121st Legislative Day

4/23/2018

Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on April 23, 2018: recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is Floor Amendment 2 to House Bill 1265, Floor Amendment 1 to House Bill 4331, Floor Amendment 2 to House Bill 4340, Floor Amendment 2 to House Bill 4757, Floor Amendment 2 to House Bill 5778, Floor Amendment 1 to House Resolution 828, Floor Amendment 1 to House Resolution 850; approved for consideration, referred to Second Reading is House Bill 128, House Bill 984, House Bill 1593, House Bill 1595, House Bill 1877, House Bill 2040."

Speaker Lang: "The House will be in order. The House will be in order. We shall be led in prayer today by Pastor Shaun Lewis who is the Executive Director of Civil Servant Ministries in Springfield. Pastor Lewis is the guest of Representative Morrison. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off cell phones, and rise for the invocation and Pledge of Allegiance. Pastor Lewis."

Pastor Lewis: "If you would bow with me in a word of prayer. Isaiah 40:29-31 says, The Lord gives power to the faint; And to him who has no might He increases strength. Even youth shall faint and be weary, young men shall fall exhausted; But they who wait for the Lord shall renew their strength. They shall mount up with wings like eagles. They shall run, and not grow weary. They shall walk, and not faint. Father in Heaven, Isaiah gives us a beautiful picture for us today. For who here hasn't grown weary in the current political climate.

121st Legislative Day

4/23/2018

And who hasn't grown faint or who hasn't had thoughts of quitting at times. Isaiah encourages us to look to You for renewal and strength. And so for all here, for our Representatives, for their Legislative Assistants, other staffers, for all who are really beaten down in the throes of Illinois government, may they seek You in the pages of Your Holy word, meditate upon it, and mount up with wings like eagles. Whether they're in caucus or committee, here on the floor, whether they are with constituents or here in the Capitol, may they commit their work to You. In Jesus' name we pray, Amen."

Speaker Lang: "Be led in the Pledge by Mr. Burke."

Burke, D. - 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 show that Representatives Arroyo, Kelly Burke, Conroy, Feigenholtz, Gabel, and Hernandez are excused today."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Demmer."

Demmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please let the record reflect that Representative Sosnowski and Representative Stewart are excused for the day."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, please take the record. There are 107 Members answering the roll and we do have a quorum. Page 27 of the Calendar, House Resolution 927, Mr. Davidsmeyer. Out of the record. Returning to House Resolution 927, Mr. Davidsmeyer. Mr. Clerk."

121st Legislative Day

4/23/2018

Clerk Bolin: "House Resolution 927. Be it

RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENATIVES OF THE ONE HUNDREDTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that we congratulate the Jacksonville High School Winterguard on winning the State Championship titles for both their routines for the first time in the school's history."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davidsmeyer."

Davidsmeyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm a little out of breath. I was just up meeting with the IDTA State Champs in tall flag and IDTA State Champs in lyrical for Winterguard. And soloist, Serenity Norman, got second place. This is the first time in history of Winterquard team for Jacksonville to win state. If the ladies behind me if ... you're already standing. Well done. So, this is the Jacksonville High School Winterguard team. Last week, we had the Jacksonville Poms, which was another state championship team. We're continuing the ... on the order of Jacksonville High School State Champions. With team members Karson Baker, Alyssa Barrow... is it Barrow or Borrow? Barrow. Abbi Blanford, Breanna Butler, Taylor Caldwell, Tanasia Clark, Kayla Critchelow, Emma Decker, Faith Hadlock, Summer Harris, Rissa Capps, Kira Morton-White, Serenity Norman, Jasmin Watson, and Piper Upchurch and their head coach, Rachel Mansell, assistant coaches, James Vannier and Jessica Vannier. If we could give them a warm Springfield welcome and congratulate them on all their hard work on winning the first state championship for Jacksonville High School."

Speaker Lang: "Congratulations to all of you. We're pleased to have you with us today on the House Floor. Those in favor of

121st Legislative Day

4/23/2018

- the Resolution will say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. Congratulations. Mr. Harris is recognized."
- Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Good to be back. A quick moment of personal privilege, if I may?"
- Speaker Lang: "We cannot wait, Sir."
- Harris, D.: "I would like to move to Southern Illinois for a piece of good news today. Southern Illinois University claimed the #1 rank, the #1 rank on online colleges. Ten online colleges with the best financial aid opportunities in 2017. Number one was Southern Illinois University. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign was #4. And the University of Illinois at Springfield ranked #6. So, congratulations to those schools."
- Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Harris. Chair recognizes Mr. Demmer."
- Demmer: "Thank you, Speaker. The Republicans request an immediate caucus for one hour."
- Speaker Lang: "Room 118 for the Republicans immediately. And the House will be in recess until the hour of 4:10, 4:10. No caucus for the Democrats. The House will be in order. Moving to priority Bills. House Bill 5104, Representative Ammons. Representative Ammons. Out of the record. House Bill 5611, Mr. Andrade. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5611, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andrade."
- Andrade: "One second, Sir. Sorry, Mr. Speaker. Okay. House Bill 5611 creates the Illinois Information Security Improvement Act and establishes its purposes. House Bill 5611 establishes

121st Legislative Day

4/23/2018

the Office of the Statewide Chief Information Security Officer within DoIt and lists its goals. The office is directly subordinate to the Secretary of DoIt. The secretary's duties are listed below. And House Bill 5611 also includes a provision that states the Office of Statewide Chief Information Security Officer identify security risks to each state agency. If there's any questions, I'm more than willing to answer them. If not, I respectfully request an 'aye' vote."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Ammons. Crespo. Thapedi. Thapedi. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 110 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4828, Representative Cassidy. Out of the record. House Bill 4415, Mr. Costello. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4415, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Costello."

Costello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 4415 amends the Sales Tax Act to extend the exemption on mining equipment to June 30 of 2023. Currently this is set to sunset on August 2018. I ask for your 'aye' vote."

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

121st Legislative Day

4/23/2018

108 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5042, Mr. D'Amico. Out of the record. House Bill 1471, Mr. Evans. Mr. Evans. Out of the record. House Bill 4687, Mr. Bennett. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4687, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bennett."

- Bennett: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. 4687 is the initiative of the Department of Aging. The Bill amends a statute that currently allows adult children to petition the court for visitation rights if the guardian were unreasonably preventing them from seeing their parents. What this Bill does, it expands those able to petition the court for visitation rights in this manner to also include a spouse, adult grandchild, parent, or adult sibling. It's supported by the Guardianship and Advocacy Commission, Cook County Public Guardian, and the National Academy of Elder Law Attorneys, the Illinois Chapter, among others. I ask for an 'aye' vote, please."
- 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? Mayfield, Thapedi. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. There are 109 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5251, Representative Fine. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5251, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

121st Legislative Day

4/23/2018

Speaker Lang: "Representative Fine."

Fine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 5251 is a piece of legislation that's actually going to protect the consumer. The Illinois Health Maintenance Organization Guaranty Association and the Illinois Life and Health Insurance Guaranty are required by law to protect consumers if their insurer becomes insolvent. It's kind of like an insurance safety net for the consumer. All HMOs and health and life insurers must be members of a guaranty association to do business in Illinois. And they provide coverage for the insured if the provider goes out of business. This Bill merges the two organizations and gives them more flexibility in paying out consumers of an insolvent business. There's no opposition that I know of to this Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record, Mr. Clerk. There are 109 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Returning to House Bill 5042, Mr. D'Amico. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5042, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. D'Amico."

D'Amico: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What House Bill 5042 does is the judge just has to give a reason why he's rescinding the suspension order of his driver's license."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all

121st Legislative Day

4/23/2018

voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Drury. Please take the record. There are 110 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4560, Mr. Frese. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4560, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Frese."

Frese: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 4560 is simply a TIF expansion for the City of Monmouth, Illinois, a town of about 10 thousand people in the northern part of the district that I represent. They have a number of issues they need to clean up. This is a true good use of the TIF measure. All seven of the other taxing bodies have submitted letters in approval of this. And I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 98 voting 'yes', 10 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5741, Representative Cassidy to handle for Representative Gabel. Representative Cassidy. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5741, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Cassidy."

Cassidy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As you note... as you noted, this is a Bill I'm carrying for Representative Gabel while she

121st Legislative Day

4/23/2018

continues to recuperate. This is an initiative of the Illinois Environmental Council and relates to having the Prairie Research Institute do a research study to identify chemicals found in wastewater and bring about recommendations for addressing any public health concerns. And I ask for your support."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Breen: "And Representative, would you just give us a quick idea of what these chemicals are and what the concerns are?"

Cassidy: "I think that's the point of the study is to determine which... which chemicals we might be dealing with in wastewater treatment plant effluent. And... and you know, which contaminants we might be... we might be in need of addressing."

Breen: "So, this is the... I mean, we keep reading articles about the endocrine disrupters that are the side effects of our various compound... pharmaceutical compounds, et cetera. So, your study is actually going to now... or our study I guess, if we adopt this, is going to now identify these things and try to figure out what to do about them? Is that right?"

Cassidy: "Yes. That's exactly right."

Breen: "Well, that's a wonderful idea. Yeah, please add me to the Bill. Thank you."

Cassidy: "Would be delighted. Thank you for your help."

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? Carroll. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 109 voting

121st Legislative Day

4/23/2018

'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1485... I'm sorry, 4885, Representative Wallace to handle for Representative Gabel. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4885, a Bill for an Act concerning children. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Wallace."

Wallace: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 4885 is a Bill that creates a... credentialing... oh no, I'm sorry. This is the wrong one. House Bill 4885 is one that strengthens our child care pro... no, not the child care program, the Human Services Program which impacts the Intact Family Services Program of DCFS. It makes sure that children and families that are participating in the Intact Family Program also have access to the child care assistance program so that the child has stability and continuity in his care. I urge an 'aye' vote."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves, Members. 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. One more Bill for Representative Gabel, House Bill 4665. Representative Wallace. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4665, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Wallace."

121st Legislative Day

4/23/2018

Wallace: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 4665 is the one I thought I was speaking to before. This creates a credentialing program for direct service professionals. They do many of the same duties as a CNA. They go through very extensive training and we want to just make sure that that training is actually stabilized and it is one that is standardized. I encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Breen: "And Representative, I'm... I'm reading the various parts of your Bill. It looks like you've got a couple of parts. One of which is that a... am I correct in seeing that a Certified Nursing Assistant's going to lose their certification if they don't... if they go for 24 months without performing nursing or nursing-related services for pay?"

Wallace: "Right now that is the case."

Breen: "Okay."

Wallace: "This is trying to prevent that."

Breen: "Wait. So, you... you're taking the current law and changing it so that they don't lose their certification status if they go 24 months without providing nursing services for pay?"

Wallace: "Correct. What you see very often is you have individuals who have been trained to be Certified Nursing Assistants who become direct service professionals, but they are not working in entity... in an agency or an entity that continues their certification with the state. But they are providing services drastically close to the same services that a CNA would provide in a nursing home, for example. So, we're saying that

121st Legislative Day

4/23/2018

if a CNA is working in a Community Care Program they would be able to keep their certification by being a direct service professional."

Breen: "Well, that sounds like a great idea. Thank you."

Wallace: "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 109 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1010, Representative Greenwood. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1010, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Greenwood."

Greenwood: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1010 addresses the Election Code in changing committeemen to committeeperson and chairmen to chairpersons throughout the Election Code."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor..."

Greenwood: "There are no opponents. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Sorry to interrupt you, Representative. 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? DeLuca. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 107 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4346, Mr. Jones. Mr. Jones. Out of the record. House Bill 5148,

121st Legislative Day

4/23/2018

Representative Kifowit. Out of the record. House Bill 4922, Representative Mah. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4922, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Mah."

Mah: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 4922 is an initiative of the Treasurer's Office. It amends the Consumer Fraud and Deceptive Business Practices Act. And what it does is it bans the sell... or it bans the use of post-sale fees on rebate cards. Illinois banned post-sale fees on gift cards in 2008. And this Bill simply extends those protections to rebate cards, which are often offered by retailers as an incentive for purchases. These inactivity fees diminish the value of these cards and by the time they get to the Treasurer's Office the value usually goes down to zero and are not... they're not able to be returned to the consumer, if it's not redeemed. So, this is simply an extension of protections that already exist that we passed in this Body for gift cards. And these inactivity fees should not be used on rebate cards. So, I ask for your support. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Breen: "So Representative, just so that I'm clear. So, we've...
we've got stored value cards are where they actually hand you
a little Visa/Master... you know a Visa gift card that's got
twenty bucks on it. That's a separate issue."

Mah: "Right."

Breen: "We're not dealing with that."

121st Legislative Day

4/23/2018

Mah: "Correct."

Breen: "We're dealing here with something like Kohl's Cash or a Sears Shop Your Way. The rebate that can only be used at the retailer, correct?"

Mah: "Correct. And these are incentives that are offered to consumers to entice you to make a purchase, for example. And so, if you are offered an amount in a rebate, that's the amount that should remain on the card. And that's really all we're asking."

Breen: "Now, it's only if they hand you a card that is a rebate card or is it if they just have a... any sort of a rebate program? So, if it's... if the rebate is store... do you need a physical card to attach your bill to it? Does that then kick in the protections or do you just... anytime they offer you a rebate?"

Mah: "So, these are the cards that are used; whereas, in the past these rebates were often issued in... in the form of checks. Retailers are using these rebate cards instead of checks these days. And many of these cards have inactivity fees that kick in after a certain time. But I think that if consumers are offered a rebate in a given amount that amount should remain available to them for the duration of... of their use of the card."

Breen: "Right. So, your... your Bill, though... so anytime they offer you a rebate connected with, you know, in whatever way they give you the rebate, they can no longer put a time limit on the rebate?"

Mah: "Exactly. Yes."

121st Legislative Day

4/23/2018

Breen: "Wow. Okay. So, I just... I bought a Dell... I bought a television from Dell last year and they offered me a \$100 rebate, but it expired. I had to use it within three months. Under your Bill, that would no longer be allowed?"

Mah: "No. Under my Bill, the... there should not be an inactivity fee attached to the card. So, rebate cards that maintain their value are fine, but inactivity fees... these post-issuance dormancy fees that are... that diminish the value of the card would be disallowed under this Bill."

Breen: "Wait. But... what I just described sounds like... but I mean... after three months the rebate goes away. So, it's gone."

Mah: "And that's fine."

Breen: "That's fine. But if they give me the rebate and then say, well, in six months it'll be \$50 less, another six months it'll be another \$50 less. But that is not fine?"

Mah: "Right."

Breen: "But how does that make any sense?"

Mah: "So, it's the post-issuance fee, the inactivity fee that this Bill is addressing. It's not the rebate itself or... or the length of the rebate."

Breen: "And... and just... I think, as well, on my analysis the various banking groups are opposed."

Mah: "I'm sorry. Can you repeat that?"

Breen: "The various banking groups appear to be..."

Mah: "Yes."

Breen: "...opposed to your Bill?"

Mah: "Yes."

Breen: "What... what's the basis of their opposition?"

Mah: "Because they make a profit from the sale of these cards."

121st Legislative Day

4/23/2018

Breen: "And... and if the card value doesn't diminish... so you've these rebate cards and the card value doesn't diminish ever?"

Mah: "Then... then they're not able to make..."

Breen: "At some point does it pass to the Treasurer's Office?"

Mah: "So, in the past these rebates were issued in..."

Breen: "'Cause you're saying... I see the Treasurer's Office next to you."

Mah: "Yes."

Breen: "Do they at some point get the money?"

Mah: "So, if the... if the rebate card is not redeemed by a certain amount of time, then it goes to the Treasurer's Office after three years and it gets returned to the consumer as unclaimed property. When the post activity... post-issuance activity... inactivity fees kick in, there's no value left for the Treasurer's Office to return that rebate to the consumer."

Breen: "And... and just so that I'm clear, the... it looks like the Illinois Bankers, the Illinois Credit Union League, and the Community Bankers are opposed. They're still opposed to your Bill, right?"

Mah: "Correct. Although we did work with them on an Amendment that clarified that we are only talking about rebate cards. And so, the same rules would not apply to other cards like the... the type that you buy at a Walgreens. I mean, those have already been covered by legislation that was passed in 2008. And they... those do not have inactivity fees attached to them any longer. And if a card were lost, then there could be a replacement fee attached, but rebate cards themselves cannot have inact... inactivity fees attached to them."

Breen: "How many other states have this restriction?"

121st Legislative Day

4/23/2018

Mah: "We are the first."

Breen: "Oh. All right. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, in life there is no such thing as a free lunch. And if we decide to put new restrictions on these... these cards and become the first state to do this, it seems to me like we're going to have a spade of retailers stop offering these cards to our consumers here in Illinois. There is obviously a cost to keeping open a liability to a consumer indefinitely. And there's no need for us to be adding new regulations on Illinois businesses or new costs on them to disincentivize them from giving our consumers rebate cards, which we all love. We love rebates. So, let's continue to keep them flowing by not adding this new restriction on them. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Harris, D.: "First of all, Representative, let's be... let's clarify something. My analysis indicates that there are at least 10 states already that do something like this to prohibit dormancy fees. Is that accurate?"

Mah: "Yes. But not..."

Harris, D.: "Okay. Okay. That just... okay."

Mah: "...in this exact way."

Harris, D.: "Just yes is fine."

Mah: "But we already do it ourselves for gift cards. We're just extending the same protections to rebate cards."

Harris, D.: "Okay. Let's dig into this a little bit. If I buy a product and I buy that product because the… the vendor says,

121st Legislative Day

4/23/2018

I'm going to give you a rebate and that rebate is going to come in the form of a Visa card or some sort of MasterCard or Visa card, okay? So, they're going to send me a Visa card and that Visa card is issued by a bank, right?"

Mah: "Correct."

Harris, D.: "Let's say there's \$50 on this Visa card. So, I take it and I spend it and maybe I only spend 20 or 30 dollars, so there's still \$20 or \$30 left on the card. And for whatever reason, I throw it in the... in my drawer and I don't use it. If I don't use that card for let's say a year, that issuer... that bank can then charge me dormancy fees on that remaining balance. Is that correct?"

Mah: "Correct."

Harris, D.: "And those dormancy fees could conceivably eat up the entire remainder of what's on the card. Is that correct?"

Mah: "That's correct."

Harris, D.: "So in essence, I'm paying fees to the bank or to the issuer of the card because I didn't use it, but it's my money that indeed they are taking. Is that correct?"

Mah: "Correct."

Harris, D.: "Okay. Go a little bit further. Big banks and businesses understand how people use dollars. And they probably know that a certain number of people don't use all of the money on the card, right?"

Mah: "That's what they're banking on."

Harris, D.: "So, that \$50 card that they gave as a rebate they probably sold it to the... the vendor for less than \$50, right?"

Mah: "Yes. Yes."

121st Legislative Day

4/23/2018

Harris, D.: "So, it seems to me that the person who's ending up holding the short end of this stick is the consumer."

Mah: "That's correct."

Harris, D.: "Because once those dormancy fees kick in all of the money that is left on that card, which after three years as you correctly state, after three years would be turned over to the Treasurer's Office and that Treasurer would then try to find me and say, hey, you've got \$20 here on this card that you may not know about. That is lost because the value on the card has been eaten up by the dormancy fees charged by the issuer, namely, the bank. Does all that make sense?"

Mah: "Yes."

Harris, D.: "Okay."

Mah: "That's exactly how it works."

Harris, D.: "Okay. To the Bill, Ladies and Gentlemen. I think we had a good discussion right there by way of question and answer. And yes, I understand how the… the issuer, be it a bank or… or others that might issue these cards, are going to say wait a minute, we don't like it. Well, they don't like it because as the… as the Sponsor correctly stated they indeed make money off of this. They make money off of this because you and I when we get those cards, we don't use all the value of the card. And when that happens, after a year they can start charging dormancy fees which eat up the remainder of the value of that card. If they didn't do that the dollars left on those… that card would be turned over to the Treasurer's Office and the Treasurer's Office would try to find us under the… what is now known as the I-Cash Program,

121st Legislative Day

4/23/2018

to get that money back to us. So in my opinion, a good consumer Bill. I recommend a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Batinick."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Batinick: "A couple questions, Representative. I want to distinguish a few things. So, are you familiar with Kohl's Cash?"

Mah: "No."

Batinick: "Okay. Clearly, I don't shop..."

Mah: "Yes."

Batinick: "...at Joseph A. Bank all the time, I'm more of a Kohl's guy. When I... when I shop at Kohl's, I know... when I shop at Kohl's sometimes they send me cash and say you have to use this by a certain amount of time. Does this affect that at all?"

Mah: "No."

Batinick: "Okay. The second one is, Menards. I have an older home, I shop at Menards all the time. And they... they run their 11 percent sales all the time. And so you go in you buy a rebate thing and you don't get technically a card, you get a little piece of paper in the mail that you... that gets scanned, works the same way a card would. Does that... does this Bill affect that? It's a rebate."

Mah: "No."

Batinick: "So, it's 11 percent rebate... okay. Why wouldn't it affect that? I don't read sign language, I'm sorry."

Mah: "The... so that's only usable at one merchant. These are cards that are usable at multiple merchants."

121st Legislative Day

4/23/2018

Batinick: "Understood. So, it's more the Visa card... Visa card scenario?"

Mah: "Yes."

Batinick: "Okay. I guess that might answer my last question which had to do with how... how this would affect interstate commerce. Because, you know, you have stores that are across state lines and how this Bill, you know, if you're at a Menards or... or if you had a store that offers a rebate in one state and... does that come into play at all with this?"

Mah: "So..."

Batinick: "I... he had a... okay, go ahead."

Mah: "...so we're not regulating the fees in this Bill; we're regulating what the merchants promised to consumers. So, if a certain amount is promised... for example, a couple of months ago I bought a new iPhone from Costco and I was promised \$200 in a rebate card. So, the idea is that amount that I was promised as an incentive to purchase my iPhone should remain the amount that they promised. And it shouldn't be eaten away... you know, if I for... if I leave my card in Chicago and I spend the entire year here in Springfield working on Bills and I forget about it..."

Batinick: "Right. Okay."

Mah: "...after a year I should still be able to redeem the \$200 that was promised."

Batinick: "So, it sounds like a Visa card is more universal? When you say at multiple stores, can there be like a restaurant card that's used at like six different stores that this counts as or does that apply into the Menards scenario where it's considered like one store?"

121st Legislative Day

4/23/2018

Mah: "It's... it's any rebate card. We're talking about... so, those Visa, MasterCard, or Discover cards that are offered as rebates."

Batinick: "Okay. So, not any rebate card? 'Cause you can get a store rebate card that's only used at that store. So, it has to be more of the credit card type users is what you're referring to, correct?"

Mah: "Yes. 'Cause we... we already prohibit post-issuance fees on single use... on... on gift cards."

Batinick: "Right. So, if I buy a Christmas gift for my... for my grandkid... my grandkid, I don't have any yet. Hopefully, that I know of. But I buy one for my niece or nephew and it's just a Visa card, you can't take any out on that? So, it would look... when it looks the same and it comes in a rebate card you can't do the timed fees on that either?"

Mah: "So... so, the gift cards already ban post..."

Batinick: "Right."

Mah: "...issuance fees."

Batinick: "Okay."

Mah: "We're talking about those that are offered as rebates."

Batinick: "Right. So, you're making the... if you're giving the same card, but it's offered as a rebate instead of as a gift, then you're making the rules the same?"

Mah: "Exactly."

Batinick: "Okay. Thank you. Thank you."

Mah: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wheeler."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

121st Legislative Day

4/23/2018

Wheeler, K.: "Representative, I'm just going to follow up on... on something that my colleague from the Lombard area mentioned.

He gave an example..."

Mah: "Sorry, I can't hear?"

Wheeler, K.: "He gave an example of he bought a... he bought a device from Dell that gave a... a rebate card. The way that we were thinking of rebate cards a moment ago had to do with the fact that you could only use that card at that particular outlet, in this case Dell. Would this Bill apply to that or not apply to that?"

Mah: "No."

Wheeler, K.: "It would not apply to that. So, it's different..."

Mah: "Doesn't..."

Wheeler, K.: "...than what we were originally talking about just a moment ago?"

Mah: "Right. We're talking about the... the cards that are sold by banks to the retailers to offer as rebate cards. And they're sold for less than face value with the assumption that they'll be making the... the difference because we don't use the... the complete value of the card before the dormancy fees kick in."

Wheeler, K.: "Right. But we don't have a limit on the… I mean, let me start in a different direction here. Those cards are used for a reason though to… to invite someone to make a sale… to make a purchase, correct?"

Mah: "Correct."

Wheeler, K.: "Okay. So, that's already an arrangement between the purchaser and the seller. They can read this now... if I read the current law correctly that already has to be disclosed if

121st Legislative Day

4/23/2018

there's dormancy fees in place under the current law. Is that correct?"

Mah: "Under... yes, under Federal Law as well."

Wheeler, K.: "Okay. So, on... yeah. So we're changing from that part of it. It's already disclosed, it's not like it's a hidden thing. If a person wants to read it, they can find it right now, correct?"

Mah: "I'm sorry. Can you repeat that?"

Wheeler, K.: "If a... if a person... if a purchaser is concerned about these dormancy fees, currently they have the option to... to read the disclosure statement to find out that they already exist, correct?"

Mah: "Yes."

Wheeler, K.: "Okay."

Mah: "But they don't... but they don't have a choice between which card to pick. So, if they're issued a rebate card that has these dormancy fees on them, they have no control over that.

And they could lose the value of the card."

Wheeler, K.: "But they could lose the value of the card if the card expires, which you said this... this Bill would not impact, correct?"

Mah: "Correct. So... so, they can have an expiration on the card but not on the value that's placed on the card."

Wheeler, K.: "So, if they put a card out that had a 90-day expiration date, that wouldn't be able to be interpreted by an attorney as a 100 percent... what's the correct term we're using here... dormancy fee? Thank you."

Mah: "So, under Federal Law they... they can't have an expiration that short."

121st Legislative Day

4/23/2018

Wheeler, K.: "Okay. Even one year? What was... what was your limit?"
Mah: "Under Federal Law, it's five years under the Card Act."

Wheeler, K.: "So... okay, so five years. So in other words... the concern I have is the reason why companies might not send a regular check or cash and they send this card because it's convenient for people to use if it's a Visa, or MasterCard, or debit... or Discover card. So they could use it online, other places they couldn't necessarily use cash. Is... that they have to keep these open on their books for a period of time, correct? And that does cost money to keep records open and active in a database. Is that correct?"

Mah: "Yes."

Wheeler, K.: "And we've passed Bills recently, at least since I've been here, to allow the state to clean the rolls of would it affect our dormant activities with respect to the State of Illinois. We allow that currently and we actually... we've passed Bills to expedite that process."

Mah: "Yes."

Wheeler, K.: "So, I guess my... my concern is that those are in effect dormancy fees that we do as a state to our clients. And if... if it's already disclosed to... to the user, what we're ultimately doing is preventing companies from actually taking these kinds of activities and using them in the first place in the State of Illinois."

Mah: "But when these rebates are offered in the form of a check, if the check is not cashed within three years the State of Illinois, through the Treasurer's Office, can offer that money back to the consumer. So, the amount that was promised is not diminished and you can recover that. But with the

121st Legislative Day

4/23/2018

rebate cards, as they currently are, one could not recover the full amount if it's not used within a year."

Wheeler, K.: "Okay. Thank you."

Mah: "Thank you."

Wheeler, K.: "To the Bill. This is another example of Illinois getting in-between a purchaser and a seller, making things more complicated, more expensive for those sellers to actually do business here in the State of Illinois. Only because we're going to divert their behavior from what they may be doing now, which is working for them and for the consumer at some level. They made the choice to make the purchase knowing what they know. And now we're going to tell them, well, you know what, use a different form of activity because we're going to make that either more difficult or more expensive, which I think is what the purpose of the Bill is. I appreciate the Sponsor's intention of trying to... to make this better for consumers. Ultimately, this is going to make things less... more offers less available to consumers. Thank you. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Fortner."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Fortner: "I think we've... a lot of good questions. I just want to clarify some things because I think one of the things your Bill is trying to get at, and it certainly was part of the previous discussion with the previous questioner, is the fact that there was a time when if a store offered a rebate... if I went and bought four new tires for my car and they said, hey, at the store, you know, this manufacturer's got a rebate. If

121st Legislative Day

4/23/2018

you buy the tires from there, you can apply for the rebate. Now, the store couldn't give me any discount 'cause they were still selling me the tires, but they would hand me paperwork and I would fill out the paperwork, I would mail it in. And I would get a check. Ten years ago that's what I would do. Is that a pretty good way of describing it?"

Mah: "Yes. Correct."

Fortner: "And certainly there are still people who do that, but now we see there are providers that will say, hey, we will offer it as a card. Now, sometimes you might not even know or recognize that it was going to be a card when you chose to enter into the rebate. And let me give you an example. I happen to have a rebate card sitting here in my wallet that I just got mailed to me in February, so it hasn't expired yet. There's no dormancy fees on it yet. But back last fall I chose to stay at a certain hotel property and they said, hey, if you spend a certain number of nights with us you could have up to a certain amount of money discounted on your next stay. We'll... we'll give you money for the next stay at the hotel. And what they did is they... the way they delivered on that, I went and did the stay. They gave me paperwork and they said here's what you want, here it's good for. When you stay at the other hotel because that other hotel still has to make their money just like the person who sold me my tires to my car 10 years ago, they asked me to fill out some paperwork and mail it to the corporation. Just like I did with the tire company 10 years ago. The difference is here at this point they didn't send me a check, they sent me a rebate card. Well, that's fine. It's got the same dollar amount that they

121st Legislative Day

4/23/2018

promised me. And because of Federal Laws, I presume, there's also ... the disclaimers are right on the card. It says, valid only in the United States and U.S. Territories and funds do not expire but fees apply. Now, the interesting thing is maybe that was there when they made the original offer before I stayed at the hotel, but I can't say that for sure. I only saw that when I got on to filing for the paperwork after my subsequent stay and applied for the discount. And the point is, and I think what you're trying to do with your Bill, is to say in the past I'd have just gotten a check. And this is supposed to work like a check at any place that would accept a Visa card. And certainly that's what Visa would like it to do is to act like a check. But it has this other issue of these fees. And really what I think you're doing, and correct me if I'm wrong, is you're basically saying the consumer has an expectation that this acts like a check."

Mah: "Yes."

Fortner: "And all this does... all your Bill does is to say, since it is a good as a check would be when I cash it at any of... any other store that I'd pay money for this acts in the same way. Did I get that correct?"

Mah: "Yes. Exactly."

Fortner: "So... so, I think that really what this does is simply is telling the consumers when you started on the process and were made an offer at a store, not through the people working to the rebate offering company 'cause sometimes they're not the same. Sometimes it a dealership that markets multiple products that what this does is it says that you had a thought that it would be like a check. Your Visa card is supposed to

121st Legislative Day

4/23/2018

act like a check. And all this does is it makes it, again, even the way the consumer would expect if they're dealing with that type of store. I'm going to support your Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Halpin."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Halpin: "So, I just had a couple questions. In 2008 we passed regulation of this nature about gift cards, correct?"

Mah: "Correct."

Halpin: "And 10 years later, are you aware whether or not the State of Illinois has bankers and credit unions issuing rebates... or issuing gift cards still?"

Mah: "Yes."

Halpin: "So, we hear a lot of argument about the businesses not wanting to do business or not offering these deals to consumers in Illinois. And if they're still doing business in gift cards 10 years later, I think that's a clear indication that... there's almost 13 million people in the State of Illinois, they're all consumers and these companies want our business. It's a good Bill. It's consumer protection. I... vote 'yes'."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ives: "During the committee testimony, and of course today on the floor, was there ever any allegation that the… the stores were being untruthful in any way without… in not disclosing exactly the terms of the gift cards or the rebate cards?"

121st Legislative Day

4/23/2018

Mah: "No. And the..."

Ives: "Okay. Thank you."

Mah: "...retail merchants..."

Ives: "Mr. Speaker..."

Mah: "...are neutral on this Bill, by the way."

Ives: "Right. Right."

Mah: "I failed to mention that before, but they are not opposed."

Ives: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. So, what you have here is really the consumers are protected as long as they read the details of the rebate cards. And then this is just an honest transaction between the consumer and the store. And we should leave it at that without adding more regulation on yet another business activity here in Illinois. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Hammond."

Hammond: "Thank you, Speaker. To the Bill. There's no argument that these rebate cards are certainly an incentive to the consumers. And we are about to impose a restriction that would be unique to the State of Illinois. There is an indeed a cost to this program for these cards. So, for those of us like myself that live on the border of other states we will indeed be sending business out of the State of Illinois. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Wallace."

Wallace: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to go directly to the Bill. This is an amend... this is a good Bill. Thank you, Representative Mah, for bringing it forward. We're constantly reminded within this chamber that profit often trumps people. And I think that... I really appreciate Representatives like yourself who bring forth legislation that say that people,

121st Legislative Day

4/23/2018

the consumers of Illinois should be protected. This is a good consumer protection Bill and I encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Mah to close."

Mah: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think it's pretty clear that this is a consumer friendly Bill. It... it is a Bill that encourages honesty and... and truth in what's offered to consumers and allows consumers to recuperate the full value of what they're offered. And it is an extension of what we've already done in 2008 with regard to gift cards. I would not say that it is something that would drive consumers across our borders because I think that there's nothing wrong with being on the forefront of doing what's right. And I think consumers would appreciate the fact that, you know, we're a state that protects them and promises to return to them what's offered... what... what should be theirs when, you know, they neglect to use a card. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Harper. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 67 voting 'yes', 44 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5497, Mr. Martwick. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5497, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Martwick."

Martwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 4... 5497 makes various changes to bring

121st Legislative Day

4/23/2018

Illinois law and credit unions closer to the Federal Law. The main changes concern mostly the external audit requirement. They require the use of licensed CPAs rather... rather than merely registered public accountants for external audits. It increases the external audit thresholds to keep up with inflation, changes some reporting deadlines, and it requires mid-size credit unions to conduct annual external audits rather than every three years. I... I know of no opposition. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Members, please record yourselves. Scherer. Scherer. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 87 voting 'yes', 24 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5596, Representative Moeller. Out of the record. House Bill 4531, Mr. Moylan. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4531, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Moylan."

Moylan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the General Assembly. House Bill 4531 provides a county or municipality with an option to require one of the following by a builder or developer when working on a public construction project: a letter of credit, surety bond, or a letter of commitment. This just says that a municipality may require a bond. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen."

121st Legislative Day

4/23/2018

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Breen: "Thank you. Representative, give us a view of the current state of the law on this because you're... you want to require certain... certain devices for public works projects, but not others. What... what's the current law on this?"

Moylan: "The current law was changed previously to the 1980s. Since... since then, some construction projects in municipalities have gone bankrupt leaving the cities or municipalities holding the... the bag as I would say. This Bill would say that they have the option to require a cash bond. And it has different types of cash bonds."

Breen: "And so we're... we are returning to the municipalities an ability they did not have?"

Moylan: "Correct. It was changed... the municipalities had this option before and then in discussion from last year to this year I changed some of the issues that people that we're opposed to it had to make it more reasonable."

Breen: "Now, it... Representative, I've been contacted by a constituent who was against this and I see that the Great Lakes Cement Promotion Council, the Independent Insurance Agents of Illinois, the Illinois Ready Mix Concrete Association, and other opponents from the home and construction industry are opposed. What... what's the nature of their opposition?"

Moylan: "They're opposed because they don't really want to put down a cash bond for their project. But as I mentioned earlier, this is only optional. Towns are not... do not have to do this. This is... only be for a developer where the city may

121st Legislative Day

4/23/2018

have a... thought that they may not finish the project. So, they could... could require a cash bond or surety bond."

Breen: "Okay. So what... what we're doing is if the municipality... so, I mean, this... this would apply to any building project?"

Moylan: "Correct."

Breen: "So, it's a... you know, if you're going to knock a home down and redo it, if you need to do some improvements to the public right of way and that process, anything. Anything from that to building..."

Moylan: "Right."

Breen: "...a subdivision to doing a commercial building, what have you."

Moylan: "Right. The in... the intent is for subdivisions and that type. And I think I made that clear, but I will make sure that I make that clear."

Breen: "Okay. So, it... but in those circumstances, currently they've got... we have certain requirements that they have to meet that are a little more generic. They've got to... they can file... they can file these letters with the county or municipal clerk: letter of credit, a surety bond, a letter of commitment issued by a bank or an SNL. And so, you're saying well we're not going to have that anymore..."

Moylan: "No."

Breen: "...they're got to file something a little more... or the municipality now can require them to file a more firm commitment of funds?"

Moylan: "Right. To the first part of your question, I am not saying that they cannot do that. This would only give a city an option to do that, if they thought there was a need. This

121st Legislative Day

4/23/2018

would not... this is not a requirement. It is only an option for cities if they feel the need to require a type of bond where they would not be held... would not have a project that could not be completed and the city was left holding the bag."

Breen: "Interesting. So today, the balance is more toward development... the developer. They have their option of what to post for these municipal projects or for the municipal parts of the project. What this Bill would do is move the burden on... or move the balance to the municipalities, so the municipality can require a much higher level of guarantee from a builder before commencing work?"

Moylan: "That's correct. And that is what the... the whole body of the Bill contemplates on doing."

Breen: "Okay."

Moylan: "And... and as I mentioned, this is only an option. It's not demanding."

Breen: "Fair enough. And then, I know we've got other Representatives who have questions."

Moylan: "Correct."

Breen: "I'm... I... I understand, having been a village board member and an acting mayor, that there are some of these issues out there. I don't know... I'm going to continue to listen to the debate..."

Moylan: "Right."

Breen: "...to see if we're maybe moving the balance a little too much away from the builders who are trying to get things on the ground and go and too much to the municipal side or not.

But thank you for the Bill."

Moylan: "Thank you, Representative."

121st Legislative Day

4/23/2018

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andersson."

Andersson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll speak to the Bill. I rise in opposition of this Bill, Ladies and Gentlemen, that should be somewhat unique because this is a municipal Bill that gives options, as the Sponsor said, to municipalities. However, there is a right time to do that and there's a wrong time to do that. In this case, what's happening is right now we are crawling out of a financial and real estate crisis that began in 2007. One of the difficulties is obtaining finances for development. One of the difficulties that this Bill imposes it ... is it now flips the option. The option is currently for local developers to be able to post one of two types of security for public improvements: a letter of credit or a bond. Both are totally legal, both are totally backed by solid coverage. And by the way, the municipalities can evaluate the propriety of either instrument to make sure that they're not junk, so to speak. So, we're going to flip that. And now the municipalities will decide that instead of the developer, even though both options are totally legitimate. As a result of that, the development costs are going to go up. And this is how they're going to go up. Most municipalities, I can tell you from experience, favor letters of credit. But unlike a bond, which is relatively inexpensive to purchase, because most of the time letters of credit and bonds are not called, most of the time our developers do a fine job of finishing their projects because, in fact, that's how they become profitable. So, most of the time it... they're not called and the bond is inexpensive. But municipality now elects a letter of credit, guess what? That

121st Legislative Day

4/23/2018

million dollar... or 2 million dollar letter of credit, 'cause that's the kind of numbers we're talking about, now becomes a million dollar cash bond not with the municipality but with the bank because the bank will not issue the letter of credit without a commensurate deposit. So, you just lost a million or two in flexible financing so to speak. You lost a million or 2 million dollars' worth of equity in the developer that they now can't use to build the project. Ladies and Gentlemen, the way the law is today is good. It's been done correctly to encourage development. And there is no real risk to the municipalities because either instrument is valid. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative McDermed."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

McDermed: "Isn't it true, Representative, that the way your proposing that the municipalities have the option, isn't this the way it used to be but it took three actions of the Illinois General Assembly to reverse that option because municipalities abused it so badly for so long? Didn't it take three different actions of this General Assembly to stop the bad behavior? And now they want that option back again. Isn't that true?"

Moylan: "No."

McDermed: "All right. Let me read you off the... how... to the Bill. In fact, the abuses by municipalities in holding bonds and using the money of the bonds for their own purposes, even when the project was completed, resulted in the Illinois General Assembly... listen up all of you that weren't here in

121st Legislative Day

4/23/2018

1996... to change the law with P.A. 89-0518. That wasn't sufficient to get the municipalities to stop their abuses, so we passed another law P.A. 90-0558. Still the municipalities held the bonds and the money passed the completion of the projects and abused their discretion. So, we passed Public Law 92-049... 0479, excuse me, in order to take away from the municipalities the options that the developers have in what kind of money they're going to put down on deposit. Let's not go back down a bad road that our predecessors have already corrected. Let's not allow our municipalities, once again, to abuse the money deposited by our developers by holding it long past any completion date for purposes of their own and to finance their own overspending. Please, please, please keep the good work that our predecessors have done and vote 'no' on this Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Moylan to close."

Moylan: "Ladies and Gentlemen, people on this side of the aisle always talk about local control and this is all about local control. And I respectfully ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Bill 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. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 45 voting 'yes', 62 voting 'no'. And the Gentleman's Bill fails. House Bill 4843, Mr. Moylan. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4843, a Bill for an Act concerning ivory. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Moylan."

121st Legislative Day

4/23/2018

Moylan: "Okay. Ladies and Gentlemen, we're going to try again on a different Bill. Okay. House Bill 4843 prohibits the import, sale and offer for sale, purchase, barter, or possession with the intent to sell any ivory product. Excludes various antique musical instruments. Allows weapons or the administrative rule exemptions to the aforementioned prohibits for a bona fide educational or scientific purposes. Ladies and Gentlemen, we made several changes to this Bill. Previously, the Bill was proposed and I have learned from previous examples to work together in a bipartisan manner and respectfully ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Breen: "Representative, I... I knew your Bill on... banning the sale of ivory would be coming down the pike and I guess I was hoping in your presentation that you would give us a story of someone attempting to import or sell ivory in the State of Illinois that would then justify the Bill. So, can you give us the story that... that you're... whatever it is that you're trying to do?"

Moylan: "Generally, I would have a... numerous stories to... to back up my Bills, but today I am working... well, here, CBS recently reported that as many as 30 thousand elephants were killed a year for their tusks, 1 every 15 minutes. Several states, including California and Washington and the country of China, have recently proposed conservative legislation intended to ban the sale of ivory."

121st Legislative Day

4/23/2018

Breen: "Wait. So, it... is this... and you'll forgive me. I thought

we had a federal... isn't there a Federal Law on ivory..."

Moylan: "Correct."

Breen: "...or International Law of some sort that we don't..."

Moylan: "Yes."

Breen: "...kill elephants for their tusks?"

Moylan: "Yes. Yes, under a previous administration it was banned.

Under the current administration, they banned it, but now they're changing it to allow the hunting of elephants for special purposes. And I think it's important for us as a state to send an example that we really belove our elephants."

Breen: "Wait, now... so... now, I see you've got exemptions. So, you have an exemption for guns and knives that are less than 20 percent ivory and that are more than 100 years old. And then you've got an exemption for musical instruments where it's less than 20 percent of the volume of the instrument and that the item was manufactured no later than 1975. And I'm just... just sitting here trying to think this through. What... what about... so, jewelry or other items that may have been made... made of ivory but you know 100 or more years ago that are antiques, those are no longer... those are not allowed at all?"

Moylan: "Mr..."

Breen: "They're not part of the exemptions are they?"

Moylan: "...Mr. Representative, people that came to me with an objection and came up with a use of ivory in certain instances, I made an exemption and tried to do the best I can. And this is the result of that."

121st Legislative Day

4/23/2018

Breen: "But I just... I... of any exemption to have you,

Representative, in particular make, the exemption for guns
and knives made of ivory just seem a little odd to me."

Moylan: "Well, those... yes. The Gentleman..."

Breen: "So, you're doing a pro-gun Bill with your ivory ban?"

Moylan: "We're always trying to help out."

Breen: "Okay. And... and maybe... maybe another Representative who has a family heirloom with ivory in it or something like that... because at this point, any item that has any ivory in it, even if it was from 200 years ago before the various bans at the federal level, internationally, what have you, that those items could not be sold under your Bill. They can't be sold at all."

Moylan: "Our Bill prohibits..."

Breen: "Or bartered. I mean, that... that's the issue. So, I mean, they're... they're entirely banned. Does somebody... I don't know if somebody else in the chamber has a family heirloom or something like that? I don't even know if they exist. But it... it's just something of concern as we're doing this. Certainly the import, sale, and ban of any new ivory products obviously we don't want to encourage..."

Moylan: "Right."

Breen: "...the killing of further... further elephants. So, thank you, Representative."

Moylan: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Olsen."

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

Speaker Lang: "Absolutely, Sir."

121st Legislative Day

4/23/2018

Olsen: "Thank you. Representative, does... do you currently own any ivory?"

Moylan: "I don't recall at this time."

Olsen: "All right. Well..."

Moylan: "As Jeff Sessions would say."

Olsen: "Okay. Now, do you... so for example, in my family there is a piano, Steinway Piano, 1926 Steinway Piano, that's owned by a family member in my family. Would they be able to sell that piano under your Bill?"

Moylan: "This... we have an exemption that... that allows ivory... ivory to be convened... conveyed to a legal beneficiary upon the death of the original owner."

Olsen: "So, if my family member who owns the piano passed away, they would be able to will it to me or my sister or another heir? Is that what you're saying?"

Moylan: "Are you currently taking piano lessons?"

Olsen: "Representative, I'm asking the questions here."

Moylan: "Well, what... well, I... there's a reason I say this. I've... the reason I say this is 'cause if she's going to will it to you or your sister, if you don't take piano lessons it's going to go to your sister."

Olsen: "Well... thank you. But does it allow them... So, they are... they are allowed to will it to me or to another nonfamily member. Is that correct?"

Moylan: "Correct."

Olsen: "And they're also allowed to sell that instrument?"

Moylan: "That's the way I read it."

Olsen: "Okay. So, they would be able to sell it to a third party not a family member?"

121st Legislative Day

4/23/2018

Moylan: "Correct."

Olsen: "Okay. Does... what other... what stipulation would you have..."

Moylan: "Also, it's been brought to my attention that the keys are left... are less than 20 percent of the musical instrument.

So, that would be allowed."

Olsen: "So piano..."

Moylan: "Correct."

Olsen: "...applies under that... that exemption?"

Moylan: "Correct."

Olsen: "But they could not... is this legislation duplicative of Federal Law?"

Moylan: "It ... it coincides ... it works with Federal Law."

Olsen: "Does it go further than current Federal Law?"

Moylan: "I think that we should... I think that we as a General Assembly should do everything we can... can to protect endangered animals and species, and elephants being one. And so rhinoceros's horns also."

Olsen: "Well, I don't disagree with any of that. I think we need to do our part to protect the environment, and protect rhinoceros, and elephants, and et cetera."

Moylan: "Well, good. You'll be voting for my Bill then. Thank you."

Olsen: "But I... all right. Well, I think... I think I'll leave it to... leave it there. Thank you."

Moylan: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Durkin is recognized."

Durkin: "To the Bill. You know, I appreciate every once in a while where you have this playful interchange, but I don't think this is a Bill that we should be doing at this time. I want

121st Legislative Day

4/23/2018

to remind people of a couple of weeks ago when we had a Judiciary Committee meeting... Criminal-Judiciary Committee meeting, in which Members of my caucus went with good intentions to pass three different Bills. One was to increase penalties against criminals that batter a DCFS employee during the course of employment and that was by Representative McCombie. That Bill was not even given a proper hearing. It was a 'do not pass' Motion. Also that day in Judiciary Committee, Representative Patti Bellock brought a Bill to increase penalties on human trafficking. Again, that Bill died on a 'do not pass' Motion. Also that afternoon in the Judiciary Committee, Representative Mike Unes introduced a Bill in which he was seeking the prohibition on sex offenders from being... from living next door to their victims, 'do not pass'. But today, we're taking on the ivory traffickers in the industry. Folks, don't laugh about this. Think about priorities. And think about what happened two weeks ago. I do not plan to vote for your Bill because of what has happened over the past two weeks in which many of my Members were embarrassed in caucus... in... in that committee. And I don't think that this Bill is appropriate for this Body. And I'm asking my Members not to vote for this either."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Moylan to close."

Moylan: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. The Leader on this side of the aisle, that was a different day. Today's a new day. I don't live in the past, Mr. Leader. This is important. I'm sure if you're an elephant how would you feel if they're shooting you and cutting off your tusks? And I respectfully ask for an 'aye' vote."

121st Legislative Day

4/23/2018

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 61 voting 'yes', 44 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4858, Mr. Pritchard. Mr. Pritchard. Out of the record. House Bill 4469, Representative Stratton. Representative Stratton. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4469, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Stratton."

Stratton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 4469 would require county jails and local election authorities to collaborate in creating a process to facilitate an opportunity for voting, including providing a voter registration form to everyone in eligible. Large counties, those with custody who is populations of more than 3 million, would be able to establish a temporary polling place in county jails. And the thousands of individuals being released from prison each year would be notified that their voting rights have been restored and be given an updated registration form. Seven counties already have a program and Champaign County became the eighth during the most recent primary. I'd like to acknowledge the collaboration of stakeholders on this effort including the Illinois State Board of Elections, the Chicago Board of Elections, the Illinois Department of Corrections, and the Illinois Sheriffs' Association. I respectfully request an 'aye' vote."

121st Legislative Day

4/23/2018

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Breen: "Representative, I... I heard the other day about an Amendment where Cook County was exempted from the requirement of facilitating vote by mail and... why is Cook County the only one that's allowed to be withheld from that... that requirement as opposed to the other counties?"

Stratton: "Under the... under the Bill and that specific Amendment, it makes it clear that when there's a population of over 3 million then they are to establish a temporary polling place on-site. We did not want it to be overly burdensome to counties. Cook County, or a larger county like Cook County, could establish a temporary polling place; smaller counties should do what works best for them. And that's... and it's... we're leaving it up to local control. And that could include voting by mail."

Breen: "Now, Representative, I... I think, you know, the Leader made a point previously that in our rush to concern for everyone who is incarcerated in jail, we appear to have lost the concern for the people that they victimized that put them in jail. And I wonder what your answer would be as to whether we should be dealing with these other issues first, possibly protecting victims first, ensuring that our criminal laws truly meet the needs of our citizens first before imposing a mandate on every county in the state to do something that Cook County appears to be doing."

Stratton: "Again, this Bill has two specific parts. One is that it talks about facilitating a process for voting for pretrial

121st Legislative Day

4/23/2018

detainees that are in county jails. Pretrial detainees have not been convicted. As you know, in our country you are innocent until proven guilty. So, merely by virtue of being in a jail does not mean that you are going to be convicted or have been convicted of anything. The second portion of the Bill relates to providing information for those exiting the Department of Corrections. This is a process that we worked with the Department of Corrections; they have agreed to do this. And that is simply providing information to people who have been convicted. They cannot vote while they are in prison. So, this Bill specifically is only talking about people who are pretrial detainees who have not been convicted."

Breen: "But again, Representative, I think the issue is, you know, I.m I'm certainly willing to consider a Bill like this. And I'm sure my caucus Members would be more willing to consider a Bill like this if they had a bit more consideration on Bills dealing with the victims of the crimes. And now, you, yourself, I believe, voted on some of those Bills. I think I remember seeing your name on the Roll Call killing some of the Republican Bills that would help to ensure that our criminal law properly punishes those who do harm to our innocent citizens. So, again, I ask why... why should we bother with something like this? Even though it might not be a bad idea to require every county in the state to do something akin to what Cook County does, might not be a bad idea. But why would we start here when you're killing good Bills that vast majorities of the people of this state agree with? Eighty percent-plus want us to protect child welfare workers when

121st Legislative Day

4/23/2018

they are in the midst of their business. They want us to address the criminal element that is taking over our counties. They want to start there, not here. What... how can you justify voting 'no' on those Bills last week or when we were last here and then running this Bill, which is so solicitous of the rights of those who commit the crimes?"

Stratton: "Well, first of all, Representative, I would respectfully suggest that you review the Roll Call to see what my vote was. Secondly, I want to stay focused on the Bill that I'm presenting, which is House Bill 4469. Voting is a constitutional right in this country. And this Bill is only about providing people who are pretrial detainees, who have not been convicted the opportunity to vote. It's a constitutional right and that's exactly why I believe it's something that should be pursued."

Breen: "To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, we're hearing a lot about constitutional rights today and certainly voting is one of those. And we're glad to work on this issue, maybe not in a way that mandates a method from Cook County on all of the other 101 counties in the state that we were told only is being practiced in 7 counties. If we had a focus on the victims of the crime, if we had cooperation on Bills that in any other General Assembly in any other state in the country that had any sense would have gone out in a bipartisan manner, but instead have been killed. That's what we're dealing with here today. The merits of the Bill are what they are. But the fact is, the focus of this General Assembly is for too long been on the criminals and not on the victims. And so for that

121st Legislative Day

4/23/2018

reason, respectfully urge either a 'no' vote, a 'present' vote, or no vote at all."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Durkin."

"Thank you. To the Bill. Previous speaker made a good point, exempting Cook County doesn't make any sense to me. I don't think it's right, but we don't have control of this chamber. But I want to reiterate what he stated and also what I... make some points about what I said last... in the previous Bill. And I think I speak for many of the men and women in this... on this side of the aisle but also on the other side of the aisle. Is that we will stand in hopes, we will stand tall on behalf of that DCFS employee who was assaulted on the job, the victims of human trafficking, and victims of sexual abuse and assault before we are going to side with criminals, violent criminals throughout the State of Illinois who've been charged and indicted with horrible crimes. And that's throughout the State of Illinois. But before we get some type of resolution on the case on the ... on the Bills that I spoke about earlier, I don't believe our side of the aisle is prepared to work and to pass these types of initiatives where there is an imbalance between the victims of the crime and those who perpetrate crime. And I would ask that our Members also over there on that side of the aisle to vote 'no' and let's talk about priorities."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

121st Legislative Day

- Flowers: "Representative, I'm sorry I was preoccupied working on some of my legislation. Can you explain to me, once again, what is the purpose of this Bill, please?"
- Stratton: "The purpose of the Bill is twofold. First of all, for those individuals that are currently detained pre... pretrial in county jails, it requests that county jails and local election authorities facilitate an opportunity for those individuals to be able to vote while being detained. The second aspect is that people who are exiting the Department of Corrections would be given information that lets them know that their voting rights have been restored and that they are in fact able to vote."
- Flowers: "So, pretrial? Now, remember, I'm not a lawyer and I don't play one, but pretrial is for detainees who are locked up in Cook County or the county jails and they have not been found guilty and they may be there because they couldn't afford the bail. Am I correct?"
- Stratton: "That's absolutely correct. And, again, as I mentioned previously, in our country you are in fact innocent until proven guilty. There is such a thing as due process under the law, you do have the opportunity to have a trial but also there are many people that the charges are dismissed and they are never pursued. And they might be in jail temporarily but there's no reason why they are not eligible to vote."
- Flowers: "And so, the other portion of your Bill is kind of concerning to me as well. And I didn't hear your explanation. You said something about ex-offenders when they are exiting the prisons. Can you elaborate on that, please? I just need clarity."

121st Legislative Day

4/23/2018

Stratton: "Yes. And so just by way of background, when I would knock on doors a number of times there were many people who told me they were unable to vote because they thought because they had a back... a felony conviction that they were unable to vote in our state. That is not true. But there's so much misinformation. There are people who are in affect being disenfranchised because they are not aware that their voting rights have in fact been restored upon exiting the Department of Corrections per Illinois law. And so, the second part of this Bill is to provide your... information on their voting rights, as well as a voter registration application upon exiting the Department of Corrections, so that they can in fact be aware of their rights."

Flowers: "And... and finally, Representative, my last... well, a couple questions. In... in regards... and this has nothing to do with the Bill and if you don't know the answer that's fine. But I think here in this state we do have something called the Crime Victim Witness Act and I do believe that is to address the person that was the victim of the crime, that's number one. And number two, as Legislators are we the judge, the juries, and the executioners or do we have another level of government that will make those decisions with the proper evidence that is presented?"

Stratton: "Correct. And so, when I mentioned due process under law, there is a process in place constitutionally for someone to... if there's a determination, if they've been charged to go through a trial and be adjudicated one way or the other. However, as a previous speaker indicated to call someone a criminal, and that was the term that was used, when someone

121st Legislative Day

4/23/2018

has merely been arrested and being detained those... that's not synonymous with being a criminal because there has been no adjudication or a determination as to whether or not that person would be found guilty under our laws."

Flowers: "And... and finally, Representative, my last question. And again, if you don't know the answer, perfectly fine. But there have been quite a few people that was once labeled erroneously of being a criminal and found guilty but then later been found innocent. And so, we have had to pay for the mistakes that the State of Illinois has made by falsely incarcerating innocent people. And will this Bill restore... help restore their liberty that was lost as well? For those who are not fortunate enough to get a... a certificate of innocence?"

Stratton: "I'm not sure if this particular Bill addresses that issue but one thing that we do know is that when people are exiting the system and they have an opportunity to be civically engaged that it's one of the things that helps reduce recidivism. People feeling that they are a part of the process that they have some level of hope, and certainly as elected officials I know that we're all aware of how important the right to vote is. And that we want to ensure that everyone who is eligible to vote has that opportunity. And that was the impetus behind this Bill."

Flowers: "Well, thank you, Representative. And to the Bill. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think if we're going to debate the Bill, or any Bill, we should not imply what we think the Bill says or what we think it should say in order to make it something negative. We need to deal with the facts. There's no reason why we have to elaborate

121st Legislative Day

4/23/2018

and make this Bill on something that it's not to make this Lady seem like she's cuddling criminals. And she's not. The fact of the matter is this Bill is restoring rights of people who are entitled to have their rights restored respectfully. So with that being said, I would appreciate an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wheeler."

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

Speaker Lang: "Your request is acknowledged, Sir."

Wheeler, K.: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davidsmeyer."

Davidsmeyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Question of the Chair?"

Speaker Lang: "Yes, Sir?"

Davidsmeyer: "Are you... are you holding off speakers on your side of the aisle and letting us speak first? Is that what's going on here?"

Speaker Lang: "Not at all, Sir."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. That's not my understanding, but I appreciate it. Question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Davidsmeyer: "So, earlier you mentioned that... earlier it was mentioned that the City of Chicago is exempted from this... this Bill. It is not?"

Stratton: "I'm sorry... I did not say that, no."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. You're just... you're just exempting yourself from the vote by mail process?"

Stratton: "Essentially, what was added in... what was added in House Floor Amendment 4 was that the counties can choose what they

121st Legislative Day

4/23/2018

want to do but at the very least a county with a population of 3 million or more should have a temporary polling place on-site, which is something that Cook County jail is already actually doing. There... as I mentioned before, there are already eight counties that are participating in a program. And part of the reason why I filed this Bill is because it's not consistent around the state."

Davidsmeyer: "So, the... the City of Chicago gets to make their own rules and the rest of the state has to follow what this Body says?"

Stratton: "Again, it's not the City of Chicago. Jails are..."

Davidsmeyer: "Cook County?"

Stratton: "...managed by counties."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay."

Stratton: "And so, this would be Cook County or any... any place with 3 million. If they want to do vote by mail, they can. But what we wanted to make clear on this Bill is that they can just... they're only required under the Bill to do an onsite temporary polling place because it's so large. And what we also did under the Bill is we left the requirement specifically broad, very broad, so that counties can decide what works best for them. We know that it's not... each county is different. There are different needs, different sizes. And we wanted to give that local control so that each county could decide what works best for that county."

Davidsmeyer: "So why... why didn't you afford the same local control for counties under... or for counties over 3 million individuals?"

121st Legislative Day

4/23/2018

Stratton: "That's the floor in terms of having a temporary polling site. Whatever else Cook County or any other county that has 3 million or more wants to do, they can certainly do that. But as you know, Cook County, I think, currently has about 7 thousand people detained in its jail. There are other counties that have only let's say 20 people who are detained in their jail. It wouldn't make sense to have all of the election authority to come in and actually set up a temporary polling place. But if they wanted to do that under this Bill they could. We're leaving it up to the county to decide what's best under its local control."

Davidsmeyer: "I just... it looks to me like there's a different standard for those over 3 million than there is under 3 million. I... I urge... I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Evans. Mr. Evans."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Evans: "Our Republican spokesperson made a statement and it was really concerning and I want to get clarity from the Sponsor. I know that you've worked in the criminal justice space and I really want to get clarity on what a criminal is. Could you please, in your professional experience, explain the definition of a criminal? What would you say the definition of a criminal would be?"

Stratton: "I think the best way to respond to that is to talk about the term that's used within the Bill..."

Evans: 'Sure."

Stratton: "...and that is pretrial detainees. So, individuals who are being detained in a jail pretrial, and that speaks for

121st Legislative Day

4/23/2018

itself, they have yet to have a trial, are being detained in jails oftentimes because they cannot afford bond amounts. But that's what a pretrial detainee is."

Evans: "And would you say that a pretrial detainee, has that individual been convicted of a crime?"

Stratton: "No."

Evans: "So, that person most likely would not be considered a criminal, correct?"

Stratton: "I mean, I... it's hard to try to attach labels to individuals. What I would say is that a person who has not been convicted is not going to be sentenced, certainly not sentenced to prison. They are not convicted of a felon... whatever it is, they are not convicted. And so, while you're pretrial, as I talked about before, you're innocent until proven guilty."

Evans: "Thank you, Representative Stratton. To the Bill. We can believe whatever we want to believe about criminal justice, about criminals, about whatever, but this Bill is clear. Individuals who have not been convicted of a crime are not criminals. We are not giving rights to criminals. We're not doing anything for criminals. We are giving a right to individual citizens who for whatever reason could possibly, potentially have an issue. So, I ask you to support this piece of legislation and not turn this into anything than what it is. This is an opportunity for individuals who have not been convicted of a crime to have their constitutional right as a citizen, not only in the State of Illinois but in the United States. I ask for your support for this great piece of legislation. And thank you, Representative Stratton, for

121st Legislative Day

4/23/2018

bringing this Bill forward and giving individuals the right throughout this state to do what we want them to do. We call our penal system the Department of Corrections; the path to corrections is feeling like a citizen. So, thank you, Representative Stratton."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mitchell."

Mitchell, C.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to go straight to the Bill. I'm going to ask the chamber and Sponsor to forgive me as I have laryngitis, so it's kind of hard for me to speak. But I wanted to speak to something that was said by the Republican Floor Leader. He made a juxtaposition in his nativist dog whistling screed about citizens versus those who are somehow more innocent and then this criminal element that's working its way into our counties. These are still citizens. People in prison awaiting trial are still citizens. I would think that someone who was a member of the Illinois Bar would know the difference. Apparently that wasn't taught at this Gentleman's law school. So, I want to ... I want to note that what we're talking about here is the right of citizens who have not been convicted of a crime to be able to vote. What we're talking about is giving other counties the flexibility to do something that Cook County is already doing. If you want to talk about what's happening in the Judiciary Committee, about a process that is an interesting and valid concern that I think will be addressed here shortly. But while you're doing it, please don't play into this Sessions-esque, Trump-like notion about criminal elements juxtaposed to those to people who are in jail who are not yet convicted of having done anything. It lowers this chamber, it

121st Legislative Day

4/23/2018

lowers the Floor Leader for the other side, and it is not an acceptable conversation on this Bill or any other. This Bill deserves an 'aye' vote. Thank you so much."

Speaker Lang: "Representative McCombie."

McCombie: "Thank you, Speaker. To the Bill. I would just like to say that I contacted all of my counties and they are already doing this in my four counties and have asked me not to vote for this. So, I will not be able to vote 'yes' for this Bill. But my counties are already doing this."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Gordon-Booth."

Gordon-Booth: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. The Sponsor has so eloquently laid out exactly why this is a critical piece of legislation being brought to the forefront at a time in which we are unpacking many of the injustices that are currently... this Bill is coming forth at a time when we are beginning to... as a country, we're beginning to unpack so many of the injustices that have gone on largely in black and brown communities around the issue of justice and the lack of justice. And what concerns me so much is the fact that people Body are so comfortable denying someone's constitutional right to be able to participate in democracy. What I also can't understand is how anyone feels comfortable speaking against citizens having the ability to vote because goes against the entire concept and ideal self-government. Which is what your forefathers, when they founded this country, that was a critical piece of importance to them. What often... what also bothers me in this chamber is the fact that unless we're talking about the Second Amendment all the rest of them are negotiable, all of them, when it

121st Legislative Day

4/23/2018

comes to the rights of people that don't look like you. And the notion that somehow this issue of people being able to participate in democracy somehow takes something away from victims, how dare you. How dare you. I stand here as a victim of gun violence. My family received a call that no one in this place wants to ever receive, ever. So, please don't play that tough on crime 1994 Crime Bill feeling 'cause it doesn't work anymore. And we're going to stand in this Body against that kind of language because you know what? It reeks of racism. I said it. It reeks of racism. And you know what, you may be tired of hearing it but guess what? I'm tired of experiencing it. And so, what I hope that we can do in this Body because we have worked on a lot of Criminal Justice Reform Bills over the last few years because we should be doing it. We shouldn't have to be grateful and so benevolent because we're doing exactly what we should be doing for people who need us to do it for them. And so, my hope would be that we don't let something that has nothing to do with this Bill get in the way of a very important piece of criminal justice reform. A very important Bill to instilling democracy even when people are behind bars but not yet convicted and imprisoned. It is a simple concept. It is something for all the constitutional scholars that we have in this Body. They should inherently not only understand it, but they should also fight for it. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative McDermed."

McDermed: "To the Bill. As someone who's been on quite a few of the Criminal Justice Reform Bills on the floor of this House and all of you whose Bills I've supported, you know who you

121st Legislative Day

4/23/2018

are, I just want to say that it's very discouraging, disheartening, disrespectful, and I don't know... dashes my hopes that it's always a one-way street. Always a one-way street. I don't disagree with any of the points that have been made, particularly by the most eloquent Rep from Peoria. She's completely correct. But it is also correct that we have Bills, we have concerns and to be disrespected and to never have any of our concerns and the wishes of our districts considered ever, but in fact to have them mocked and just laughed at continuously... I've been here for 4 years, I'm kind of over it. And I'm tired of giving away my support to the social justice reform Bills for free. I'm over it all, y'all."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Wallace."

Wallace: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to go straight to the Bill. I was actually not going to say anything. I was going to allow Leader Gordon-Booth's impassioned words be the last words that were heard on this particular debate, or that I hoped would be heard on this particular debate, because what she said was so true about ensuring democracy. We have watched over the last several years as the enfranchisement and the voting rights of people of color have been chipped away at bit, by bit, by bit for the last several years; 2013 was the nail in the coffin for the Voting Rights Act of 1965. And then we've had our first Presidential Election since then, our first Gubernatorial Election since then and we have had cross-check popups since then. And I just want to understand why should we, as a chamber... not a part or a side of the aisle... as a chamber, stand here each and every single one of us who raise our right hands and swore to uphold the

121st Legislative Day

4/23/2018

Constitutions of this state and of the United States of America, why should any one of us sit here and vote 'no' to a Bill that is about protecting the rights of individuals who have not had their day in court? I've been here 4 years too. I've got about seven or eight months left. And in those next several months, I will not continue to sit here and let for the dog whistles to be blown as loud as possible as Representative Mitchell just mentioned. We have got to have honest conversations about who we prioritize in this state, whether we prioritize people in this state and if we are really going to take our oaths of offices seriously. Because if we're not then everybody should pack up with me in January and we should let a whole new group come in who is willing to hold up the Constitution of this state and of the State of Illinois as we all swore to do. So, I hope that we can stop having discussion over... well, I got my Bill and you got yours. You didn't get your Bill, I didn't get mine. That is not ... that shouldn't be the type of discussion... our discussion should be germane to whatever the Bill is that is on the board. But we are not in preschool anymore, we had that debate about preschool last Friday. We're not there. We are all adults. We should all work as hard as possible to move our legislation. And then if it doesn't happen, we come back at it. I have Bills that I have introduced every single year that I've been here. You just keep working at it. But you don't get to demoralize somebody else's legislation and try to cut them down because you didn't get your piece of legislation. That's not how this process works. So, I encourage, when we do vote for this Bill, everybody to

121st Legislative Day

4/23/2018

remember the oath of office that you rose your right hand to God and swore to and remember the card that you signed your name to and make sure that it's consistent with how you cast your vote on this particular Bill. Because I would say that you're a hypocrite if you vote 'no' on this Bill. And go back on... up and continue to take an oath of office to uphold the Constitution when you are willing to deny the constitutional rights of individuals who may be in a county jail because they don't have \$5 thousand to bail themselves out. I encourage an 'aye' vote at the due time."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Stratton to close."

Stratton: "Mr. Speaker, please pull it from the record."

- Speaker Lang: "Bill will be taken from the record. Ladies and Gentlemen, we're going to Second Reading Bills now. If you have a Bill on Second Reading, please listen for your name. House Bill 5757, Representative Bristow. Do you wish to move your Bill? Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5757, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. But a fiscal note has been requested on the Bill and has not been filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Bill will be held on the Order of Second Reading.

 House Bill 1469, Mr. Burke. Mr. Burke. Out of the record.

 House Bill 4512, Representative Conyears-Ervin. Conyears
 Ervin. Out of the record. House Bill 5508, Mr. Ford. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5508, a Bill for an Act concerning human rights. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. A note... a state

121st Legislative Day

- mandates note has been requested on the Bill and has not been filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Hold the Bill on the Order of Second Reading. House Bill 4364, Mr. Davidsmeyer. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4364, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Two Floor Amendments have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Davidsmeyer."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davidsmeyer."
- Davidsmeyer: "Floor... Floor Amendment 1 just ensures that the courts have a say in whether a person goes to a... a work camp or not by specifically saying they do not want them to go. So, that's their way of... of not allowing it."
- 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: "Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Davidsmeyer."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davidsmeyer."
- Davidsmeyer: "Floor... Floor Amendment 2 just makes sure that... I believe that it comes back to the General Assembly..."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment..."
- Davidsmeyer: "...for..."
- Speaker Lang: "...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... Third Reading. House Bill 5612, Representative Greg Harris. Please read the Bill."

121st Legislative Day

- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5612, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Greg Harris."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."
- Harris, G.: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Floor
 Amendment #2 adds another location in Representative Laura
 Fine's district to some other exemptions from the 100-foot
 limit."
- 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 filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 1265, Mr. Hoffman. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1265, a Bill for an Act concerning education. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Two Floor Amendments have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Hoffman."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hoffman."
- Hoffman: "Thank you. This was discussed in committee and will be amended by Floor Amendment #2. So, adopt this and then go to Floor Amendment 2."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen."
- Breen: "It... to clarify, we're going to... Floor Amendment 1 and... are we going to talk about 2?"
- Hoffman: "Yes. We'd like to adopt 2 as well."
- Breen: "Okay. But we'll talk about 2 after we get to 2."

121st Legislative Day

4/23/2018

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: "Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Hoffman."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is what was suggested by the other side of the aisle in order to make the Bill more palatable to them. It reduces the amount of... the amount that you can increase the debt limit by the amount that actually would be received from the Capital Development Board or the State Board of Education."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen."

Breen: "Just... just to be clear. So, Representative, I think your...
your Bill Floor Amendment 1 is increasing a debt limit for
the Wolf Branch School District 113. And then it's also
generally increasing the maximum amount of debt for grants
awarded by the State Board of Education or Capital Development
Board for this similar purpose of repairing or reconstructing
a school building damaged by mine subsidence. Is that the
extent of the Bill?"

Hoffman: "Yeah. The... what's happened is the school has sunk, they need emergency funds. The emergency funds are hopefully going to come, they're working on it now. We're asking the debt limit be increased. However, your side of the aisle suggested that we only allow it to be increased by amount that is... that would include or... by an amount that is less than what we received from the state. In other words, this... the total

121st Legislative Day

4/23/2018

amount of the project's supposed to be \$17 million... 17.5. If they receive 10 million from the state, then they can only increase the debt limit by 7 million, 7.5 million."

Breen: "Fair enough. Good idea. Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 1292, Mr. Hoffman. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1292, a Bill for an Act concerning education. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Hoffman."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "I just ask that Floor Amendment #2 be adopted."

Speaker Lang: "Sir, tell us something about the Amendment."

Hoffman: "What this would do is it deals with the SIU system. And what it would do is it would... it would... it would gut and replace the original Bill. And it allows the student members... excuse me. And it... what it would do it would allow that we have a 7 board of governance for the SIU-Edwardsville and the SIU-Carbondale. I apologize, I've got something in my throat."

Speaker Lang: "Don't apologize, Sir. Take a drink of water. Mr. Breen."

Breen: "Just to clarify, Representative. Your legislation separates SIU into two separate universities, two distinct Boards of Trustees. You've got student voting members. But

121st Legislative Day

4/23/2018

it's two separate universities is what you're creating with the Bill?"

Hoffman: "Yes."

Breen: "Okay."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 4226, Representative Kifowit. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4226, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Kifowit."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Kifowit."

Kifowit: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I ask for the Amendment of... I ask for the adoption of Amendment #1. It clearly changed the ROEs to district superintendent."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen."

Breen: "Just to clarify, Representative, what are you... you're changing ROE's to..."

Kifowit: "District superintendents. It's a technical change in
 the Amendment."

Breen: "On the authority to supervise athletic training and things like that..."

Kifowit: "Correct."

Breen: "...in an emergency action. Thank you."

Kifowit: "Correct."

121st Legislative Day

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 5310, Representative Lilly. Representative Lilly. Please... please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5310, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. But a fiscal note has been requested on the Bill, as amended, and has not been filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Please hold the Bill on the Order of Second Reading. House Bill 5344, Representative Lilly. Do I need to say please? Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. House Bill 4657, Representative Manley. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4657, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Manley."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Manley."
- Manley: "You always come to me when I'm not ready here, hold on one second. House Floor Amendment #2 is a technical Amendment... excuse me... coming from the Illinois School Psychologists Association. It clarifies that Emotional Intelligence and Social and Emotional Learning Task Force shall develop a curriculum and assessments guidelines pertaining to the... I can't see, I'm getting older... emotional intelligence and social and emotional learning. Previously the Bill only

121st Legislative Day

- provided that the task force was required to develop a curriculum."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 4658, Representative Manley. Two in a row. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4658, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments have been approved for consideration. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 5786, Representative Mayfield. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5786, a Bill for an Act concerning education. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Committee Amendment #1 and Floor Amendment #2 have been adopted. No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 5632, Mr. Mitchell.

 Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5632, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Christian Mitchell."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mitchell."
- Mitchell, C.: "Thank you. So, this is a clean-up Bill from... or clean-up Amendment from the Ambulance Association. It clarifies certain... it clarifies the definition. There was concern after the word intervention that it could prevent

121st Legislative Day

- some potential life-saving intervention. This Bill cleans that up and removes that opposition."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 4442, Representative Willis. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4442, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 5682, Mr. McAuliffe.

 Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5682, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 5683, Mr. McAuliffe.

 Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5683, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 5595, Representative McCombie. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5595, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

121st Legislative Day

4/23/2018

- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 4247, Mr. McSweeney. Out of the record. House Bill 5573, Mr. Mitchell. Mr. Mitchell. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5573, a Bill for an Act concerning crime victims. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Christian Mitchell."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mitchell."
- Mitchell, C.: "This is a clarification offered by the State's Attorneys Association that removes their opposition."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 5163, Representative Moeller. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5163, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 5164, Representative Moeller. Out of the record. House Bill 1620, Mr. Moylan. Second Reading, Sir. Do you wish to move the Bill? Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1620, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Moylan."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Moylan."

121st Legislative Day

4/23/2018

Moylan: "Yes. Mr. Trailer (sic-Mr. Speaker), we are working on a agreement with the opponents of this Bill. And I would like to move this... adopt this Amendment."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Breen: "Representative Moylan, is this a trailer Bill?"

Moylan: "Yes, Sir. It's a trailer Bill about trailers."

Breen: "Fair enough. Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 4867, Mr. Olsen. Please read the Bill."

- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4867, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 5541, Mr. Sauer. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5541, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 5778, Representative Stuart. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5778, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 has been

121st Legislative Day

- adopted. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Stuart."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Stuart."
- Stuart: "Thank you. Floor Amendment #2, it's just a clarification.

 The original tax credit expired in 2014. Department of Revenue asked that we made sure that it didn't look like it was going to be retroactive and let people file amended returns."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 5122, Mr. Welch. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5122, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Welch."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Welch."
- Welch: "Mr. Speaker, thank you. Floor Amendment #1 on House Bill 52 (sic-House Bill 5122) is the Amendment that I promised to file in committee that clarifies that the tuition waiver is a last dollar waiver. I would ask for adoption and move to Third Reading."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 5166, Mr. Wheeler. Please read the Bill."

121st Legislative Day

- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5166, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Keith Wheeler."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wheeler."
- Wheeler, K.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd move to adopt Floor Amendment #1 which is clarifying language regarding the acceptance of email and disputes between parties in the Administrative Procedure Act. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 4340, Representative Barbara Wheeler. Out of the record. House Bill 4811, Mr. Zalewski. Mr. Zalewski. Out of the record. House Bill 5344, Representative Lilly. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5344, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Chair recognizes Mr. Turner on a point of personal privilege."
- Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Body. Just a moment of personal privilege. You know, I've been hearing a lot of discussion about the Motions that were made in my Criminal Committee last week, here on the floor and behind the scenes of our protest votes and others just having ambeing angry about what took place. And you know, it... it just bothers me. And I usually don't get on this mic to go back

121st Legislative Day

4/23/2018

and forth with anyone in this chamber about anything, but what... what you're not hearing is that there were steps taken by... there were discussions that were had behind the scenes. Members were offered subject matter opportunities, options to discuss Amendments, options to come up with other negotiated sort of approaches to what was being suggested in their Bills and that just wasn't done. Instead, there were Motions made for 30 something-plus Bills to be discharged and heard and so that's exactly what we did. But we sent a strong point that the old days of just locking them up and throwing away the key and extending penalties down here, they just won't be ... it's not happening on my watch. That's not what I'm about. That's not what my people back home sent me here for. And everyone in this chamber knows that increasing penalties blanketly across the board doesn't serve as a deterrent for anything. And the Representative from Carroll's Bill... from Carroll County... Carroll County's Bill that person could have been charged with murder and would have locked up for longer than even what is being suggested in her legislation. But all... here we... we come down here and we've been doing it for years, where we take this political approach, we run back down to Springfield with some incident that's happened back home somewhere and we say, hey, we want to lock them up for 20 years now, 30 years now. What has it got us? Overcrowded jails. Jails that don't help or contribute to our fiscal crisis that we have here in Illinois at all. You need to have a Governor that has supported our efforts in criminal justice reform, who doesn't buy into the approach of locking them up more or just extending penalties across the board. So, until

121st Legislative Day

4/23/2018

we start negotiating about smart approaches to dealing with the criminal issues that we have here, the idea of just locking up more brown and black people or anybody for that matter and increasing penalties in the State of Illinois is not happening while I'm the Chair of the Criminal Committee. So, we can go back and forth about it. You can protest vote. You can not vote. You can take whatever approach you want to, but it doesn't get us any closer to getting anything done. And I'm more than willing to discuss anything with anybody in this chamber. Everybody knows that. I'm upset, so forgive me. But it's not right. It's not right. And to suggest that and to throw it out there like we're not concerned about victim's families or ... you know that enhancing penalties won't bring that person back and won't deter the next person from doing anything. So, let's talk about smart legislation. Let's talk about smart approaches to criminal justice reform. Let's get on board with your boss who wants to also reduce the prison population and we can go from there. Until then, you can stand up and yell and cry about it all you want, but it's not going to change anything that happens in that Criminal Committee. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bryant."

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

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Bryant: "I'd like to address what the previous speaker just spoke to as a Member of the Jud-Crim Committee. So, I would be somebody coming out of the criminal justice system that has been very open to often voting on Bills that I ordinarily would not have supported but to try to move the... the justice

121st Legislative Day

4/23/2018

reform Bills forward, to try to take a different approach, to get off of the idea of a knee on their neck, to... you know, to maybe get some... some folks past felonies expunged or sealed, we've moved in that direction. But what we saw last week, all due respect to the previous speaker, was not everything that he just said. There were Bills that were... that we... had Motions 'do not pass'. One in particular, was Representative from Oakwville who had a Bill that would have just allowed concealed carry for members of the military who were stationed in this state and for their spouses. And that... that Bill did not even really get a decent hearing. All because there was a push last week to just 'do not pass' on a bunch of Bills. So, I understand and again, all due respect to the Chairman, but it wasn't exactly the way you just portrayed it. So, I ... I'm committed to continuing to work on the Bills to not keep people incarcerated any longer. I appreciate the approach that we're taking when it comes to reentry programs. And... and moving maybe closer to more transitional centers, an approach to get people trained when they're out on the street. But what is... what went on last week in the committee, I... I'm sure that that wasn't what was intended, but it certainly is exactly what happened. So, you have a commitment to move in that direction, but it has to be reciprocal. Thank you."

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

Clerk Bolin: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 1003, offered by Representative Andersson. House Resolution 1005, offered by Representative Andersson. House Resolution 1006, offered by Representative Moeller. House Resolution 1007, offered by

121st Legislative Day

4/23/2018

Representative Ford. And House Resolution 1008, offered by Representative Jimenez."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. And now, leaving perfunctory time for the Clerk, Leader Currie moves that the House stand adjourned 'til Tuesday, April 24 at the hour of 11 a.m. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the House stands adjourned."

Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Introduction and First Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 2546, offered by Representative Guzzardi, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 2580, offered Representative Turner, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 2629, offered by Representative Willis, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Senate Bill 3223, offered by Representative Cassidy, a Bill for an Act concerning children. Senate Bill 3241, offered Representative Evans, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. First Reading of these Senate Bills. Introduction and First Reading of House Bills. House Bill 5867, offered by Representative Ford, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 5868, offered by Representative Ford, a Bill for an Act concerning health. First Reading of these House Bills. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."