel is recognized."
- Gabel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Lang: "Proceed."
- Gabel: "I just want to let the Body know that we are having our Green Caucus meeting tomorrow at 4 p.m. in Room 100. We're going to be talking about urban flooding and groundwater protection. Our drinking water is very important. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Representative. Now, we'll return to Representative Ives on House Bill 3328. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3328, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

Ives: "Thank you. We're just making a correction to the statute, which is actually followed and right now in practice. And essentially, way back when they instituted mandatory training for police chiefs and deputy police chiefs they did not require this of the City of Chicago or the Sheriff's Police Department of Cook County. This Bill says that they also must undergo this mandatory training. It passed out of the committee unanimously. And there's no opposition because they are already doing this training. So, this just cleans up the statute from that respect."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Sims. Please take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1849, Mr. Stewart. Please read the Bill. Mr. Stewart, you have an Amendment. Is that correct? We'll move the Bill back to Second Reading for you. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1849, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Stewart."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Stewart."

Stewart: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is a clean-up Bill for the Illinois State Police. It eliminates several ranks that are obsolete and no longer utilized by the department."

38th Legislative Day

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 2462, Representative Moeller. Please read the Bill. We understand you have an Amendment on this Bill as well? Mr. Clerk, please put the Bill back on the Order of Second Reading and read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2462, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Moeller."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Moeller on the Amendment."
- Moeller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Floor Amendment #1 simply adds two exceptions to the underlying Bill. It allows an employer to access inform... public wage information. And it allows employers to access wage information when hiring within an organization."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 270, Representative Wallace. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 270, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Wallace."

38th Legislative Day

- Wallace: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 270 is a Bill that asks for independent investigation of officer involved sexual assault. I would encourage an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative, we understand you have an Amendment on this Bill that's pending? Is that correct?"
- Wallace: "Amendment #4 was passed out of committee yesterday."
- Speaker Lang: "But we haven't adopted it yet, I presume. So, let's put this Bill back on the Order of Second Reading. And have the Clerk read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 270, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #3 has been adopted. Floor Amendment #4 is offered by Representative Wallace."
- Speaker Lang: "Did you just explain the Amendment, Representative?"
- Wallace: "I explained the Bill. The Bill just... I mean, yes. The Amendment asks for an independent investigation."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 3711, Representative Wallace. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3711, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Wallace."
- Wallace: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3711 is an initiative of the Illinois Attorney General. It allows for the Attorney

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

General to seek civil damages against those who have committed criminal acts of... or criminal hate crimes."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen."

Breen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And Floor Amendment 2's already been adopted. Is that correct? Has Floor Amendment 2 was already adopted on to the Bill?"

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Two Amendments have been adopted to the House Bill 3711. Committee Amendment #1 has been adopted. And Floor Amendment #2 has been adopted."

Breen: "Great. Thank you. And Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields. Two minutes, Sir."

Breen: "Okay. Representative, I just want to thank you for being sensitive to the concerns of the interest groups with regards to the Intimidation Statute. And I want to make clear for the record that there are Sections of the Intimidation... the offense of intimidation that appear to punish pure speech. And your Bill only imports Sections (a) (1), (a) (2) and (a) (3) of that Intimidation Statute, correct?"

Wallace: "That is correct."

Breen: "Great. Now, as well as bringing new offenses into the Hate Crime Statute, we're also bringing in the related exceptions, which broadly protect first Amendment conduct, correct?"

Wallace: "Yes. So, this did restrict the issues related to intimidation that were raised in committee when the Bill was first presented."

38th Legislative Day

- Breen: "Okay. And then, so... just... because it's an important statute because in 2009 the General Assembly imported under the... put into the Stalking Statute a broad exception, subsection (d)(2) of that statute, which stated that it's not a crime when in particularly and that stalking was the context. When it is 'an exercise of the right to free speech or assembly that is otherwise lawful'. And so, you're bringing that into... as you import the crime you are importing that specific exception?"
- Wallace: "Yes. So, what we are saying in terms of intimidation is that... what does not rise to the level of a hate crime is accusing another person of an offense, exposing someone just unnecessarily to hatred. Things like ridicule, bringing or continuing to strike, protests, or participating in acts of collective bargaining. Those are not forms of intimidation under this statute."
- Breen: "Right. And I... and so, I... I've kind of moved on to stalking. So, there's... 'cause there's a couple different things that are brought in. Under the Stalking Statute, there's that broad exception that we had discussed. And I want to make sure that that..."
- Speaker Lang: "Please bring your remarks to a close, Sir."
- Breen: "I... I think I've someone to yield me some time only 'cause
 I think I'm the lead on this to clarify this very important
 Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "That's... that's fine. Just finish your next sentence."
- Breen: "Okay. Okay. Sure."
- Speaker Lang: "And then someone can yield you some time."

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

Breen: "Okay. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And then, so I just want to make sure so that's... you know, that means as to this... the stalking issue, as long as picketers and protestors are not trespassing or hitting people or assaulting folks, they can't be charged with a hate crime under... under your Bill?"

Wallace: "Correct."

Breen: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Who's doing the yielding? Mr. Wheeler will yield Mr. Breen some time. Mr. Breen, two more minutes."

Breen: "Okay. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Okay. Now, let's... just to continue on as well. You know, currently the Illinois Appellate Court has held that Sections 1 and 2 of our Stalking Statute and Sections 1 and 2 of our Cyber Stalking Statute are unconstitutional based on my last research in light of the recent Elonis decision from the U.S. Supreme Court. I want to make sure that if those underlying Sections are held un... continue to be held unconstitutional that they can't be then used against folks in a civil context while they're barred by a criminal context. Is that correct?"

Wallace: "My understanding is that you are correct. This Bill is trying to be as consistent as possible with the Criminal Statute and is only allowing for the Attorney General to seek civil remedies. And only if he or she does so on behalf of the people of Illinois."

Breen: "Okay. And that... that was my final thing. Just to make sure folks understand, currently, the civil side of hate crime is just the victim of hate crime versus the person who has committed the hate crime. This now adds attorney's fees, adds

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

an Attorney General component, and a \$25 thousand civil penalty, correct?"

Wallace: "Up to 25 thousand, yes."

Breen: "Up to 25 thousand. Thank you for your... the answers to my questions."

Wallace: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Barbara Wheeler for two minutes."

Wheeler, B.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask the Sponsor a couple of questions. And also..."

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Wheeler, B.: "Thank you. Representative, we... where are you? We... you did a great job. I appreciate how you listened to the committee and to Members who had issues, especially with the word 'intimidation'."

Wallace: "Thank you."

Wheeler, B.: "So, thank you and thank you to the Attorney General who worked with us, I appreciate that. I just want to make some clarifications. The day that you brought it to the committee I believe Illinois Right To Life and IFI were opposing this Bill. Is that correct?"

Wallace: "I thought it was the Family Institute."

Wheeler, B.: "Family Institute?"

Wallace: "Yes."

Wheeler, B.: "Where do they stand on this Bill right now?"

Wallace: "They are in support of this Bill now that we've worked through removing some of that broad language related to intimidation."

Wheeler, B.: "They're... they're in support or are they neutral?" Wallace: "They're in support my last..."

38th Legislative Day

- Wheeler, B.: "Okay."
- Wallace: "...communications that they were in support."
- Wheeler, B.: "I know that they were grateful that you had worked with that. I just want to... another question I had. And I... I can't remember whether it was clarified in committee. This allows the Attorney General to bring forward a civil suit for all these other issues. Is that correct? How does something like that begin?"
- Wallace: "Well, it would begin with the process of someone having actually committed a hate crime, someone actually being victimized by that, and then asking for some civil remedies for the things that occurred as a basis of that hate."
- Wheeler, B.: "With... they would ask for an investigation?"
- Wallace: "There would definitely be an investigation. And I believe the state's attorney would be the initial person to move forward with that."
- Wheeler, B.: "Well, again, I want to thank you for working on this. I really appreciate it. And I stand in support, Representative. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 89 voting 'yes', 22 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2738, Representative Ammons. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2738, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ammons."

Ammons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2738 is seemingly a simple Bill worked out between myself and the Department of Corrections to allow for video visitation to take place as it becomes available in all of our DOC institutions as well as protecting the right of individuals to visit their loved ones in person. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. D'Amico, Nekritz, Parkhurst, Cavaletto. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. There are 105 voting 'yes', 10 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3922, Representative Kelly Burke. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3922, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Burke."

Burke, K.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3922 establishes a municipal task force on recycling strategies to reduce gas house... greenhouse gas emissions, to review the status of municipal policies and programs on greenhouse gas emissions and report its findings and recommendations to the Governor and the General Assembly. I know of no opposition. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those who support the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting

38th Legislative Day

- 'yes', 2 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Second Reading, House Bill 734, Mr. Crespo. 734, Sir. Out of the record. On the Order of Second Reading, House Bill 2402, Mr. Mitchell. Out of the record. House Bill 2963, Representative Nekritz. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2963, a Bill for an Act concerning corporations. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #3 has been adopted. Floor Amendment #4 is offered by Representative Nekritz."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Nekritz."
- Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #4 is some technical cleanup to the Entity Omnibus Act for how business organizations in... in Illinois either domesticate or convert to another type of organization."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment will say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Mr. Turner in the Chair."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Wheeler, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Wheeler, K.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Sir."
- Wheeler, K.: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it's April 25th, State Government in Illinois is financially adrift because the General Assembly hasn't stepped up to lead and make the

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

tough decisions to work through a budget. This state has become a laughing stock across the country for our lack of willingness to govern and that we haven't had a full year budget for the last 2 years. We haven't had a balanced on paper budget for 3 years. And we haven't honestly balanced a budget for about 15 years. You've heard me ask on this floor for more than 2 years now for us to adopt a revenue estimate. Why? Here are the three reasons: Number one, the revenue estimate is the actual first step in our House budgeting process. How do we know how much each Appropriation Committee has to allocate for their assigned departments and agencies if we don't actually start with a revenue estimate? The revenue estimate is required by state and law... State Law and the Illinois State Constitution. Look it up, we have to do it. If we appropriate funds without a revenue estimate, we are in effect breaking the law. And the third reason is because the revenue estimate is an important form of taxpayer protection. If we skip the revenue estimate and just appropriate according to our wishes and the requests of the departments and agencies of State Government, we will likely spend a lot more, which will trigger a tax increase. That should be enough for us to actually do our jobs and adopt a revenue estimate. We don't really have an excuse not to. I know we've all heard the, Governor do your job speech on the House Floor before. But the Illinois State Constitution, Section 8, Article 2, Paragraph (a), which refers to the Governor's proposed budget is not a prerequisite Paragraph (b), which outlines the appropriations process which can only be done by the General Assembly. There is no

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

connection between then the two paragraphs. The responsibility to actually prepare a budget by law rests with us in the General Assembly. Therefore, I have prepared three different revenue estimate resolutions. One that uses the COGFA estimates, one that uses the GOMB estimates, and one that averages the two of them. Remember, revenue estimate can be amended. If we choose to adjust fees, tax rates, loopholes, or any other parameter that affects the expected funds to be available during the next fiscal year, we can file an Amendment. We did it just a few years ago. Seriously, Ladies and Gentlemen, there are only three Session days before we begin the month of May. The Appropriation Committees have met for... and spent dozens of hours hearing from agencies about their budget requests for the next fiscal year. If we are going to get any appropriating done in the final month of Session, we need to start with how much is available to actually appropriate. Let's adopt a revenue estimate by the end of this week. And I invite every Member of this Body to work with me to get our budget process started. Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "House Bill 4011, Leader Lang. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4011, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. We're all aware of risks that not-for-profit institutions such as synagogues, mosques, and cemeteries, even schools, undertake on a regular basis in the... in the climate that we have in our

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

country today. This Bill would create emergency grants or create a program whereby the Secretary of State could receive money to distribute emergency grants to be accomplished by rule through his office to protect these institutions. There could be new doors, it could be lights, it could be alarm systems, whatever these institutions feels is appropriate they could apply through the Secretary of State's Office for a grant. I know of very little opposition to this Bill and I ask your support."

Speaker Turner: "Further discussion? Representative Andersson is recognized."

Andersson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. It's hard to argue with... with the points; it's important stuff. The problem is it's going to cost \$25 million in GRF. And we don't have \$25 million in GRF. So, with respect, until we can get a budget, until we can do what we need to do, this like so many other things I think has to wait. Don't like saying that. I think that the threats and the vandalism is real and needs to be addressed, but we don't have the money. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative David Harris is recognized."

Harris, D.: "A question of the Sponsor, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Harris, D.: "Thank you. Representative, we talked briefly about this \$25 million to the Secretary of State. Any particular..."

Lang: "I just want to interrupt and then I'll let you go on. And Mr. Andersson should listen to this as well. This Bill appropriates no money at all. There's a different Approp Bill for the money. This just sets up the program."

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

Harris, D.: "Understand."

Lang: "Please proceed."

Harris, D.: "You need... you need an Appropriation Bill for the... for the substantive Bill, got that. But this substantive Bill, presuming there is an Appropriation Bill, would give \$25 million to the Secretary of State for these security grants. Any particular reason why we're giving it to the Secretary of State?"

Lang: "Two reasons. First, the Secretary of State does have grant programs today through the library, et cetera. And of course libraries would be covered under this Bill. And the second reason is that some of the grant programs going through the Governor's Office don't work to my satisfaction."

Harris, D.: "Okay. Well, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that second answer was really the answer that... that... that puts the points right at the reason for the Bill. Look, probably a very important initiative... \$25 million for security at... at facilities that may very well be a threat, but the Secretary of State Office? Come on. This is a responsibility of the Executive. It's a responsibility of the Illinois Emergency Management Agency. It's a responsibility of the security individuals within the Governor's Office to handle this. And I understand that my friends on the other side of the aisle don't trust the Governor's Office. There is some ... there is some unease about that. But that's where these dollars belong if indeed there is ever an appropriation of \$25 million. It does not belong in the Secretary of State's Office. It just doesn't. This is an initiative that should be handled by the Executive. Again, by the Illinois Emergency Management

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

Agency, by those entities in the Executive Department and not in the Secretary of State's Office. Whether or not we have the \$25 million, which we don't, I would urge a 'no' vote simply because of the fact that this is inappropriately targeted to the wrong... to the wrong individual in the Executive Branch of government. This should be in the Governor's Office. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Pritchard is recognized."

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

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

Pritchard: "Representative, continuing on this line of thought that there are organizations that feel there are threats, does your Bill have any provisions in it for how we determine the threat level?"

Lang: "We don't determine that, the Secretary of State would create the criteria and the protocol by rule, which would go through JCAR."

Pritchard: "But how do you have protocol to determine whether there is a threat and whether that threat's valid? I mean, that's what we have the federal agencies, emergency management, and the FBI to try to help determine."

Lang: "Well, Representative, if... after all the vandalism that has taken place at mosques and synagogues and Jewish cemeteries and Jewish community centers, if you were a person that frequented those places, you would feel at risk every day."

Pritchard: "Well, I'm sure people in the City of Chicago feel at risk every day too. Is... is that going to be a part of this program?"

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

Lang: "Any not-for-profit institution that feels a risk and can establish the risk through whatever rules and protocol are created by the Secretary of State's Office could apply for a grant."

Pritchard: "Do you have any idea what kind of grants the Secretary might give?"

Lang: "You're talking about the amounts?"

Pritchard: "No. The... the items, the types of things."

Lang: "As I said in my remarks, Sir, maybe they need new doors with bolts. Maybe they need a lighting system, a security lighting system. Perhaps they need an alarm system. Each one would make the request they wish to make."

Pritchard: "And the Secretary of State would determine if they had limited dollars which one was being more of a threat than the other?"

Lang: "I guess it would be on a first-come, first-served basis that would be up to the Secretary of State."

Pritchard: "Well, I certainly empathize with the organizations that feel this kind of stress. I'm not sure that this is the right answer nor the right venue for getting a solution. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Davidsmeyer is recognized."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Davidsmeyer: "So, we've already talked about not having any money in the bank to pay for any of this stuff. What do you tell my local West Central Mass Transit District who had to shut down for a month or two, who technically has an appropriation that

38th Legislative Day

- they're going to have to wait longer to receive their money because you're diverting other funds to other people?"
- Lang: "Representative, this Bill is subject to appropriation which means a budget. And until we all agree on a budget, I can't answer that question. Assuming that we pass a budget, it would mean that... it would be the will of the General Assembly to do what we will with our dollars. If it includes funding this program, so be it; if it doesn't include funding this program, so be it."
- Davidsmeyer: "So... so, would you agree that there's a need for a balanced budget?"
- Lang: "Representative, that's not what this Bill is about. I agree that we need to be careful with the taxpayer dollars and try to bal... pass a balanced budget."
- Davidsmeyer: "But it's... it's issues like this... it's... it's creating new programs and new... new funding for new programs that take away from all the other things that we've already promised."
- Lang: "Representative, we've used more in state resources in electricity in the microphones now than this Bill costs. This Bill costs zero dollars."
- Davidsmeyer: "But it... it will eventually cost \$25 million?"
- Lang: "No. I have a separate Bill that's not out of the Appropriations Committee yet and may not get out of the Appropriations Committee for \$25 million."
- Davidsmeyer: "Something tells me that you have an... an 'in' somewhere on that... along the way, but I'm not quite sure. Anybody who has had any difficulty with programs that are currently appropriated, that are having trouble getting money, this will eventually take money away from you. So, I

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

just want to make people aware that we're providing another opportunity to divert funds away from things that are currently appropriated and give it to somebody else. So, we're providing another avenue for that. I... I understand what the Sponsor's trying to do. I just... I think we're just trading one area for another. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Andersson, your name was used in debate."

Andersson: "Yes, it was. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Brief remarks, please."

Andersson: "Very brief. I just wanted to clarify 'cause Leader Lang had pointed out that I needed to listen. So, my understanding is this appropriates nothing. Is that correct?"

Lang: "This Bill appropriates nothing, Sir."

Andersson: "Thank you very much. Appreciate the answer."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Lang to close."

Lang: "This is an important Bill. You know, we all talk about when we're in our districts and... when we refer to what's going on in the Federal Government, we often refer to the risk of ISIS and the risk of vandalism and the risk of domestic terrorism. This is a Bill that will help us fight that. Please vote 'aye'."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 4011 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting
is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
Have all voted who wish? Member, please record yourselves.
Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 72 voting
'yes', 41 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', House Bill 4011,
having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

declared passed. House Bill 3741, Representative Andrade. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3741, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Andrade."

Andrade: "Thank you, Speaker. I promised this would be the last Bill, Bed Bug Bill. This is just one other thing to prevent the prevention of the spread of bed bugs. House Bill 3741 creates the Bed Bug Inspection Act. Our merchants must inspect any previously rented furniture and equipment before renting the furniture or equipment to a subsequent customer. If during inspection pests are found, the merchant must treat the furniture or equipment to eradicate the pests before renting the furniture or equipment to subsequent customer. If there's no questions, I respectfully... respect an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3741 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 106 voting 'yes', 5 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 3741, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Phelps, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

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

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Sir."

Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Tonight the Associated Fire Fighters of Illinois is hosting a.m. they're honoring the years of service of Danny

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

Fabrizio. And a lot of you know Danny Fabrizio, been at Local 2 forever and just a stalwart here in Springfield. So, tonight at 927 South 2nd at the AFFI house, we'd love to have you to help honor Danny Fabrizio. He's sure going to be missed. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative. House Bill 3649, Representative Crespo. Out of the record. House Bill 259, Representative Ford. Out of the record. House Bill 1785, Representative Greg Harris. Out of the record. House Bill 2812, Representative Hammond. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2812, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Hammond."

Hammond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For many of you who have worked on issues of... of child support, trying to identify the location of the non-custodial parent... House Bill 2812 is a measure that would use cellular... a cellular phone contact to do that. Now, I will add that we have an Amendment that we are going to do in the Senate because there was some concern about location information. And just to be clear, the intention is that the location information will be used for the physical whereabouts of the non-custodial parent that owes child support. And that would include a home telephone number, a home address, a cellular telephone and an email address. It will not include things such as real-time GPS and those types of information... location information. And we will be doing that in the Senate. So, I appreciate an 'aye' vote. And take any questions."

38th Legislative Day

- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2812 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 107 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present', House Bill 2812, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3903, Representative Stratton. Mr. Clerk, can you please move this Bill back to the Order of Second Reading and read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3903, a Bill for an Act concerning education. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #3 is offered by Representative Stratton."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Stratton on the Amendment."
- Stratton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #3 just included some language to remove the opposition of the Illinois Chiefs and the Chicago Police Department and provided some clarification regarding the definitions under school-based booking stations."
- Speaker Turner: "Lady moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 3903. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Members, we'll be moving to Bills on Second Reading. Please be prepared. House Bill 3803, Representative Cassidy. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

38th Legislative Day

- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3803, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. House Bill 2953, Representative Evans. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2953, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. House Bill 2624, Representative Fine. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2624, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. House Bill 454, Representative Flowers. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 454, a Bill for an Act concerning financial regulation. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. House Bill 3049, Representative Fortner. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3049, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments have been approved for consideration. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. House Bill 3839, Representative Halpin. Out of the record. House Bill 2831, Leader Lang. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2831, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendments 1, 2, 3, and 4 were adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. House Bill 2992, Representative Slaughter. Out of the record. House Bill 3794. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3794, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. House Bill 3648, Representative Welch. Out of the record. House Bill 3877, Representative Willis. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3877..."
- Speaker Turner: "Out of the record. Out of the record. House Bill 40... 456, Representative Greenwood. Out of the record. House Bill 698, Representative Slaughter. Excuse me. Out of the record. Excuse me. House Bill 698, Representative Slaughter. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill. Can you move that Bill back to the Order of Second Reading, please, Mr. Clerk? Then read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 698, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 has been adopted. And Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Slaughter."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Slaughter."

38th Legislative Day

- Slaughter: "Thank you... thank you, Mr. Speaker. The... again, this is a Bill that establishes a entrepreneurship program for IDOC."
- Speaker Turner: "Floor Amendment #2, Representative?"
- Slaughter: "Right."
- Speaker Turner: "So, we're adopting the Floor Amendment? Go ahead."
- Slaughter: "That's correct. The previous Amendment provided unnecessary language regarding wages for inmates. This Amendment takes... is... is not germane to the objective of the Bill. This Amendment is removing that language."
- Speaker Turner: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 698. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. House Bill 3837, Representative Scherer. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3837, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Leader Lang in the Chair."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative McCombie, for what reason do you rise?"
- McCombie: "Sorry, I wasn't ready for you. I meant to vote for House Bill 618 and I meant to vote 'yes'."
- Speaker Lang: "The record will reflect your intentions."
- McCombie: "Thank you."

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

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

- Clerk Bolin: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 327, offered by Representative Meier. House Resolution 329, offered by Representative Hays. House Resolution 331, offered by Representative Chapa LaVia. House Resolution 332, offered by Representative Chapa LaVia. House Resolution 333, offered by Representative Demmer. And House Resolution 334, offered by Representative Dan Burke."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, Committee... Sorry. Leader Currie moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "The following committees are meeting immediately after Session: Appropriations-General Services is meeting in D-1, Construction Industry & Code Enforcement in 122, Insurance: Health & Life in C-1, Public Utilities in 413, Elementary & Secondary: Licensing, Administration & Oversight is in Room 115, Health care Licenses is in Room 118, Business Incentives for Local Communities in Room 114."
- Speaker Lang: "And now, leaving perfunctory time for the Clerk, Leader Currie moves that the House stand adjourned 'til Wednesday, April 26 at the hour of 10:30 a.m. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the House stands adjourned 'til Wednesday, April 26 at the hour of 10:30 a.m."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Second Reading of House Bills. House Bill 827, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 828, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 829, a Bill for an Act

38th Legislative Day

making	appropriations.	House	Bill	830,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	831,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	832,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	833,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	834,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	835,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	836,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	837,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	838,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	839,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	840,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	841,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	842,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	843,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	844,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	845,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	846,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	847,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	848,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	849,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	850,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	851,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	852,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	853,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	854,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	855,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	856,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	857,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	858,	a	Bill	for	an	Act

38th Legislative Day

making	appropriations.	House	Bill	859,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	860,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	861,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	862,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	863,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	864,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	865,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	866,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	867,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	868,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	869,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	870,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	871,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	872,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	873,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	874,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	875,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	876,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	877,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	878,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	879,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	880,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	881,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	882,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	883,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	884,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	885,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	886,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	887,	а	Bill	for	an	Act

38th Legislative Day

making	appropriations.	House	Bill	888,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	889,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	890,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	891,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	892,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	893,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	894,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	895,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	896,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	897,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	898,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	899,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	900,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	901,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	902,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	903,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	904,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	905,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	906,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	907,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	908,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	909,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	910,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	911,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	912,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	913,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	914,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	915,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	916,	а	Bill	for	an	Act

38th Legislative Day

making	appropriations.	House	Bill	917,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	918,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	919,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	920,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	921,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	922,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	923,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	924,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	925,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	926,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	927,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	928,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	929,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	930,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	931,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	932,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	933,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	934,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	935,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	936,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	937,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	938,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	939,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	940,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	941,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	942,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	943,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	944,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	945,	а	Bill	for	an	Act

38th Legislative Day

making	appropriations.	House	Bill	946,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	947,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	948,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	949,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	950,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	951,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	952,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	953,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	954,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	955,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	956,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	957,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	958,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	959,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	960,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	961,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	962,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	963,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	964,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	965,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	966,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	967,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	968,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	969,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	970,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	971,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
making	appropriations.	House	Bill	972, a	В	ill fo	r an	Act	t in
relatio	on to budget impl	ementat	cion.	House	Bil	Ll 973	, a E	Bill	for
an Act	in relation to b	udget :	impler	mentat:	ion	. Hous	se Bi	11	974,

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

a Bill for an Act in relation to budget implementation. House 975, a Bill an Act in relation to budget for implementation. House Bill 976, a Bill for an Act in relation to budget implementation. House Bill 977, a Bill for an Act in relation to budget implementation. House Bill 978, a Bill for an Act in relation to budget implementation. House Bill 979, a Bill for an Act in relation to budget implementation. House Bill 980, a Bill for an Act in relation to budget implementation. House Bill 981, a Bill for an Act in relation to budget implementation. House Bill 982, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 983, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 984, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 985, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 986, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 987, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 988, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 989, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 990, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 991, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 992, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 993, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 994, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 995, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 996, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 997, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 998, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 999, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 1000, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 1001, a Bill for an Act

38th Legislative Day

concerning	government.	House	Bill	1002,	а	Bill	for	an	Act	
concerning	government.	House	Bill	1003,	а	Bill	for	an	Act	
concerning	government.	House	Bill	1004,	а	Bill	for	an	Act	
concerning	government.	House	Bill	1005,	а	Bill	for	an	Act	
concerning	government.	House	Bill	1006,	а	Bill	for	an	Act	
concerning	government.	House	Bill	1007,	а	Bill	for	an	Act	
concerning	elections.	House	Bill	1008,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	
concerning	elections.	House	Bill	1009,	а	Bill	for	an	Act	
concerning	elections.	House	Bill	1010,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	
concerning	elections.	House	Bill	1011,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	
concerning	elections.	House	Bill	1012,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	
concerning	elections.	House	Bill	1013,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	
concerning	elections.	House	Bill	1014,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	
concerning	elections.	House	Bill	1015,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	
concerning	elections.	House	Bill	1016,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	
concerning	elections.	House	Bill	1017,	а	Bill	for	an	Act	
concerning	elections.	House	Bill	1018,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	
concerning	elections.	House	Bill	1019,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	
concerning	elections.	House	Bill	1020,	а	Bill	for	an	Act	
concerning	elections.	House	Bill	1021,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	
concerning	elections.	House	Bill	1022,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	
concerning	State gover	nment.	House	Bill	102	23, a	Bill	foi	an	
Act concern	ning State go	overnme	nt. H	ouse B	ill	1024,	, a B	ill	for	
an Act cond	cerning Stat	e gove	rnment	. Hous	se I	Bill 1	.025,	a I	Bill	
for an Act	concerning	State	gover	nment.	НС	use B	ill	1026	ō, a	
Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1027,										
a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill										
1028, a Bi	ll for an A	ct cond	cernin	g Stat	e o	goverr	nment	. Но	ouse	
Bill 1029, a Bill for an Act concerning State government.										

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

House Bill 1030, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1031, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1032, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1033, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1034, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1035, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1036, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1037, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1038, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1039, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1040, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 1041, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1042, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1043, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1044, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1045, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1046, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1047, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1048, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1049, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1050, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1051, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1052, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1053, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1054, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1055, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1056, a

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1057, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1058, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1059, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1060, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1061, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1062, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1063, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1064, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1065, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1066, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1067, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1068, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1069, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1070, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1071, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1072, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1073, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1074, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1075, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1076, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1077, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1078, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1079, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1080, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1081, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1082, a Bill for an Act

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

concerning State government. House Bill 1083, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1084, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1085, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1086, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1087, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1088, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1089, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1090, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1091, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1092, a Bill for concerning finance. House Bill 1093, a Bill for Act an concerning finance. House Bill 1094, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 1095, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 1096, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 1097, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 1098, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 1099, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 1100, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 1101, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 1102, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 1103, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 1104, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 1105, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 1106, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 1107, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 1108, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 1109, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 1110, a Bill for an Act

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

concerning finance. House Bill 1111, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 1112, a Bill for Act concerning finance. House Bill 1113, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 1114, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 1115, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 1116, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 1117, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 1118, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 1119, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 1120, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 1121, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. [House Bill 1122, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 1123, a Bill for concerning revenue. (sic-read in error, not meant to be read into the record)] House Bill 1124, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 1125, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 1126, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 1127, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Second Reading of these House Bills. These will be held on the Order of Second Reading. Introduction and First Reading of House Bills. House Bill 4041, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. First Reading of this House Bill. Introduction and First Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 61, offered by Representative Andersson, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Senate Bill 71, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 195, offered Representative Chapa LaVia, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Senate Bill 586, offered by

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

Representative Demmer, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 616, offered by Representative Mayfield, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Senate Bill 666, offered by Representative Wheeler, Barbara, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 667, offered by Rep... correction... Senate Bill 667, offered by Representative DeLuca, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Senate Bill 675, offered by Representative Evans, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Senate Bill 677, offered by Representative Reis, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 680, offered by Representative Wheeler, Barbara, a Bill for an Act concerning drug disposal. Senate Bill 683, offered by Representative Rita, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 8... correction... 684, offered by Representative Arroyo, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Senate Bill 685, offered by Representative Zalewski, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 698, offered by Representative Davidsmeyer, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 701, offered by Representative Nekritz, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Senate Bill 702, offered by Representative Conroy, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 736, offered by Representative Halpin, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 752, offered Representative Mussman, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Senate Bill 764, offered by Representative Mayfield, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 768, offered by Representative Moeller, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate 770, offered by Bill

38th Legislative Day

4/25/2017

Representative Soto, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 772, offered by Representative Soto, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 860, offered by Representative Kifowit, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Senate Bill 609, offered by Representative Nekritz, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. First Reading of these Senate Bills. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."