81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

- Speaker Lang: "The House will be in order. Members will be in their chairs. We shall be led in prayer today by Lee Crawford, the Pastor of the Cathedral of Praise Christian Center in Springfield. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off cellphones, and rise for the invocation and Pledge of Allegiance. Pastor Crawford."
- Pastor Crawford: "Let us pray. Most gracious God in Heaven, creator of us all, for it is from You, oh God, that all of our help come and it is from You, oh God, that all of our blessings flow. Oh God, look upon us, this august Assembly gathered here. May Your hand be upon each of them to direct them in their actions. Oh God, grant them hearts, give them minds to know You, give them diligence to seek You, and wisdom to find You. I pray today, oh God, that You would bless them with Your might, advise them with Your counsel that in all of their endeavors they would willingly do that which is the good and that which is the most precious will of God. In Your name, and in Your honor we pray, Amen."
- Speaker Lang: "We'll be led in the Pledge today by Representative Harper."
- Harper 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 the excused absences of Representatives Thapedi and Yingling today."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Demmer."

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

- Demmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please let the record reflect that Representatives Parkhurst, Phillips, Pritchard, and Sosnowski are excused."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, please take the roll. We have 111 Members present and we do have a quorum. The Chair recognizes Representative Hammond. For what reason do you rise?"
- Hammond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege." Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."
- Hammond: "I would like all of our colleagues here in the chamber to join me in wishing Russ Kimmons a very happy birthday today."
- Speaker Lang: "Happy birthday. Mr. Butler is recognized for a point of personal privilege."
- Butler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If I could have the attention of Body for an important point of personal privilege, I would appreciate it. Last night, the remains of a World War II hero finally returned home to Sangamon County. Michael Aiello entered the Army in 1942, rose to the rank of Staff Sergeant with the glider infantry Regiment, under the 82nd and 101st Airborne. He took place in a D-Day invasion and afterwards, as part of Operation Market Garden, died in a ferocious battle in Kiekberg Woods, Netherlands, on September 30, 1944. His unidentified remains were laid to rest in Belgium. Staff Sergeant Aiello was born in St. Louis in 1909, the youngest of 16 children. His family soon moved to the Sangamon County town of Sherman where he attended grade school until becoming a coal miner at the age of 13. He eventually moved to Springfield with his family continuing as a coal miner as well as owning and operating a restaurant. The remains of

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

Staff Sergeant Aiello were disinterred about eight years ago. Family members provided DNA samples that allowed for identification and recently arrangements were made to transport his remains back to his home community. Current survivors of Staff Sergeant Aiello include a niece, Rose Palazolo, of Rockford; a nephew, Jasper Aiello, of California; godson, Michael Aiello, of Springfield; and over 100 great, great-great, and great-great-great grandnieces and nephews. Tomorrow morning Staff Sergeant Michael Aiello, who posthumously was awarded the Bronze Star, will come to his final resting place during a ceremony at Camp Butler National Cemetery in Riverton. Mr. Speaker, I thank you and I would ask for the Body to take a moment of silence in honor of Staff Sergeant Michael Aiello."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Butler. Members may be seated. Page 2 of the Calendar, House Bills-Third Reading, House Bill 2984, Mr. Evans. Mr. Clerk, please... before we move on to that Bill, Mr. Clerk, Committee Reports."

Clerk Bolin: "Committee Reports. Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on October 26, 2017: recommends be adopted Floor Amendment #1 for House Joint Resolution 82. Representative Chapa LaVia, Chairperson from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs reports the following committee action taken on October 26, 2017: recommends be adopted House Resolution 530. Representative Conroy, Chairperson from the Committee on Mental Health reports the following committee action taken on October 26, 2017: recommends be adopted is House Resolution 594 and House Resolution 607. Representative

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

Dan Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on Executive reports the following committee action taken on October 26, 2017: do pass Short Debate for Senate Bill 1667. And Representative Greg Harris, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-Human Services reports the following committee action taken on October 26, 2017: do pass Short Debate for House Bill 4096; and recommends be adopted House Resolution 533."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Now, page 2 of the Calendar, House Bills-Third Reading. House Bill 2984, Mr. Evans. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill. I understand you have a Floor Amendment, Mr. Evans, so, I'm asking the Clerk to put the Bill back on the Order of Second Reading and read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2984, a Bill for an Act concerning health. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Amendment #2 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #3 is offered by Representative Evans."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Evans on the Amendment."

Evans: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As was mentioned, I would like to adopt only Amendment 4... excuse me... Amendment 3. The rest of language in the Bill was addressed in Senate Bill 1774 which is now law. So I would like to adopt this Amendment. This Amendment is a gut and replace Amendment. And what it does is it's in regards... is an initiative of Cook County with regards to vaccinations. It's clarifying language for a hospital system that already mandate vaccinations. It makes it crystal clear that if you have a mandate for vaccinations, individuals who choose not to participate based off philosophical reasons cannot utilize that anymore, but medical reasons and

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

religious reasons remain for opting out of requested mandated vaccinations for hospital systems who choose to do that. So, I request your support. I don't believe I have a lot of opposition to this Bill."

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

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

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

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2984, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Evans, did you just explain the Bill, Sir?"

Evans: "Yes. I would request your support for the Members, yep."

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

Breen: "You know what, Mr. Chairman, I'm just going to move for Standard Debate 'cause I have no idea what this Bill's about. So, just..."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Sir."

Breen: "Thank you. Representative, could you explain your Bill? What... what was the need for this Bill?"

Evans: "Yeah. Right now, so just to address the problem. We have hospital systems all over the nation, which request individuals to be vaccinated, particularly health care personnel, you know, individuals with the flu. One worker in a hospital could potentially cause a lot of issues for patients. So, particularly in Cook County, which the reason why if you look in line... if you look in line 10, we wanted to make it crystal clear that it does apply to Cook County. Well, for any system if you have a vaccination program, we want to

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

make sure folks are doing a vaccination program. If for whatever reason you don't want to be vaccinated, you can go to your doctor... If you work at a hospital, if you're a nurse or what have you, and they'll give you an opt-out. If for religious reasons, you choose to opt-out. The problem we had in Cook County is we had some folks saying, well, I just don't want to take it for philosophical reasons. And that's not acceptable to protect the health and welfare of folks coming into the hospital, whether it be patients, visitors, or what have you."

Breen: "Okay. So, just so I'm clear. So this is... and certified local health departments with jurisdiction over areas of more than 500 thousand residents... so that would include DuPage County as well, right? That's not just Cook County."

Evans: "For sure. So, and in making it crystal clear, if the medical system in your county does not require vaccinations, they continue. Nothing in this language changes that. But if they require vaccinations, we're just tightening up the language to say, hey, we're requiring vaccinations to protect patients and visitors of the hospital. You have to participate, unless you have a valid reason to opt-out. We're trying to tighten it up, so folks without valid reasons can't cause all of these issues because if you work in a health care field, you need to be vaccinated if you work for a system."

Breen: "Okay. And we are guaranteeing the exceptions for personnel who are medical or religious reasons exempt from this. So that is explicitly being set out in the Bill because it doesn't exist in the current law."

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

Evans: "And without question, if you look, first of all, starting at the top, we didn't… we didn't remove the may require, so it's still 'may' Bill. We didn't change nothing in the statute. And also, it's only for individuals who already have it. If you look in line 11, it says that along with exceptions for personnel may be exempt for medical or religious reasons. So, I have my religious views and I'm not looking to step on anybody else's religious views."

Breen: "Fair enough. No, thank you. Thank you, Representative, for answering the questions."

Evans: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bellock."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Bellock: "Where is the Representative? So, oh, thank you. So, I was just going over some of my questions that have been answered by what Representative Breen asked you..."

Evans: "Thank you."

Bellock: "...and this Bill does allow local health departments, if they want to make their things more stringent that they are allowed to do that?"

Evans: "Yeah. They are allowed to make it stringent; they are allowed to do nothing. It's all up to the system."

Bellock: "Right."

Evans: "Yes."

Bellock: "Right. Thank you very much, Representative."

Evans: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Hammond."

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Hammond: "Representative, you spoke of some of the exemptions and it's my understanding that those exemptions are in accordance with the guidelines that we currently have with the CDC. Is that correct?"

Evans: "Yes."

Hammond: "Okay. And also, it's also my understanding that ultimately what we're... one of the goals here is that our health care providers, those that are providing care to many individuals in long-term care and our medically fragile population, it's to ensure that those that are giving care to them hopefully choose to have this vaccination. Is that correct?"

Evans: "Yes."

Hammond: "Thank you, Representative. And I support your Bill.

Thank you."

Evans: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Mayfield."

Mayfield: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Mayfield: "Representative Evans, I'm sorry. I'm a little confused because part of this... what I'm reading in the analysis talks about blood and then the other part talks about the flu shot. What specifically are you addressing?"

Evans: "Vaccinations. So generally, my understanding, the flu shot is a part of the vaccinations, but a particular health care facility, I think that's kind of up to that particular health care facility, and my understanding, Northwestern

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

requires a flu shot. Cook County Hospital requires a flu shot. I don't want to get into... I'm not a doctor, so what the particular vaccination will be up to the health care facility."

- Mayfield: "So, let me get this straight. If I had a medical or a religious objection, I can be exempted, but if I just simply do not want one, I can be forced to have a shot? So now my personal preference is being overruled by your Bill? Is that what you're telling me?"
- Evans: "Yeah. I think you're forced... nobody's forced to do anything. Medical facilities all over the country, and there's guidelines of the CDC, so this is a standard all over the country that if you work in a health care field, you need to protect the patients and the visitors of the hospital. You don't have to work at their facility. Some facilities don't require vaccinations, so nobody is being forced to do anything, but if you work in this particular facility and they're asking folks to be vaccinated, you can opt-out. You have your medical or religious reasons to opt-out."
- Mayfield: "Okay. But you have individuals currently at some of these hospitals that may request individuals to get a flu shot, but are saying, no, I don't want one. They're allowed to refuse, currently. Your Bill will say, no, you cannot refuse and that that institution can fire you, if you don't submit to the flu shot, correct?"
- Evans: "Yeah, if you... for philosophical purposes because the protection of the patients and the visitors of the hospital is much more critical. This is a small group of individuals... the... the majority of folks don't oppose doing a flu shot."

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

Mayfield: "Sure they do."

- Evans: "But again, we have to balance out what's important, protecting the health care of the patients that are there. You got individuals with low immunes, you got cancer survivors, you got children with particular diseases with low blood count. You know, we can... we can argue it back and forth or these folks can be vaccinated to protect the patient at the hospitals. That's... that's up to them."
- Mayfield: "What type of documentation is required for the religious exemption?"
- Evans: "I'm not sure. We'd have to check with the particular health care facility. I'm not looking to micromanage the health care facility. You would have to contact them. Whatever they deem necessary is fine with me."
- Mayfield: "Okay. Well, that doesn't help me to understand what that exemption is."
- Evans: "Basically, what I'm explaining is Northwestern Hospital may require a letter from the minister. I don't know what religious views or Cook County may require whatever, but they have to make that decision of whether they are allowing an opt-out for religious reasons. So, I don't think it's my job on the state level, we're setting out the parameters. You're asking for specifics."
- Mayfield: "Well, I don't think it's your job to mandate what I can do with my body."
- Evans: "I am not mandating anything. This is a 'may' Bill, so it's not a mandate. The particular facility will determine their criteria for your religious views. You can contact whichever facility in which you want to get clarity on what

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

they require. This is a 'may' Bill. It is not a state mandate. We are laying out the requirements... the parameters if you choose to take this direction."

Mayfield: "Right. But you're taking an option away. I'm sorry, I cannot support your Bill. You know, we're supposed to be, at least on this side, a pro-choice chamber. So, if I do not have a choice of what to do with my body, you're going to take away my choice? I actually have an issue with that. And I cannot support your Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Stuart."

Stuart: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Stuart: "I wanted to thank you for bringing this Bill forward. I have a... we have a family member, my brother's little niece, Brooke. We call her Brookie the Cookie. We're all members of what we call, 'Team Cookie'. We raise funds for cystic fibrosis through lots of different means because she has suffered from cystic fibrosis since birth. She's eight years old now. We've been lucky that she's never had a bad episode and never been hospitalized, but because of her cystic fibrosis, she cannot get vaccinated. And if she were to get the flu, it would be deadly. So, it might be, you know, a few weeks of me being sick, but for Brooke it's a difference of life and death. And when I get myself vaccinated, I don't do it for me. I do it for those around me who are susceptible to those things. And I try to encourage everybody to always think of vaccinations in that way. So, I just wanted to say a thank you for bringing this Representative."

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

Evans: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Evans to close."

Evans: "Please support this patient protection Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Bill will vote

'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who

wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please

record yourselves, Members. Please record yourselves. Mr.

Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are

104 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having

received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared

passed. House Bill 4095, Mr. Harris. Mr. Clerk, please read

the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4095, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 4095 is in response to the massive credit breach, security breach by Equifax Credit Bureau that happened several months ago. As you may know, at the time, they believed that all the personal and financial information of 143 million Americans was accidentally exposed and you know, could have been stolen opening half the country to I.D. theft. Since then they've discovered another two and a half million more records were involved in that issue and at this point, 47 State's Attorney Generals and the Attorney General in Washington, D.C. are entering actions in court against the company. But that does nothing to protect Illinois citizens, right now, who are being obligated to go in freeze their credit in not only Equifax but the other credit bureaus to

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

protect themselves. The scale of this is massive. In the State Illinois, there were 5.6 million individuals whose information was compromised in this breach. According to the U.S. Census, there are only 4.5 million households in the United States. So, what these numbers tell us is that every single household in the State of Illinois could possibly be affected by this breach. What this legislation does is it prohibits the credit reporting agencies from charging Illinois residents to freeze their own financial information to protect their identity. And also, forbids the creditrating agencies from charging them to unfreeze their credit reports every time they need to have them unfrozen for the purpose of applying for a credit card, purchasing a car, taking out a student loan, applying for a mortgage on a house or any other credit transaction. And once that credit transaction was completed, the freeze would have to be put back in place, and at this point in time, there are fees charged to consumers for, you know, each one of those transactions. So, following the lead of a number of states who have already done this, I'd like Illinois to join these ranks... and there are states across the country who are also considering this... so that our population is not penalized over and over and over again for the misdeeds and the lack of security at the Equifax Corporation. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

Breen: "Thank you. Representative, I just want to make sure just for clarifying, this process of credit freezing is already in our statutes. We set it up as the General Assembly, correct?"

Harris: "Yes."

Breen: "Okay. And we're the ones who said, well, they could charge up to \$10 for that credit freeze, right?"

Harris: "Yes."

Breen: "So, now we're just saying, hey... and then we have plenty of exceptions we had already put into that \$10 fee, right?"

Harris: "There were certain exceptions for veterans and certain seniors. So, you know, we've always done this before, but that was absent every household in the State of Illinois being impacted."

Breen: "Right. And so now we're taking that fee to zero? I mean, we're... the credit agencies can still, you know, they're still making plenty of money off of your personal information and everything else. We're not closing down their businesses, we're just making sure the freezes now can be applied?"

Harris: "Yes. Representative, this year the credit rating agencies between them will be making \$10 billion, \$10 billion. So, you know, I don't think the \$10 fee is going to nick the bottom line too badly."

Breen: "Yeah."

Harris: "And I just want to thank you, by the way, and I meant to acknowledge that there was an Amendment to this legislation in committee where Leader Breen also pointed out that we needed to update the statute to allow Illinois residents to do all of the processing for the freezing and the unfreezing electronically as opposed to by mail. So..."

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

Breen: "Right."

Harris: "...thank you for that."

Breen: "Yeah. There was a requirement previously, you had to use certified mail, which I don't think anyone does anymore, so."

Harris: "Or... or pony express. We could have done that, yeah."

Breen: "Pony Express would've worked. Okay. Well, again and other states are doing this. I think even our neighbor Indiana and others are already taking this fee to zero. So, this... I very much support this Bill. I think it's a perfect thing. I think it's a good balance, particularly in light of all of the, I mean, not just the Equifax recent breach, but all of the breaches that continue to occur. Folks should have access to be... to able to freeze their credit report. So thank you for bringing this legislation."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris to close."

Harris: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? D'Amico, Fortner, Skillicorn. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 109 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Welter is recognized. For what reason do you rise, Sir?"

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

Speaker Lang: "You may proceed."

Welter: "Members, I would like you to please give a warm Springfield welcome to my three Pages that I have for the day

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

here in the well: Armann, Mason, and Pierce come to us from Plainfield, the 75th District. If you could please give them a round of applause. And their parents, Tony and Tasha, are up in the balcony as well. Thank you for bringing them."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome to the House chamber. Happy to have you here. Mr. Swanson is recognized."

Swanson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege." Speaker Lang: "Proceed, Sir."

Swanson: "Thank you, Sir. I'd like everyone to welcome my Page here for the day. Her name is MckKayla Bartkiewicz. She's a sophomore at Princeton High School. She's on the Golf and German Club. Her community activities include babysitting for high school teachers. Her special recognition is she was nominated for student of the month and also serves on Senator Chuck Weaver's Youth Advisory Club... Council. She's here today with her grandmother, Carol, who's up in the ... Carol Hubbard. I'd like to point out the special part of this young lady. If I could have everyone's attention. She... she is a Gold Star daughter. Her father was an active-duty Army solider, who paid the ultimate sacrifice in Operation Iraqi Freedom. And his name was Sergeant... or was Specialist Christopher Bartkiewicz and paid the ultimate sacrifice in September 2008 in Operation Iraqi Freedom. And if we could, I'd like the Body to take just a moment of silence in recognition of Specialist Christopher Bartkiewicz."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Swanson. And welcome to the House chamber. Thank you for joining us. Representative Kifowit is recognized."

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

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

Speaker Lang: "Proceed, please."

Kifowit: "Today I am honored to have with me Page for the day, Dylan, Mason, and Leah Frieders. The Frieders family, Joel and Julie, are up in the balcony, are on a mission to bring suicide awareness to every municipality in the State of Illinois including this chamber here, which we will vote on later on today. So, I want you to welcome them. And all of us that represent our municipalities are encouraged to reach out to them to pass a Resolution to bring suicide awareness front and center. So, I would like you to welcome them to the Capitol today."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Representative and welcome. Thank you for joining us. Mr. Brady."

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

Speaker Lang: "You may proceed."

Brady: "Thank you very much. I, too, would like to also welcome, from my district office who's interning this fall semester from Illinois State University, a junior, is Daniel Rauch. And Daniel is standing right up there, behind me or to the right. If you'd give him a nice Springfield welcome. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Happy you're with us today. Thank you, Mr. Brady.

And welcome to the chamber. Senate Bill 863 on page 3 of the

Calendar. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 863, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Chapa LaVia."

Chapa LaVia: "Thank you, Speaker. You're looking mighty fine today. I know you missed me. Amendment #1, which is added... it

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

was a gut and replacement. House Committee Amendment #1 would allow out-of-state applicants for Professional Education... Educators License to provide evidence of completed and a compatible state-approved educator preparation program as defined by the State Superintendent of Education. I'll take any questions."

- Speaker Lang: "There being no debate, those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Feigenholtz, Moeller, Wheeler. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. There are 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1262, on the Order of House Bills-Second Reading, Leader Currie. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1262, a Bill of an Act concerning education. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Currie."
- Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie on the Amendment."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. I wonder if I might amend the Bill and then discuss it on Third Reading?"
- Speaker Lang: "There being no objection, those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1262, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."

"Thank you Speaker and Members of the House. When we Currie: adopted the Education Funding Reform Bill earlier this season, Senate Bill 1947, we made some changes in the school waiver procedures and we also streamlined the process. I think we may have over streamlined because of the 45 or 50 waivers that we have seen this season, one of them, if not rejected by the state board or by us, could've resulted in increased property taxes. I don't think it was ever the intention, to the Members of this chamber, to say that we will allow school districts, willy-nilly, to have waivers that mean that how we've asked them to spend their money that they're able to ignore. In the case of the one that did appear this season, the state board did deny it, so it has come to us for approval or denial. All this measure would do, all House Bill 1262 as amended would do would be to say that if there's a chance of an increase in property taxes or if there is an absolute violation of the statutory authority over certain fund levels then that will automatically come back to the General Assembly, which is the way it's been during all the years we've had the school waiver process in place. This will not happen often. I think over the course of school waivers, I think it's only been perhaps 15, 16 times that school districts have sought this kind of change, but I think we want to nip it in the bud, and say, let us close the loophole, let's make sure that if we're talking about property tax increases then say will be ours rather than the state board's."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen."

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Breen: "Thank you... Representative... First, I'll move to Standard Debate."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Breen: "Thank you. Representative, I'm noticing your changes to the agreed Bill, Senate Bill 1947 that we recently passed. Was this Bill a process of negotiation between the Republicans and the Democrats?"

Currie: "It was, but I think what happened was..."

Breen: "Well, wait. But..."

Currie: "...when we made the changes to the procedures, nobody recognized that among the changes we made we also would affect situations in which a school district might decide to increase property taxes above the statutory rate. I don't..."

Breen: "And... and here's the problem though. But... but my colleagues are telling me there was no negotiation between Republicans and Democrats on this. This is not an agreed Bill the way that the education Bill was an agreed Bill that we went through the process. It was a lengthy process. And so, what you're talking about, some of the things that you're saying might be good points, but there are some things in here that are very much concerning. But the biggest concern is if we're going to do this, let's work together and put something together with due consideration instead of you guys ramming another Bill down to amend the Bill that we just fought over, the education Bill."

Currie: "Well, this Amendment came out of the House Education Curriculum Committee unanimously. I don't think anybody on

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

this floor wants a situation in which we are no longer in the oversight role of dealing with school districts that want to increase property taxes. I would think that you of all people would want to make sure that we're able, going forward, to see to it that these kinds of changes have to come before us for approval or denial."

Breen: "And here's the problem, Leader. Had you actually negotiated with us, I'm assuming we would've been glad to move this property tax part out, but like everything in Springfield, what you're saying the Bill about... is about is not what it's actually about. There are other provisions that you're also striking out, like the ability to use interfund transfers for districts that have too much in a transportation fund and not enough in an education or operations and maintenance fund. You're limiting the purposes..."

Currie: "Representative, they..."

Breen: "...of these funds."

Currie: "...they can do that and nothing in my... in my legislation changes that. Until 2020, districts are allowed to do that without having to come to us."

Breen: "Well, at least according to my analysis..."

Currie: "What my measure would cover is if you don't extend that sunset then after 2020 they would have to come to us."

Breen: "Well... well, Leader..."

Currie: "So, all we're touching are places where school districts might exceed statutory caps and increase property taxes. And I don't think it would behoove anybody on this House Floor to say we want to... we want to abdicate our responsibility to

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

make sure that school funding is done appropriately at the local level."

Breen: "And again, here's the problem. You've identified something that may be an issue, which sounds like it's an issue that we'd be glad to work with you on that I'm assuming the Senate would be glad to work with you on, and that I'm assuming the second floor would be glad to work with you on. The problem is you're just ramming the Bill down our throats right here today and there are some things in here... I... I don't know ... why not let them waive some of these revenue issues? As we know, they're getting a bunch of new money. That's going to change things up for school districts. Hopefully, that will reduce the number of waiver requests we get, but what you're putting forward here, it would be great to use as instead of slapping it onto a shell Bill and ramming it through in a day, we could negotiate it. Frankly, we could probably negotiate over the next two weeks and come back and deal with it at the end of the Veto Session."

Currie: "But remember that we're not denying anything under this measure and this measure was approved unanimously in the House Education Committee yesterday. All this does is provide that the General Assembly will continue to have oversight over these rare instances in which a school district is asking for the opportunity to up the property tax Bill without any kind of legislative oversight. So, I resist the idea that we're ramming anything through. I know that this has been discussed ever since we've seen the latest raft of waiver requests. And I would certainly encourage an 'aye' vote."

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

Breen: "I'll go to the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, we just had a massive, a difficult debate over education funding. If you were in this room and you voted for it, you voted for a structure that is in place and needs to be allowed to work. Or if it's going to be changed, it needs to be changed by agreement of the House Democrats, House Republicans, Senate Democrats, Senate Republicans, and the second floor. That's the way we do business. If you voted against the education funding reform then you weren't for any of this stuff in the first place, but I wasn't hearing any complaints by folks about the waiver relief. Parts of this... this was part of the mandate relief, was part we all kind of got together on and appreciated. It was one of the few things for my district that this education Bill did. So, I would respectfully request, reject this Bill; let's work on it. We can come back with an agreed solution, very quickly, if there's actually a need for it, which there may be. But please, vote 'no' today. Let's come back and do... let's stop playing the games with education, like we've been playing for years. Let's go back to that spirit of bipartisan compromise and please, reject this and let's go back to the drawing board. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Demmer."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Demmer: "Leader Currie, as was mentioned by my colleague, this is a relatively new process that we've established to allow for a streamlined treatment of waiver requests. Were you part of the discussion during the formulation of the education Bill

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

- about... about the... what should be included in this streamlined waiver process?"
- Currie: "Yes, although we did not have very specific discussion over all the… all the moving parts in the waiver process."
- Demmer: "So, these items that you're seeking to exempt from that process today, those weren't brought up during negotiations earlier in the year?"
- Currie: "We did not discuss this specific kind of situation during the negotiations on Senate Bill 1947. We since have seen a waiver request that should it had been granted by the state board would've... without our opportunity to say a word, would've meant a property tax increase in one of our Illinois communities. And that's all this measure does. This measure says, let's not allow that to happen, let's retain our oversight. Let's not abdicate our responsibility to be careful... careful overseers of the public purse."
- Demmer: "And you know, we both agree that that's an important thing, but I guess the reason for my question is, we stood together on this House Floor a month or two months ago and passed this significant piece of education reform. One of the pieces that I think had... drew support from both sides was the streamlining of this waiver process. One thing I know that drew the respect and the admiration of every Member of this General Assembly was the comprehensive bipartisan negotiation that led to that agreement on the House Floor. So, what I'm interested in today is given... given how productive that group was, given the fact that both our caucuses had Members who participated in that in good faith talks, who know these issues inside and out, why not take this idea back to that

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

group that worked so well the first time and acknowledge that look, when you passed this, when you came up with this agreement, these specific items didn't come up, but we think they warrant further consideration. Why not go back to that group that was so productive the first time?"

Currie: "Well, I would just say that we're talking about a very small number of instances in which a school district might request a waiver. If we don't close this loophole, my estimate is that you'll find large numbers of school districts asking for the authority on their own hook to raise your property taxes. I don't think we can wait to have that happen. And the fact that this was a unanimous vote in the House Education Committee led me to think that we are talking about a bipartisan concern that property taxes should not be raised at the local level, because a school board decides it wants to."

Demmer: "And... you know, I respect that point, but I would suggest that the fact that we just went through a significant process together, the fact that this is a brand new streamlined waiver process that we just set up, and now we've encountered maybe something that we should've considered earlier. I'd suggest that we should get back together with the folks who are subject matter experts on this. Have a little bit more discussion on this. This is... this kind of came... you know, came up quickly, on a process that's brand new, we haven't had a chance to see how this plays out. The other point I'd make, I think that in this waiver process, what was agreed to in the Bill a couple months ago, there still is a role for the General Assembly. If three of the Leaders object to the

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

waiver, the General Assembly still gets involved. So, we're not abdicating our responsibility as a General Assembly. In fact, that's a key component of those streamline process is that we retain the authority to intervene when necessary."

Currie: "Let me just point out that in the instance that... that just came up in the waiver requests, there was one in which three Leader caucuses did not agree that the measure should come to us and that's why we are here today. The state board did decide to deny that waiver and it is now before the General Assembly but not because of our oversight. I just think we don't want to risk that happening again, and that's why I think this measure is so important."

Demmer: "I appreciate that. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. Again, it's important that we recognize, we all stood together here in this House and gave respect and admiration to our colleagues, who worked so hard to put together a Comprehensive Education Reform Bill. This was a component of that that I think a lot of people thought was an innovative, unique approach, a proper function of the General Assembly to say there is a complicated waiver process in place. We should help streamline that for school districts. The General Assembly still has the ability to intervene in certain situations. Before we take... you know, make a change to a process that's only a couple of months old, we've barely seen this process work at all so far. We need to better understand what's involved. We need to send this back to the folks from both our caucuses, who have spent so much time working on this before we start to carve out exemption after exemption. We should look at the bigger picture and appreciate this for the entire Bill that it is.

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

I'd encourage further consideration on this before we take action. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reick."

Reick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. As one who yesterday sat in the committee and was one of the votes for it, I will say that this Bill did much the same as much of the legislation that we see in this Body is the fact that the first time I saw it was when I sat in the committee yesterday. I didn't have a real good chance to think about it. I think had I had the chance to think about it before the vote, I would've voted against it in committee for the reasons that have been so amply stated here. We have a Bill that was very, very contentiously and very thoroughly examined. We, again, the waiver process is one that I think everybody agreed was one of the ... one of the real shining points of the Bill, but now we find out that we're going to chip away and chip away and chip away and finally move ourselves back to what it was that we had before we signed the Bill. I fully support the notion of let's revisit this in the calm light of day with our separate caucuses allowing us to understand what is going to come up further. Not just this, but other things that are going to come up in 1947 that are going to result in legislation. This legislation, that legislation, some other legislation being passed or introduced to chip away at the ... at what it was that we tried to do to strengthen our education funding system in Illinois. I, for one, would be happy to provide more local control over levy over the levies of individual funds within a school district without us having to deal with this as a waiver. Transportation is over levied

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

and education and operations are under levied. Let the school boards deal with it. Let's make that instead of a waiver, let's just make that standard operating process... procedure for school boards themselves. We're giving them the money, let's let them choose how they choose to spend it. And this is just another means by which we're going to claw back control... to us, who've been proven to be completely ineffective at managing other people's money. Let's let the school districts manage their money in the best way they see fit, within the parameters of that which we're willing to give them. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Willis."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Willis: "Representative, I happen to be a member of the School Curriculum Committee where this came through. Were there any 'no' votes on that when we discussed it?"

Currie: "It was a unanimous 'yes' vote."

Willis: "Was there even any debate of any substance other than just clarification questions?"

Currie: "Just clarification. I think everybody in the committee yesterday agreed that we don't want to have an egregious loophole that if we don't close it now, may mean that we're stuck in this spring waiver process when other school districts decide that they want to come through and blow the caps, blow the statutory rate limitations, and raise property taxes."

Willis: "Okay. To the Bill. I happen to be a member of this committee that passed this Amendment unanimously out of

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

committee yesterday. We also are the committee that does the ... previously does all of the reviews of all of the waivers that come through. The majority of the waivers are simply for... I want to do three years of P.E. instead of four years or we want to switch around Drivers Ed. Those kind of things that really have no fiscal impact on the tax base on it. I think what the Representative has done, actually I know what the Representative has done, is made sure that we are making sure that if this is going to affect the local taxes that we look at it a little closer. This specifically came about because there was a waiver that both sides of this chamber, both the Republican and Democratic side of this chamber, put a flag on and said, this isn't right. But the Senate did not. And that's the problem. We only had two of the Legislative Leaders that looked at it and said, there is a problem. We need three under the old laws. And this is saying, look, you know what, maybe we were being a little bit too generous. I think this is a good piece of legislation. It's not going to bring us back to the ages where we have to look at every single type of waiver, but when there are waivers that are going to affect the tax base, which both sides of this chamber have agreed we want to protect and bring down. I urge an 'aye' vote and I move for a previous question. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

Ives: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. This is what happens when we do not do things in a thorough manner and when nothing is vetted. So, we passed major legislation, we passed a budget Bill now that we have to correct for multiple reasons. We passed a pension Bill that I just sat in Pension Committee,

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

and we took a vote on the House floor to fix that yesterday. And now we're looking at fixing a massive education-funding formula Bill that nobody knew the details of and now we're back here biting at it again. And let me tell you what's more depressing, the ink is barely... excuse me. I cannot even hear myself. The ink is barely dry on that Bill. And the Governor's Office of Management and Budget came out with their five-year forecast. And if you look at that forecast, you should notice that K through 12 education is only set to receive about \$200 million more each year. Well, according to the educationfunding formula, that... it's a requirement that you at least fund it for \$350 million per year or otherwise guess what, Tier 4 doesn't receive any new money, Tier 3 doesn't receive any more money, Tier 2 will get a diminished amount, Tier 1 will get filled first, and the biggest person in Tier 1 is Chicago. So, there you go. You pass a funding-formula Bill where the chief proponents of the Bill said, oh, the reason it didn't work in other states was because they never funded it completely. And when you look at the Governor's budget, it looks like that's not going to be funded completely either. So, the whole education funding formula is not going to go as planned. And this Bill is just one more representation of us not doing a thorough job when we're do... when we pass legislation in the first place. We have a big process problem in this Assembly and it needs to be corrected. And the nonsense needs to stop, and people need to take serious the legislation they put in place and instead of running all of these trailer Bills. I mean, we talked about trailer Bills yesterday, didn't we, on multiple Bills? Well, we're not

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

going... we're going to decrim now, right-to-work legislation. So, I think everybody should understand that the education funding Bill was never vetted well in the first place, and this is a perfect example. Simply vote 'no'. Vote 'no' not because the Bill is good or bad as it stands, vote no because the process is flawed and we don't know if the Bill is good or bad as it stands. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bourne."

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

Speaker Lang: "The Chair recognizes Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you. Please take the Bill out of the record.
We'll..."

Speaker Lang: "The Bill will removed from the record."

Currie: "...get back to this in the future."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, Rules Report."

Clerk Bolin: "Committee Reports. Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on October 26, 2017: recommends be adopted Floor Amendment #2 for House Bill 1023."

Speaker Lang: "Page 7 of the Calendar. Order of Resolutions.

HJR82, Mr. Crespo."

Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. Yeah, it's just... I request that we suspend the one-hour consideration for House Joint Resolution 82."

Speaker Lang: "I understand that's... it's agreed to with both sides of the aisle? And you have an Amendment, Sir. Please proceed on your Amendment."

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

- Crespo: "Yeah, I have an Amendment which is essentially the waiver request. And it's... House Joint Resolution 82 as amended denies Zion's District 6 elementary's waiver request."
- Speaker Lang: "Those who support the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. They 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted.

 Please proceed on the Resolution as... as amended."
- Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. First, would like to state that the request was made before the passage of Senate Bill 1947. It... Zion is requesting two waivers: one is a waiver to exceed the maximum statutory tax rates for their educational operations and maintenance and transportation funds. Senate Bill 1947 already allows PTELL cap districts to exceed their maximum educational levy so long as the district remains below the overall PTELL cap which applies to Zion. They are also requesting... a waiver to transfer funds between their educational, maintenance, and operations, and transportation funds as well. However, the current legislation already allows districts to do this until 2020. I should also add that Zion under the evidence-based model would be a Tier 1 school. And they are scheduled to get anywhere around 6 hundred to \$620 per pupil. And now to be very clear, voting 'yes' on House Joint Resolution 82 indicates support for denying Zion's waiver request. Voting 'no' on the Resolution disapproves of the denying the request. Happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

Breen: "Representative, just so that we're clear, this particular school district is... has asked to move funds around when they really, even in their own waiver request, they acknowledged they may not even need the flexibility to move the funds around?"

Crespo: "Correct."

Breen: "Okay. And so, voting 'yes' here is helping the people of that school district ensuring that their tax dollars are best used, especially in light of the new money that's going to come in with the new education Bill. Correct?"

Crespo: "Right."

Breen: "Thank you. To the Bill. This is... to the Resolution, very good Resolution. Something that, again, I think should have bipartisan support. The district doesn't need the flexibility and pretty much no one is supporting their waiver. So, folks, voting 'yes' is the right vote here. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Jesiel."

Jesiel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to... to the Bill. Just wanted to address this waiver request, real briefly, to clarify. Zion District 6 has had a waiver for five years that's requesting a transfer from their transportation fund to cover their education costs. They put in the waiver before the passage of 1947 in which the EBM is giving them approximately 1.6 million new dollars. So, there's a question of whether the transportation fund transfer is even necessary or required at this point. So, we requested a denial of the waiver until they start to receive the new state money under EBM, so that they can see if they actually need the transfer. They understand this. They're aware that they can reapply. So

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

we're going to give them just a little bit of time to see how the new money affects their request, and they'll have an opportunity to come back and apply in the spring. So, I support this waiver and I request an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Crespo to close."

Crespo: "Yes. I request an 'aye' vote, please. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution will vote 'yes'; opposed vote '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. There are 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the Resolution is adopted. Page 8 of the Calendar, House Resolution 590. Representative Kifowit."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Resolution came as an Kifowit: initiative from the Frieders family, as I mentioned earlier. It's profound to lose somebody to close to you. It's profound to lose that individual from suicide. And this Resolution, and I'll read a part of it, is to keep individuals talking about suicide. It ... this goes under the radar, it's not talked about. It's not embraced and we need to start talking, reaching out, and making sure that we prevent just one suicide. As you know I was in charge of the Veterans Suicide Force. So... this House Resolution... September designated National Suicide Prevention Awareness Month, so we have to come together collectively to talk about this topic. Suicidal thoughts can affect anyone regardless of age, gender, or background. Although it should not be considered normal and it is a serious issue, local and national organizations, like Suicide Prevention Services, are working diligently every day to address it. And everyone is encouraged

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

to take time to inspire as to the wellbeing of their family, friends, and neighbors. Just to point out, whether people think this is an issue or not, in Illinois twice as many people die from suicide annually than by homicide. Twice as many people annually by suicide than by homicide. Suicide is the leading cause of death for ages 10 to 14 and the third leading cause of death for ages 15 to 24, affects all ages. So, again, I ask for all members to be added as cosponsors of this Resolution. And I ask for your support."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Chapa LaVia."

Chapa LaVia: "Thank you, Speaker. You know I'm kind of ashamed while Representative Kifowit is talking about suicide that there's so much talking going on. And I bet if I asked you if you have been related or have somebody in your community that has died of suicide, it's overwhelming. So, this is a very important, important topic that she's covering. So, I wish that a Body would give her the respect because she's speaking for people that have died. She is speaking for young people in our districts: nine year old, 10 year old, 21, 23, 53, every age you can think of, feeling helpless that they have to take their life. And as a... as a community, as we sit here and we love each other, there's nothing more important than making sure we bring this to the light that people understand it's okay to have these feelings and how we help them, so they can stay alive. 'Cause it doesn't just affect the person that dies, it's everybody in the community. So, I want to thank, not only Alderman Frieders for bringing this forward, for Representative Kifowit, for the bravery that she has shown over the years not only in veterans' suicide, but taking this

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

to another level. So, I want to thank you for your attention to this. We're talking about life that's gone too quickly and we could do something about it. So, thank you Representative and thank you, Body, for listening."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Long."

Long: "Thank you, Speaker. To the Resolution. I do also support this. I deal with a lot of veterans in my community and I've known many people who have felt the loss of a loved one. And PTSD being a major issue in the United States today, that's a big driver behind suicide. And I do support this, I encourage everybody to support this, too. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Butler."

Butler: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, to the Resolution. And to thank Representative Kifowit. And Representative Chapa LaVia is tremendously correct. This is a.m. this is a large issue for many people. And as... as Stephanie said, we have twice as many people who die by suicide in our state as we do from homicide. The number one demographic for suicides is middle-aged white male actually. And three quarters of those who actually die by suicide are male. It's an issue for my demographic, it's an issue for all demographics, and it's something that we should pay attention to. There's an organization, the Suicide Prevention Organization, had a great walk here in Springfield just a couple weeks ago, 'Out of the Darkness Walk'. And we had hundreds and hundreds of people that showed up who were family and survivors of suicide victims. So, thank you to Representative Kifowit for this Resolution. It's certainly something that we need to talk about and I appreciate the fact that you brought this forward."

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

Speaker Lang: "Representative Finnie."

Finnie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to stand and thank Representative Kifowit for bringing this as well. As a Nurse Practitioner, I see kids daily in our school health center, who are struggling in so many ways, and oftentimes they divulge to me that they are suicidal. And it is heartbreaking, and so I thank all of those who are in support of this. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Kifowit has moved that all Members of the House be added as cosponsors. Is there leave? Leave is granted. All Members will be added as cosponsors. Those in favor of the Resolution will say 'yes'; opposed 'no', the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. Thank you, Representative. House Resolution 544, Representative Fine. Please proceed."

Fine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Resolution urges Congress to reduce military spending and use that money for human and environmental needs. Polling finds that the public favors a \$41 billion reduction in military spending and that's about a \$94 billion gap from the President's current proposal. Even if fractions of this spending were put into human services or the environment, we could use that money to do things like providing free education for K through college, working on ending hunger and starvation, and making sure that we have clean drinking water. I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives on the Resolution."

Ives: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I stand strongly opposed to such a Resolution as presented by Representative Fine. I am sure that there are plenty more things that we should opine on

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

rather than federal military spending. And as a mother of two who are serving the military right now, I tell you... I can tell you first-hand conversations about the lack of funds available for them to fix their vehicles and fly in planes that are safe. In fact, I'm offended by this Resolution, quite frankly. I just had a phone conversation with my son stationed up Alaska, where they did a field problem, where it's now already zero degrees, and only one of his striker units... vehicles even had heat. That striker unit alone costs about \$5 million per unit. They need to deploy within a six-day time frame to get to wherever they're... they are needed in the world. This is not the horse and solider scenario. This is not the Browning machine gun of the Civil War. This is not the very beginning of tanks in World War I. These are sophisticated machines that take a lot of money. Maybe we should talk about my other son, who is in Navy Pilot training down in Corpus Christie, Texas, where the planes that he is expected to fly cost \$176 million apiece. And where they actually suspended training... they have suspended training to some degree for flying the Navy jets due to oxygen issues in the trainers. Where people... where pilots were losing consciousness due to faulty oxygen systems. That needs to be fixed and that takes real money. The last thing I would want is my son training in a plane that is unfit and putting his life in danger even the military training is dangerous. Day in and day out the military sacrifices their lives, whether it's in training or on the battlefield. And that costs a lot of money to make it happen. And maybe somebody who sits and legislates in the worst run state in the union should not

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

opine on federal military spending, especially when people that they care about are not at risk. I absolutely insist on Roll Call Vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ammons."

Ammons: "Thank you, Mr... I'm just so thrown off I don't even know what to call you right now. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Resolution. I appreciate the sentiments that were just expressed, but the one thing that we have to start taking responsibility for... my brother who served 20 years in the Marines and just recently retired. Most of the money that is spent by the Pentagon is actually not going to the service men and women. Let me say that again. Most of the money in that over-bloated Pentagon budget does not go to the men and women in uniform. And secondly, this country needs to call for a complete audit of the Pentagon and all of the money that is going to paper clips and all of the things that they spend the money on in the Pentagon that has been revealed, and there are national Resolutions calling for an audit of the Pentagon, because we know that most of the money is not going to the men and women in uniform. If I were... had the opportunity to put up where the money goes, we would not make the statements that we make in this chamber. So we use carefully and conveniently, the soldiers as our excuse for not drilling deeply into what is happening with the money in this country. And then, at the same time, we wonder why we don't have money going from the Federal Government to critical needed infrastructure in this country because most of the money in the Federal system is going to the Pentagon. So, we should not stand on a Resolution that is calling for the

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

assistance of the Federal Government to help us in our states to improve our infrastructure, to improve needed safety-net programs. And by the way, this Federal Government is also talking about reducing benefits for Social Security and seniors. So, this is a great time, Representative, for this Resolution and I stand in full support of, not only the Resolution, but we... and I will pass an additional Resolution in this chamber to call for a complete audit of the Pentagon."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Swanson."

Swanson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Before I comment, I just wanted to verify that a recorded vote was requested earlier and that we will have..."

Speaker Lang: "There will be a Roll Call vote, Sir."

Swanson: "Okay. Thank you. I'd like to begin my comments with... I went through a time in the military when our motto was 'do more with less'. And that is a challenge when you try to go to training and you don't have enough fuel for your vehicles. Or when you go to do a military operations and you don't have the equipment needed to do that operation because, oh by the way, there's no funding for training to fight a war. And that's what we're facing again today is, is lacking money for individuals to go to school, lacking funding for basic military training, basic skills to prepare for war. And if you read the headlines and see the newspaper, there are people out there that don't like us. There's countries out there that don't like the way we... the U.S. lives, and would surely find having a weak military a starting point to impose their will on us. I believe in the response to the question about pay, I believe over 25 percent of the Department of Defense

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

budget goes to paying our soldiers. And on top of that, there's even more for compensation and benefits for our military families. And we talk about cutting the military... we're also considering those families. It's those family members that stand behind that soldier, that Marine, that Air Force or that sailor. So, we talk about cutting our defenses, we're not only hurting the soldiers, but we're also talking about cutting those of their families. So, there is part of that budget that does go to the social services of supporting our military. I stand very much opposed to this type of Resolution. I think the Resolution does more harm to our country than it does good. And for that, I would ask for a 'no' vote on the Resolution. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Ladies and Gentlemen, we're moving to a two-minute clock. Mr. Davidsmeyer."

Davidsmeyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to clarify something earlier... to the Resolution. Somebody said that we spend more on military than we do on the other things. We're spending 16 percent on military, 27 percent on Medicare and health, 33 percent on Social Security, Unemployment, and Labor. So, I just want to clarify that... you know, the military spending is not the majority of the federal budget. The other thing I want to look at... everyone to look at is we get these nice little calendars every day. The description... the description of this Resolution, all it says is, urges the United States Congress to move our tax dollars in exactly the opposite direction proposed by the President. This is a purely political Bill. Right? If the President was doing exactly what you want, would you file the opposite Bill to change

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

that... or opposite Resolution to change this? This is purely politics and it's ridiculous. We shouldn't be wasting our time on stuff like this. I urge a 'no' vote."

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

Harris, D.: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to echo the... the words of the previous speaker in terms of the specifics of the Resolution. But, you know, the 34th President of the United States, Dwight Eisenhower, said in his farewell address that there is an industrial military complex that is taking hold in the United States. And there is one, and it's true. And we have to have the latest and greatest aircraft carrier, the latest and greatest airplane, and the latest and greatest tank, and they're expensive. And the defense contractors make a lot of money off of that. And we probably do spend too much on the defense, but is... it determines on how you say, too much. You know what, the defense of our country, if you read the Constitution, is the primary... the primary goal of this country. And, if you look at the Resolution as was just stated by the previous speaker, it doesn't say just spend a little bit less on the military it says, urges the United States Congress to move our tax dollars in exactly the opposite direction proposed by the President. Doesn't say cut back, it says do a complete reversal. Is that what you want? Is that what you want? Not to support the soldiers, the sailors, and the airmen that are defending our freedom. Is that what you want? I don't think so. I think you want to vote 'no' on this one."

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

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

Skillicorn: "To the Resolution, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure we can find waste, fraud, and abuse in the Federal Government. There's plenty of areas that we can cut, but I know I'm an elected Illinois Legislator. And I think that we should spend more of our time looking at Illinois finances. So, I'm going to call right now that this Body of 118 Members, we should call out for a forensic audit of Illinois finances that would be where our time would be best served. Thanks."

Speaker Lang: "Chair recognizes Representative Fine."

Fine: "I'd like to pull this from the record, please."

Speaker Lang: "Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. House Resolution 587, Representative Hernandez. Representative Hernandez."

Hernandez: "Thank you, Speaker. I am asking if... for support for House Resolution 587. The Resolution essentially is a response to the Trump and Attorney General Sessions ending of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals also known as DACA. If you recall yesterday, I, in a point of personal privilege, I presented a young lady, Carina Espenosa, who was a pager for the day, who is a student here at the University of Springfield, who is trying to complete her Master's Degree, who currently is working in the DeWitt Department as a DACA student. She's an example of many of the 41 thousand DACA students in the State of Illinois. She is an example of a student who has been vetted through the Federal system, of being the right person to be here, to be an example of a citizen here in this state, mind you, the nation. All I'm asking here is that, as a state, we recognize that the Defer Action for Childhood Arrivals is an important program. It's important for our nation. If we are to continue to thrive

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

economically with the talent of these educated students, let's back up, let's support a system that is working on behalf of an issue that has been around for years and that needs... needs reform, needs a way to bring... a way, a pathway for these students to remain. Because this is their country. I take a look and please, please listen. Think about the young lady that was standing next to me yesterday, Carina. Because let me tell you, this is a catch 22 for these young people. She gave all her information, she risked it all. Because really, where she put herself is, accept me, or send me back. That young lady came here at the age of 11. At her... it was at no fault of her own. I think as Legislators, as people in position that can really make some real change for the lives of many good people here in the State of Illinois, I'm asking you to think to remember her. This is the kind of individual we want to keep here in our nation especially in the State of Illinois. I ask to please support House Resolution 587. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution will say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 592, Mr. Ford."

Ford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. 592 urges Governor Rauner to declare a State of Emergency in Illinois due to the heroin crisis and urges the Director of the Public Health to create a comprehensive plan to combat heroin and urges the State of Illinois to fully fund the crisis... Heroin Crisis Act. I have to give the Governor some credit on his opioid listening tour. I've been on some of the listening tours and I think it's an excellent task that he's done. But

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

the fact remains, heroin is an opioid, but we have to make sure that we focus clearly on the heroin crisis. So, House Resolution 592 states that the State of Illinois experiencing a heroin crisis and that the crisis particularly acute on the west side of Chicago. The Resolution highlights that Chicago's African-American population is disproportionately affected by heroin overdoses. And points out that conventionally, the heroin epidemic has been treated as a crime issue rather than a public health crisis. I want it to be known that on the west side of Chicago, one in four overdoses take place out of all of the state's overdoses in the State of Illinois. One in four happens on the west side of Chicago. So, I want to thank the Governor for his opioid tour that he started, but we can't forget that heroin is a crisis that's impacting every community. And we can't leave heroin out of the conversation. So, I urge everyone to vote 'aye' for HR592."

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution... excuse me, Leader Currie is recognized."
- Currie: "Please excuse Representative DeLuca for the remainder of the day."
- Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Representative. House Resolution 595, Representative Bellock."
- Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. And House Resolution 595 follows up to what Representative Kifowit had. And what this Resolution does is recognize Mental Illness Awareness week in Illinois, October 1 to the 7th. Just a few comments because she covered it so well about suicide, but several

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

years ago the Surgeon General of the United States said one out of every six adults in the United States, would suffer some form of mental illness in a year. Now NAMI has come forward to say it's now one out of every five adults will suffer some form of mental illness within a year. And one out of every five young adults will have a mental health encounter in a year. So, this Resolution is here just to raise the awareness, talk about the stigma of mental health and also above all to achieve parity of which we have voted on parity Bills in Illinois, but to recognize that parity in mental health is as important as physical illness versus mental illness. They are the same and they should always achieve parity. Thank you very much for your support."

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no', the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 602, Representative Jimenez."
- Jimenez: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Resolution 602 endorses the American Kennel Club's K9 Good Citizen Program and supports its efforts to promote responsible dog ownership in the State of Illinois."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 605, Representative Gabel."
- Gabel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Resolution talks about the importance of direct service professionals, which we have heard quite a bit about. They are the people who help folks with disabilities live full lives. They come to their homes, they take care of them, they get them dressed and ready to go out, so... so people with severe disabilities can work and

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

- contribute to society. This is... this Resolution just supports them and honors them for Professionals' Week."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 610, Mr. Martwick."
- Martwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Resolution 610 honors the culture of the Polish Highlanders, who make up a large portion of the Polish-American community in Chicago by declaring October 22, 2017 as Polish Highlander Day. I ask for a favorable vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 522, Mr. Riley."
- Riley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Resolution 522 essentially authorizes the attorney... the Auditor General to immediately conduct a performance audit of the procurement administration of the contract with Morneau Shepell. Many of you know, when we passed... which was really a landmark procurement Bill, right after there was this controversy about a Georgia company, Morneau Shepell, who had a contract to come up with a health care portal. Not only were there problems with the portal, there were problems with how that contract essentially was let. There were a lot of things that were questionable about that letting. One of which was the obviating the BEP requirements that the contract would have been under. And so, we just want to be sure, in the era of sense of transparency, plus continuing the march to do the right thing as far as procurement is concerned, giving everyone a fair shake to do business with the state to have

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

the Auditor General to execute an immediate performance audit of Morneau Shepell."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wehrli."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Wehrli: "Can you please tell me what actual expertise our current Auditor General has to do audits? Is he qualified to do audits?"

Riley: "Well, I think he's qualified to do audits. But whether the person is qualified or not qualified that is what the Office of the Auditor General does."

Wehrli: "Is our current Auditor General under Federal investigation, right now?"

Riley: "I'm requesting the Office of the Auditor General to execute the performance audit of Morneau Shepell."

Wehrli: "To the Resolution. My point is, is we currently have an Auditor General that has no experience in doing this other than his legislative duties when he was a State Representative. He is currently under Federal investigation for many things. And I just find ironic that we're trying to run a state here when have no fiscal oversight out of our watchdog, the Auditor General."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Batinick."

Batinick: "I'm going to go straight to the Resolution. I think it's a well-intended Resolution, but I'm going to let you know about my experience Tuesday morning. We had an audit of the NRI program. So, NRI was at, I believe the VPA, and a lot of scandals, so we sent it to ICJIA, Illinois Criminal Justice Information Association. Guess what, there are still more

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

scandals. But we audited again. There was one Democrat that chose to sit through the presentation. Somebody... we all, all 118 of us, should've watched and listened to that audit and the waste of money. And you wonder why on our side of the aisle, we're skeptical about all of these programs. And we need this, it's violence prevention. Tens of millions of dollars appear to have been wasted fighting violence prevention and what's happened in violence in this state over the last couple of years. So we're going to do an audit, it's probably a good thing. Is anybody going to show up to read it? And when there is an audit, and when ICJIA says to the auditors, the Governor's Office of the former administration told us not to follow the Federal regulations we normally follow. Is the auditor just going to accept that, as an answer? To me the obvious answer is, who at the Governor's Office? So, we have an Auditor General that's auditing friends of his, associates, who were on the board of ICJIA and were not asking the hard questions of where the waste of money is going. So, I'm not trying to down this Bill at all 'cause it's probably something good to audit, but maybe if we're going to audit it: 1) We should have somebody that actually wants to find out what the tough answers are and ask the tough questions. And 2) Maybe we should all attend the hearing and listen to what's uncovered in those audits. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Riley, to close."

Riley: "Thank you for the discussion. However, we have an Auditor General Office in this state that is charged with certain responsibilities. Everybody's entitled to their opinion, but essentially personalizing what is really an issue with regard

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

- to how a contract is let, sort of diminishes how important this is. Again, we passed the procurement Bill, unanimously. One of the things that I said was that, looking at how we do business in this state is not just going to be a 1.0. It's going to be a 2.0, 3.0, it's a work in progress. And that is what this is. This is a follow up on the good work that we did, plain and simple, nothing more, nothing less. Thank you for your support."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution will vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Zalewski. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 106 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the Resolution is adopted. Mr. Demmer is recognized."
- Demmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please let the record reflect that Representative Olsen is excused for the day."
- Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Sir. Supplemental Calendar number 1,

 House Bills-Second Reading. House Bill 4096, Mr. Harris.

 Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4096, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Senate Bills-Second Reading. Senate Bill 1667, Mr. Martwick. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1667, a Bill for an Act concerning... a
 Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this
 Senate Bill. No Amendments were adopted in committee. No Floor
 Amendments. No Motions are filed."

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Page 2 of the Calendar, House Bills-Second Reading. House Bill 4117, Mr. Moylan. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4117, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. The Bill was read for a second time, on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4117, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Moylan."

Movlan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the General Assembly. On the night of October 1, 2017, a gunman in Las Vegas used over-the-counter modification, known as bump stocks, to turn an arsenal of semi-automatic, military-style assault weapons into even deadlier, fully-automatic weapons capable of firing up to 800 bullets in a minute. He used these weapons to murder 58 innocent Americans. Today, we take a first step towards better protecting our loved ones and preventing this horrific crime from happening in Illinois. I am sponsoring House Bill 4117 to ban these dangerous bump stocks and other trigger devices. My measure also closes loophole by requiring purchasing pre-packaged explosive compounds to possess a Firearm Owner Identification Card. The Las Vegas shooter possessed 50 pounds of Tannerite and the FBI has warned, since 2013, about its potential use to make homemade bombs. I understand some gun advocates are claiming this measure is nothing more than a gun grab. They are wrong.

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

My measure will help save lives and reduce the destructive power of military assault-style weapons."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Costello."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Costello: "First, Marty, I'd like to get the Body's attention because I don't view this... I personally don't view this as a bump stock ban. I think this, in fact, is a possible ban on maybe 40 to 50 percent of guns in the State of Illinois. Of the 2.2 million FOID card holders in the state, I believe this could possibly affect 40 to 50 percent of the guns that they own. Secondly, you have two different Bills, Marty. So, this is your bump stock Bill, what's the other Bill?"

Moylan: "The other Bill, I'm not calling today, that's the one that bans assault rifles and .50 caliber sniper rifles."

Costello: "Okay, so this is what you... you call a bump stock ban?" Moylan: "Correct."

Costello: "If we go to page..."

Moylan: "And it also requires that if you're going to purchase tannerite to have a FOID card."

Costello: "Okay. If we go to page 22 of your Bill and you look at the words, any part or combination of parts designed or intended to accelerate the rate of fire of a firearm. Does this apply to semi-autos or does it apply to all guns?"

Moylan: "It applies to all weapons. Now wait, this Bill bans any modification device that allows an individual to accelerate the rate of firearm... of fire... of their firearm. Devices that turn legal guns into things that are like machine guns. So yes, this Bill goes beyond bump stocks..."

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

Costello: "The words in black and white, Marty, are accelerate the rate of fire. Does this apply to any gun or only semi-automatics?"

Moylan: "Both."

Costello: "Excuse me?"

Moylan: "Both. B-O-T-H."

Costello: "All guns? Correct."

Moylan: "Both."

Costello: "So this applies to shotguns. It applies to bolt-action rifles. It applies to pistols. It applies to revolvers.

Correct?"

Moylan: "Correct."

Costello: "So, any modification that's done, to accelerate the rate of fire results in a Class II felony, correct?"

Movlan: "Correct."

Costello: "And a Class II felony is 3 to 7 years in prison and a 25 thousand dollar fine. It's equivalent to arson, is that correct?"

Moylan: "Correct."

Costello: "So, where in your Bill is there an exemption for law enforcement?"

Moylan: "There is a law... there is an exemption for law enforcement."

Costello: "Show me in your Bill where that exemption is."

Moylan: "It's in the same section as the machine gun section."

Costello: "So, read that to me."

Moylan: "Jeopardy music playing."

Costello: "Well, while you're doing this, I'll just tell you a similar Bill was passed out of the House in the State of

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

Massachusetts, passed with over 150 votes. And in the Senate, all hell broke loose because the Sheriffs' Association, the Chiefs of Police, and their State Police found that in that language there were not law enforcement exemptions. Your Bill is very similar to that language and I don't believe there's an exemption for law enforcement in your Bill."

Moylan: "You're wrong."

Costello: "Well, then read me the language."

Moylan: "Subsection I(5), the same as the machine gun exemption."

Costello: "Marty, this isn't..."

Moylan: "Excuse me..."

Costello: "...the same as machine gun. This is anything that accelerates the rate of fire."

Moylan: "...when it listed the exemption, the trigger modification ban is put in the same section as the machine gun section. So the exemption for the machine guns also applies to bump stocks."

Costello: "I would argue, I don't believe the language is there.

This isn't about legislative intent. I don't think that language is in your Bill. Secondly... so, if we move on from there..."

Moylan: "No, we're not going to move on because I say that you're wrong. Now, we'll move on."

Costello: "Okay. Well, again let's point to language, because for me, being a past police officer, I believe exemptions fall under 24-2, which I don't see that in this particular Bill. So, moving on to competitive shooting, like the World Shooting Complex, I've got the World Shooting Complex, in Sparta. It's a 24 million dollar annual economic impact. These are

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

competitive shooters. Every trigger of every gun used in these competition shoots in some way shape or form has been modified. So that would be outlawed, correct?"

Moylan: "Anything that accelerates the rate of fire will be banned."

Costello: "So, competition shooting in the World Shooting Complex, which is a 24 million dollar annual economic impact to downstate Illinois, those guns would be illegal, correct?"

Moylan: "There's nothing that bans after-market trigger devices that are legal."

Costello: "Marty, that is..."

Moylan: "Only if they accelerate."

Costello: "...that is totally incorrect. Okay? Anything that accelerates the rate of fire. That could be a spring. Anything in a trigger mechanism that accelerates the rate of fire. It does, your Bill, absolutely applies to competition shooting in the State of Illinois. So after that, hunting weapons. I believe that possibly 40 to 50 percent of hunting weapons could fall into this scenario. I've got about, probably, 50 to 60 guns, myself. Use them for a number of different varieties of hunting. I can tell you that probably 40 percent of the guns I own would fall into this Bill. I use them for hunting, hunting only. I have a major issue with that. So what about people of a lesser stature, who have to pull a lesser trigger pound to be accurate? For example, a larger man may have a seven-pound trigger pull to be accurate, while someone of smaller stature may need a four-pound trigger pull to be accurate. Because I know in concealed carry one of the

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

- things we're worried about is making sure people are accurate."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Costello, your time has expired. Perhaps someone will give you some time? Mr. Beiser will give you an additional five minutes."
- Moylan: "I don't believe that it'll affect the weight of the trigger."
- Costello: "But affecting the weight of a trigger, Marty, that is how you would accelerate the speed of fire. So, I do believe that your Bill would cover that. You disagree?"
- Moylan: "Yes, I disagree."
- Costello: "Okay. So, used guns. If someone inherits a gun from their grandfather, how do you know whether the action... the trigger mechanism on that gun has or has not been at some point in time tampered with, there hasn't been a trigger job done? If you get a gun from your great-grandfather, wherein here is there a grandfather clause that says those guns would not be a Class II felony to own?"
- Moylan: "My Bill affects anything that affects the rate of fire of a single-action firearm, anything that accelerates the rate. So, if that..."
- Costello: "So, you're not answering my question, Marty. The question is, if you inherit... just give me a second to talk here."
- Moylan: "Okay."
- Costello: "If you inherit a gun, okay, and say this gun's 20 years old and 15 years ago, your grandfather had a... springs replaced on the gun, which made the gun accelerate in firing. Is that gun a Class II felony to possess?"

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

Moylan: "Whether your gun is 10 years old or 100 years old..."

Costello: "So you're saying, yes, if you inherit a gun, from some...
a family member, could be 20 years ago, that that gun is a
Class II felony to possess. How does somebody. in the State
of Illinois who has inherited this, how do they know if they
are, in fact, in possession of something that makes them
guilty of a Class II felony?"

Moylan: "Well, if you let answer the question, I will explain to you. Whether your gun is five years or 100 years old, any device that modifies the trigger action to make it rapidly fire will be banned. And there will penalties subsequent with the crime."

Costello: "And Marty, I thank you for the answer 'cause you're making my point."

Moylan: "Thank you."

Costello: "So secondly, along with that, if a gun shop, we all have a number of small businesses in our districts, many of us have gun shops in the districts. If those shops would take a gun in on trade or you know they buy a used gun off somebody, how do they know that those guns have not had some type of trigger job done, some springs replaced, you know, anything to that point?"

Moylan: "Well, if you're a gun shop owner or a gun shop, you certainly know what kind of mechanism you're taking in for trade. Any qualified gunsmith would know that."

Costello: "Marty, you're wrong."

Moylan: "No, I'm not wrong."

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

Costello: "And I appreciate the answer, but you're wrong. You can't just look at a trigger device and tell if there have been pieces or parts replaced..."

Moylan: "Well let me just tell you this."

Costello: "...so I would disagree with you."

Moylan: "Well, I disagree with you. But let me just tell you this. If I'm the owner of a gun shop and I got guns coming in, I'm going to certainly know what's in that gun and what the mechanisms are. So, you show me any reliable gun shop owner that takes a gun in... in as trade and doesn't know what he's selling, he's an unreliable gun shop owner."

Costello: "I appreciate your enthusiasm, but I disagree with you."

Moylan: "Right. And the statute requires, knowingly. And I will

spell that out if you need it."

Costello: "Okay and so, we can argue about knowing, but I would argue that that's a tricky slope. I would argue to the people of this Body... the Members of this Body that I believe that this particular Bill covers 40 percent of guns... 40 to 50 percent of guns owned by law-abiding citizens in the State of Illinois. Guns that are used for hunting, guns that are used for competition purposes. I also personally believe, I do not see in black and white where there is an exemption for law enforcement. If somebody in the Body can see that, read it, and they believe there is, do it for yourselves. I don't believe that that exemption is clear, in this particular Bill. So, I have a number of issues, but this is the most glaring issue that I have with the Bill. I would encourage a 'no' vote. And should the Bill receive the proper number of votes to pass, I would ask for a verification."

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

Speaker Lang: "Your request is acknowledged. Rep... excuse me.

Representative Demmer"

Demmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please let the record reflect that Representative Winger is excused."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Sir. Representative Bryant."

Bryant: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's kind of tough to follow my colleague from... who represents Sparta. Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Bryant: "Thank you. I want to speak to the Bill. I don't have any questions for the Sponsor, but I just want to reiterate a couple things that my... that the previous speaker said. He said that this could actually affect 40 to 50 percent, I think he is being very generous to say 40 or 50 percent. It probably includes a whole lot more than that. One of the other things, in this... the Bill, if it were only about bump stocks... Representative Wheeler's Bill, 4120, is much more narrowly crafted and actually could possibly take up what the intent of the Sponsor of this Bill wants to do. And that is to find some way to modify some of the terrible things that we saw in Las Vegas, but the problem is that some of the language that goes with the ... banning bump stocks, only talks about it ... being a novelty item. But we do have to also recognize that bump stocks and modifications are often used for citizens who have disabilities and so, we have to remember that it isn't just a novelty item. This piece of legislation, although it may not be the intent of the Sponsor, would also control common gun-smithing items, such as triggers, springs, slides, firing pins, bolts, buffers, muzzle breaks, and we could go on and on and on. So, it isn't ... it isn't just about bump stocks, it

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

isn't just about Tannerite. It's about whether law-abiding citizens have the right to own firearms. And then if they can make modifications to them, of a reasonable nature, or otherwise, and... this is, this Bill, no matter what the Sponsor's intention is, is far-reaching. It's too wide, too broad. Any time we're going to touch anything that has to do with a Constitutional right, it should be crafted very narrowly, so that we make that we make sure that we're not infringing on someone's Second Amendment right. This Bill goes way, way, way too far and I think the Body needs to recognize that and again remember that bump stocks are not just about how fast can we fire this, it's also about whether or not someone who has a disability is able to actually use a firearm. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Skillicorn."

Skillicorn: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Skillicorn: "Representative, I occasionally shoot in competitions, typically IDPA timed competition where we try to shoot targets and we're timed and the person with the highest accuracy and the fastest time wins. If I took one of my weapons to a gunsmith and said, hey, I want to do this trigger modification, I want to put a buffer in there, I want to change something with the recoil, would that... would I be in violation of the Bill?"

Moylan: "Again... again, this Bill does nothing... addresses nothing... that are... that has legal trigger modifications. So, if you are installing a legal trigger modification, that's acceptable."

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

Skillicorn: "That sounds vague to me. Does that sound vague to you?"

Moylan: "No, read the Bill. It only affects... it only prohibits modification devices which accelerate the rate of fire of that... of a machine gun."

Skillicorn: "So, I have the Bill in front of me here."

Moylan: "Okay."

Skillicorn: "And I see language like, trigger modification device means any part, combination of parts designed or intended to accelerate the rate of fire. I also go further on. It specifically says, does not convert the firearm into a machine qun, included but not limited to ... But I see quite a bit of ... quite a bit of information there. And to the Bill. This sounds awfully vague to me. This sounds like some weapons that I own may be in violation of this. And I want to point out to the Members of the General Assembly, maybe not everybody shoots all the time or owns a whole cache of weapons, but I want to let people know that quite a few of our constituents in every single one of our districts, they own weapons. So, I think of one very popular pistol, a 1911 pistol, very, very popular. Every single one of our districts have constituents that own this pistol. It's very common to change the trigger on this weapon. You can make it a lighter draw, you can change the length of the draw. As I read the language of this Bill, it sounds awfully like a modification that could increase the rate of fire. That would mean that we are making many of our own constituents, felons. Another very popular handgun is a revolver. Revolvers, due to the way they work, due to their action, they have a very heavy trigger pull. It's very common

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

to change the trigger-pull action, the weight on a revolver. It could have to do with your stature, like the Gentleman from southern Illinois said, but also, what you prefer, how you like to deal with recoil and such. It's a very common modification and doing so would make our constituents, felons. Every single one of our districts, except maybe a few, probably have people that do gunsmithing work. People who install these aftermarket triggers. Who actually do small little modifications of how the action works. It might be to improve reliability, but also might have a side benefit of firing a little faster in competition or it's just the user's preference. These qunsmiths would become felons. This Bill is vaque, people. It doesn't address what we're scared of. This has gone too far. We need to vote this down. I urge a 'no' vote. I would actually love if the Sponsor would actually just pull this legislation."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Fortner."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Fortner: "I would like to make sure I understand the ramifications of your section involving the pre-packaged explosives, which I think in your opening remarks, you used one of the brand names, Tannerite as the description. What I read in your Bill is a pre-packaged explosive components means a pre-packaged product containing two or more unmixed, commercially manufactured chemical substances that are not independently classified as explosives, but when mixed or combined results in explosive material subject to regulation by the Federal

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms Explosives under Title 27CFR Part 555. Did I get that correct?"

Moylan: "Please repeat the last portion of your question."

Fortner: "I just wanted to make sure, was I accurately conveying the new language... the new definition of what is a pre-packaged explosive in your Bill?"

Moylan: "Okay. The FBI has issued warning about these types of explosives, beginning in 2013. The FBI essentially..."

Fortner: "No, no. Let me ask, you're not... I asked a question. Am

I accurately stating your definition of..."

Moylan: "Yes."

Fortner: "...prepackaged? Thank you. So, Tannerite happens to be a particular combination. Do we have any examples currently in Illinois Law, where a person could get something that is an explosive, not a firearm, not the ammunition that goes in a firearm, but an explosive product by means of a Firearm Owners Identification Card, a FOID card? Do we have any current examples of that?"

Moylan: "I don't believe so."

Fortner: "I don't believe we do either. So this would be... this is a fairly novel use that we want to use the FOID card for. To say that someone can buy something that we are thinking is explosive by means of a FOID card. And though, you referenced Tannerite in your thing, as I read this definition, it does not refer just to that particular compound mixture, like any two or three chemicals, that when mixed together that are not independently explosive, could be explosives. I could put fuel oil and fertilizer in a box, package it, and then I'd

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

- say, well you need a FOID card to buy that. Isn't that one
 way I could read this definition?"
- Moylan: "This was actually an initiative of the Illinois Association of Chiefs of Police and was already passed in the House as Senate Bill 315. I want to thank Senator... I'm just letting you know."
- Fortner: "I understand that there's some past history, but I'm looking at this language fresh today, reading it because part of your introduction commented about this use of the FOID card for these pre-mixed explosives. Also the way I read this, if I were the manufacturer of Tannerite, it would appear to me that I could simply take and sell Tannerite part A, ammonium nitrate with maybe a little bit of ammonium perchlorate mixed in. And part B, aluminum powder, put them in separate packages even on the same shelf, and you'd be able to buy them from the same manufacturer, but would not need a FOID card. Am I interpreting that language correctly?"
- Moylan: "No. This an explicit loophole that was provided for us by the FBI and also the Chiefs of Police."
- Fortner: "But doesn't the example I just gave you still provide a means of buying it without a FOID card? Where they're in two separate containers, priced independently of each other. Ammonium nitrate and aluminum powder are both commercially available, both identified as non-explosive items. I could put them in two separate containers and sell them that way, couldn't I?"
- Moylan: "Yeah, to use them together, would require a FOID card."

 Fortner: "But that's not what... to the, to the Bill. That's not what this language says. It doesn't say, to use them together,

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

it says, to buy them requires a FOID card. What I'm reading is the part that says, the sale of this requires a FOID card. And I think that this is not well thought out. One is a wholly new use of the FOID card. In addition, these are chemicals that you can buy right now commercially, they've been in use, they were a major component in World War I in mine manufacture. So it's an old chemical technology to put these things together. I think this part is, in particular, not going to get to the goal the Gentleman seeks. It also creates, I think, more loopholes than it currently has. And I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reick."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Reick: "Representative, in your initial remarks you said that the motivation for this Bill was the shooting that happened in Las Vegas which we all, of course, lament and condemn. At any time during that incident, were prepackaged explosives used as part of the attack?"

Moylan: "No, but the shooter had 50 pounds of Tannerite available..."

Reick: "Was that Tannerite used?"

Moylan: "...in his possession. No."

Reick: "Okay, thank you. To the Bill. Much of what my friend over here said just recently, just clarifies the problems with this Bill. The second one is the fact that if you go on YouTube, you can turn an semi-automatic weapon into an automatic weapon by putting your finger on the trigger and putting your thumb in the belt loop of your pants and pulling

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

the trigger. So, at the risk of having all of us have our pants fall down, are you saying that we should now ban Levis, which of course, I am wearing? Because I may be able to take a semi-automatic weapon and turn it into an automatic weapon through just my choice of attire. Oh, I'm sorry, you can't... I went to the Bill. That was my bad. That was my bad. The one thing I do have a problem with is this trigger-modification device, where the Bill implies that it will be illegal to make it easier to fire a weapon. I'm not sure that it limits it to regulations that may go the opposite direction and make it more difficult to fire a weapon. If you've got a certain number of pounds that need to be used in order to pull the trigger, say seven pounds, ten pounds depending on the weapon and the person using, what's to say they can't pass a regulation that goes to 25 pounds, 50 pounds of pressure? There's nothing in here that says that making it easier doesn't mean that we also can't make it more difficult. So, this portion of the Bill is, again, unclear. Making it easier to pull the trigger on a weapon also can imply the authority to make it more difficult to pull the trigger on a weapon. And as has been stated by many Members on this floor, there are people who shoot for a vary number... a number of reasons, all of them legal: hunting, games... gamesmanship... And so, I would be... I would be grateful if this Bill were to be pulled from consideration. And as a part of that, I would like to know how many votes it going to take for this vote... for this Bill to actually pass? Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "To answer your inquiry, Sir, this Bill requires 71 votes. Leader Currie is recognized."

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record reflect that
Representative Soto is excused for the rest of the day."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Leader. Mr. Drury."

Drury: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the wake of the horrific Las Vegas shootings... the massacre, everybody said, what are we going to do? Is this the incident that is finally going to push our country to action? It certainly didn't push us to action when it was a bunch of children in Connecticut. It didn't push us to action when it was a mass slaughter in Orlando. But maybe a mass shooting in Las Vegas, where people travel all the time, in an open crowd that was going to do something. And then we found out that, immediately, the NRA could not blame mental health disorders. There was no immediate mental health issue with the shooter. So, the NRA needed somewhere to go. And what did they say? They're like, oh, well let's look at bump stocks and we got Speaker Paul Ryan say, let's ban bump stocks. We get Mitch McConnell, let's ban bump stocks. And there was this wave of bipartisan unity for the first time to ban trigger-modification devices and bump stocks. Now in this Assembly, what did we do? Well, the initial proposals were to ban all assault weapons and highcapacity gun cartridges and bump stocks. And I said, I don't think that's a good idea. Why don't we call the bluff and see what's going on. So I introduced House Bill 4112 which just dealt with trigger modification devices. And said, let's see if there is any sincerity on the part of the NRA, on the part of gun enthusiasts to say we're going to deal with these devices specifically. And let's not talk about assault weapons and let's not talk about the high-capacity magazines.

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

And Representative Moylan has added to that the pre-packaged explosives and I think it's a good modification, so 4112 has now become 4117. And so, now what do hear from the people who advocated for this? The NRA, who pushed for this? The Speaker of the House of the United States, who said, this is okay. The Senate President of the United States, who said, this is okay. What did we hear? Well, maybe we need to do some more analysis. They had to buy some time because they thought, wow, there are people pushing legislation that is going to make us vote on this issue. And then what did they do? They blamed Obama. Right? It went from bump stock bans, trigger modifications bans, to, oh, this is Obama's fault. It's the ATF, under Obama's fault. We need to discuss this. We need to discuss this further. Well, we don't need to discuss it further because everybody has already agreed. They're already on record saying that this is what we want. This is something we could get behind. And now there is a Bill on the board that is exactly what people suggested in the wake of this horrific massacre. This Bill gives us the opportunity to finally show Americans all over the country that we value the right to live. That we think it's okay to send our children to Grant Park for Lollapalooza without worrying whether there's somebody who has converted a gun into a machine gun who is going to slaughter our kids. We have the chance to speak on this today. We have the chance to show the country Illinois stands on issues, issues of importance, issues that the Federal Government and Federal Leaders have said that they could support. Well, we're giving them the chance to support it right here, right now. Now, are

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

there a bunch of things that the NRA comes up with to try to avoid passing legislation like this? Yes, all the time. All the time. I've been in committee hearings and I've questioned the NRA representatives. And I've said... and they say, well, we could get behind some legislation that would maybe have an effect. I said, what is that legislation? Tell me what that legislation is. And they talk about enforcing current laws. Well, we enforce current laws. I enforce current laws, many people in this chamber have enforced the current laws. And the fact is, is that we're still having these slaughters. So I said, what new laws do you support? Tell me one new law. And the representative said, I'll have to get back to you. The representative of the NRA said, I'll have to get back to you. Well, that was over a year ago and I am still waiting for that phone call, still waiting. Because the fact is, is that when it comes to responsible gun regulations, the NRA wants nothing to do with it even when we put on the board their own proposal, which is 4117. So, we can be scared of lobbyists and interests groups or we could represent people in our state and people's right to live, and we could get behind this Bill. Thank you, Representative Moylan, for joining me in this fight. And I strongly urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davidsmeyer."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Davidsmeyer: "Representative, do you exercise your Second

Amendment right?"

Moylan: "Yes."

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

Davidsmeyer: "So, you have a FOID card?"

Moylan: "Correct."

Davidsmeyer: "And you shoot?"

Moylan: "Not at this time."

Davidsmeyer: "Do you hunt?"

Moylan: "Not at this time."

Davidsmeyer: "When was the last time you did?"

Moylan: "I don't think that's pertinent to this question. The question about..."

Davidsmeyer: "It's very pertinent to the question because that was the question."

Moylan: "No. And I certainly don't hunt with an assault rifle or a .50 caliber sniper rifle."

Davidsmeyer: "Please explain to me..."

Moylan: "It's not in this Bill."

Davidsmeyer: "Please explain to me what an assault rifle is then."

Moylan: "There's a definition, you can gladly look it up. This Bill is not about assault rifles and you know that."

Davidsmeyer: "Well, you brought it up. I just figured I'd ask you."

Moylan: "No, I was responding to your question."

Davidsmeyer: "So, could you please, please explain to me what a bump stock is?"

Moylan: "You can look... yes, I'll give you the definition. And I'm sure you're aware of what a bump stock is."

Davidsmeyer: "Have you ever seen one?"

Moylan: "Yes, I have."

Davidsmeyer: "Have you seen one shot?"

Moylan: "Yes, I have."

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

Davidsmeyer: "Yup, its..."

Moylan: "And I've also seen what a gat gun is, also."

Davidsmeyer: "You've seen what?"

Moylan: "What a gat gun is. A gat... gat crank."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay."

Moylan: "Have you seen one of those?"

Davidsmeyer: "I have not."

Moylan: "I didn't think so."

Davidsmeyer: "No. Have you seen trigger modifications?"

Moylan: "Yes, I have. Have you seen them?"

Davidsmeyer: "Yes, I have. Actually, just..."

Moylan: "So you have one?"

Davidsmeyer: "...a couple weeks ago, I was shooting with a friend..."

Moylan: "So you have one that accelerates the rate of fire?"

Davidsmeyer: "I do not."

Moylan: "Okay."

Davidsmeyer: "I do not. But I have a lot of friends that shoot for sport..."

Moylan: "Good."

Davidsmeyer: "...and they shoot sporting clays, which is a little clay target, right? And they're not shooting people..."

Moylan: "And they don't need .50 calibers, they don't need assault rifles to shoot that."

Davidsmeyer: "...they're shooting a little clay target. And you can tell the difference on their accuracy and how quickly they can... they can pull the trigger to be able to compete for sport. And now you're going to make them a criminal."

Moylan: "I have shot clay and have not needed the trigger device that accelerates the rate of fire."

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. So, what score, what score did you get?"

Moylan: "Bump stocks decrease accuracy. What was that last question?"

Davidsmeyer: "What... and I'm not talking about bump stocks..."

Moylan: "Oh."

Davidsmeyer: "...right now, I'm talking about trigger modifications. What was your last score you got shooting trap or sporting clays?"

Moylan: "I didn't get them from a store, we had them."

Davidsmeyer: "You what?"

Moylan: "What? Oh, score."

Davidsmeyer: "Score."

Moylan: "I missed some and hit some."

Davidsmeyer: "I'm talking about people that are... that are hitting, you know..."

Moylan: "I did not hit any people."

Davidsmeyer: "...95 out of a hundred. You know, last time I was out, I shot 66, normally I'm in the mid-70s, mid-to-high 70s, but we're talking about guys that go out and do this for sport. So, it's like me going to play basketball or you going to, I don't know if you golf or something like that, but that's what they do as a pastime. Right? That's what they do... they're not out there shooting people. You're turning law-abiding citizens with this Bill... you're turning law-abiding citizens into criminals. You're saying things that they currently own are now going to be illegal."

Moylan: "That's not true."

Davidsmeyer: "So, there is grandfathering? So, stuff that I currently own is grandfathered in?"

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

Moylan: "No."

Davidsmeyer: "So you are turning them into criminals?"

Moylan: "Do you..."

Davidsmeyer: "Explain to me how you're not turning them into criminals, please?"

Moylan: "Do you own a gat crank?"

Davidsmeyer: "No, I don't. I'm actually asking the questions.

This is... this is your Bill. I'm asking you questions about your Bill. Could you please explain to me how you're not turning current law-abiding citizens into criminals with your Bill?"

Moylan: "Yes, but I have some questions of you to set a foundation..."

Davidsmeyer: "This isn't my... this isn't my Bill."

Moylan: "Yes, but I have..."

Davidsmeyer: "If I'm running a Bill, you can ask me plenty of questions. Please answer."

Moylan: "Any modifications that knowingly accelerate a trigger would be banned."

Davidsmeyer: "So anybody who shoots for sport..."

Moylan: "No, that's not true. They don't use trigger modifications..."

Davidsmeyer: "I'm still asking the question. Let me finish."

Moylan: "Well yeah, but I want answer the question when you ask it expediently."

Davidsmeyer: "I may need some extra time, Mr. Speaker."

Moylan: "You can have all the time you want."

Davidsmeyer: "...he won't answer my questions."

Moylan: "Because I'm not going anywhere..."

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

Davidsmeyer: "Oh, man."

Moylan: "And I'm not pulling the Bill. We can stay here..."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay."

Moylan: "...till the sun..."

Davidsmeyer: "So..."

Moylan: "...goes down."

Davidsmeyer: "I think... I think that we have ... To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I think we have a case where people who have done a lot of reading about guns are trying to write laws to limit the people who actually exercise their Second Amendment rights for enjoyment, for sport. You're turning... you're turning half of the gun owners out there into criminals, with this Bill. They've done nothing wrong. It's ... it's... we're already... we're already second-class citizens in our own state. I live on the Missouri border and if somebody wants to come over here and buy ammunition, they can come over and do that. If I want to buy ammunition, I have to show them a FOID card that I had to go through a process. We're already second class citizens in our own state, and it's not stopping people from shooting each other in Chicago. This is not going to fix your problem. We need to have a much larger discussion. You guys think taking away guns is going to fix your problem; it is not. They're still going to get them. I urge a 'no' vote on this. You don't want to take the rights away from law-abiding citizens."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Demmer."

Demmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please let the record reflect that Representative David Harris is excused."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Sir. Mr. Wheeler."

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

Wheeler, K.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. You know, over 300 people have contacted my office with similar sentiments and concerns. And it's real simple, the concern is that if this Bill becomes law, they'll be considered felons. I got a note... a personal note from a well-respected attorney back in my district who read the Bill and completely disagrees with the Sponsor's interpretation. Let's put it very simply, turning thousands of law-abiding gun owners in Illinois into felons isn't the solution that any of us are really looking for. This Bill does not deserve a 'yes' vote. Please vote, 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Welch."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Welch: "Representative, I do have a couple of questions, just listening to the debate. This Bill, 4117, the one that we're receiving hundreds of emails about. This is the bump stock ban?"

Moylan: "Correct."

Welch: "And can you... can you educate some of us folk who are not into guns what a bump stock is?"

Moylan: "Yes. The first type of modification device specifically banned by this Bill which is commonly called a bump stock. Bump stocks function by using the natural recoil of the weapon to force rapid compensations of the trigger. The result is the weapon firing at the speed of the machine gun which highly diminishes accuracy. The shooter in the Las Vegas massacre had 12 rifles modified with bump stocks."

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

- Welch: "So, the shooter in Las Vegas was able to take a gun that would shoot at a slower pace and increase the speed of which he could shoot?"
- Moylan: "Right. The shooter in Las Vegas modified a semiautomatic, assault rifle and turned it into a machine gun."
- Welch: "And how many people died in that shooting?"
- Moylan: "Fifty-eight people died, more than 500 were wounded. And in those wounded were many children, mothers, grandmothers, police enforcement individuals, fire department individuals, numerous people that were gunned down by a gun that was modified by a bump stock. And it's upon us to be the first in the nation to regulate that use and ban them."
- Welch: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. The last point is what I really want to drive home. This shooter, it is well published, was due in Chicago. This shooter had a room with an eye set on Lollapalooza. We all know someone who's attended Lollapalooza. We know someone who's going to be there next summer. The question is, what will it take for us to do action? Will it take your mother, father, son, or daughter to be shot before you speak up? It is time for us to do something. There is absolutely no reason why this type of device is needed, even the NRA admits that. This device is not needed and the time to act is now. But for the grace of God that could have been any one of us, any one of us. And if it happened in Chicago, we know this discussion would be completely different. Who do we represent here? We don't represent gun dealers and manufacturers, we represent people. People. The time to act is now. Representative, thank you for

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

this Bill. Thank you for your courage. I ask for an 'aye' vote on 4117."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Cabello."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Obviously, listening to a lot of the debate, we have done a lot of things. We've done a lot of criminal justice reforms in this chamber, good, solid criminal justice reforms in this chamber. Yet, now we want to step backwards and make many people in this state, who don't deserve to be a felon, be a felon. We can talk about Las Vegas all day long, but Ladies and Gentlemen, why don't we talk about Chicago? Why don't we talk about the issues and the shootings that we have every single day, almost every single half hour? Let's talk about the mental health situation that we have in this state that we should be spending our money on to try to rectify some of these problems. I think some of these things in this Bill would be easily passed through this chamber, if they were separated out. But apparently, we don't want to do that. We want to make sure that we put everything together, so we don't solve the problem, so we don't debate these issues one-onone. Ladies and Gentlemen, there is no provision, in this Bill that allows law enforcement to do what they are necessarily needing to do. It's time that we look for the people that are law-abiding citizens and tell them, we're not going to do this to you. Let's not make every day taxpaying citizens, common felons. I would request a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Wallace."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

Wallace: "Do you know, Representative Moylan, about how many shots rang out within 10 seconds... 10 seconds in Las Vegas?"

Moylan: "No, I do not."

Wallace: "Ninety shots in 10 seconds. I want to speak to the Bill because I am very appreciative of Representative Moylan and Drury and others who've allowed me to join them in trying to address this issue. It's very interesting to listen to this debate because much of this debate is riddled with dog whistle phrases, riddled with implied us versus them, riddled with a number of phrases that are about geography versus other parts of the state, class, the demographic makeup of those who we think aren't law-abiding citizens where they may live, who they may be, what they look like. And in all honesty, everybody is a law-abiding citizen until they break the law. So, let's not pretend that someone is inherently more innocent than someone else. We love to bring up the City of Chicago. Love to. Yet, just like the previous Speaker, I represent actually the majority of a city that has a worse crime rate. In fact, the City of Rockford's crime rate is 229 times higher than that of the rest of the State of Illinois. Luckily, we've not had these types of assaults in our city, but we do grapple with overwhelming violence, overwhelming gun violence. And if there is anything that we can do to begin to minimize what the impact of that would be if someone has their hands on a weapon and so that we can prevent 90 shots from going out within 10 seconds, then I think that that's what we should I appreciate sportsmanship, I appreciate gamesmanship, but let's be frank and let's be honest about guns. Many people own guns because they say it will protect

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

their homes. We understand that assault rifles in and of themselves are specifically designed and manufactured to be able to take out as many people as possible at one time. And if we're going to sit here and lie to ourselves and say that that's not the case then we are all absolutely delusional and maybe shouldn't be in this chamber. So let's be, again, frank and honest about what's really happening. Let's allow for some commonsense measures to take place. There is no need for the ability to walk around and manipulate our guns and our rifles in such a way that it is explicitly for the purpose of killing as many people as possible, at one time. There's no reason that that should just go unchecked. And as long as we like to believe that it's only certain people who live in certain geographic regions who are doing this and the rest of us are the law-abiding citizens and the rest of us have our Second Amendment rights that we should stand up for, the longer we go on believing that then the longer we will have division in this state. But I encourage everyone in this chamber to completely look at what this Bill truly is about and think about how do we continue to protect our citizens, or actually begin to protect our citizens? And I encourage an 'aye' vote. Thank you, Representative Moylan, for this legislation."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Batinick."

Batinick: "Mr. Speaker, I'm going to go straight to the Bill.

Notwithstanding the Sponsor's intelligence, I'm going to say
that the Gentleman from west Chicago, the Professor is one of
the smartest people I know in the chamber, I think we've kind
of brushed over something that he said that was in the Bill

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

and that dovetails to something I spoke about yesterday. And that's that, you know, how the Bill is written matters. And the way I'm reading it, and the way I believe I heard it from him is if you have a FOID card with this Bill becoming law, we can now... we are now expanding buying explosives. So, the way this Bill is written and the way it's been interpreted and explained to me is that you're actually expanding the ability to buy explosives. So, I guess the issue... these are serious issues. We had a major drafting error that was going to have a trailer Bill on something that was filed yesterday. We seem to file a lot of Bills and we vote on them based on the name, but the language in the actual Bill matters. There's been a lot of things... that this isn't the only thing in this Bill that's been brought up that's been troubling in terms of the way that it's drafted. If we want to address the issue, let's address the issue in a thoughtful, thorough, bipartisan manner, and get the language of the Bill right because that's what becomes law; not the title. I urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Moylan, to close."

Moylan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let's just... let's be... I want to make clear on a few things. The Las Vegas shooter was a lawabiding citizen and was able to buy a bump stock. This Bill does not ban all guns. It does not ban assault weapons. It doesn't ban unknown modifications, and it doesn't apply to law enforcement. It doesn't expand buying explosives. Let's talk about Representative Wheeler's Bill. I respect Representative Wheeler for her efforts, but that doesn't... but her Bill doesn't go far enough. It doesn't regulate explosives

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

like Tannerite. It doesn't ban gat cranks. And because of the way that it is worded, it doesn't even ban bump stocks. It would only ban them if they called the gun to fire at the same rate as a machine gun, nor if they caused the gun to fire at nearly the same rate. It's a big loophole. The Sun Times said it best, bump stocks have no legitimate purpose and deserve no defense from lawmakers. Even in districts where hunting is popular. By using them, the Las Vegas mass murderer, Steven Paddock, was able to kill and wound more people than he would have had with weapons that were only semiautomatic. The only function of bump stocks is to quickly kill as many people as possible. I respectfully ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

- 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 48 voting 'yes', 54 voting 'no'. And the Bill fails. House Bill 1023, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1023, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 1 and 2 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Moylan."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Moylan."

Moylan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Floor Amendment... this is the House Floor Amendment? Right, Mr. Speaker? I need to adopt the House Floor Amendment?"

Speaker Lang: "Yes, sir."

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

- Moylan: "House Floor Amendment extends the Support your Neighborhood Commission until January 31st, 2019. The Commission's purpose is to help increase the number of American and Illinois-made products sold. Currently, no other commissions address this issue. Four members of the Commission are to be appointed by the Legislative Leaders and eight members appointed by the Governor. House Floor Amendment #2 provides all members appointed by the Governor and Legislative Leaders shall be appointed within 60 days of this Act becoming law."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment... Mr. Breen, do you wish to speak to the Amendment or would you like to do it on Third Reading, Sir?"
- Breen: "Well, we have a question because the Gentleman spoke of Floor Amendments 1 and 2, but each of them become the Bill, so which one would be actually like to adopt?"

Speaker Lang: "I believe he asked to adopt both of them."

Breen: "He wants to adopt both?"

- Speaker Lang: "I'm told you only need #2, Mr. Moylan, so Amendment 1 is withdrawn. Mr. Moylan on Amendment 2."
- Moylan: "House Bill... House Floor Amendment #2 provides all members appointed by the Governor and Legislative Leaders shall be appointed within 60 days of the... of the... of this Act becoming law. This was brought up in committee and we agreed with the person that brought up the discrepancy."
- 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."

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

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

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1023, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Moylan."

Moylan: "Okay... I already explained this, so I'm just asking for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "The Amendment became the Bill, Sir?"

Moylan: "Yes. Yes."

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 102 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk Bolin: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 590, offered by Representative... correction... House Resolution 656, offered by Representative Moeller. House Resolution 657, offered by Representative Bennett. House Resolution 658, offered by Representative Martwick."
- Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie moves for the adoption of Agreed Resolutions. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Agreed Resolutions are adopted. And now, leaving perfunctory time for the Clerk, Leader Currie moves that the House stand Adjourned till Tuesday, November 7, at the hour of noon. Those in favor, say 'yes'; opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the House stand Adjourned till Tuesday, November 7, at the hour of 12, noon."

81st Legislative Day

10/26/2017

Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Introduction and First Reading of House Bills. House Bill 4141, offered by Representative Chapa LaVia, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 4142, offered by Representative Batinick, a Bill for an Act concerning health. First Reading of these House Bills. Introduction of Resolutions. Senate Joint Resolution 36, offered by Representative Swanson. This is referred to the Rules Committee. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."