141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

- Speaker Lang: "The House will be in order. We shall be led in prayer today by Lee Crawford, the Pastor of the Cathedral of Praise Christian Center in Springfield. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off cell phones and rise for the invocation and Pledge of Allegiance. Pastor Crawford."
- Pastor Crawford: "Let us pray. Most gracious and sovereign and mostly holy, God, You're the God of power and might, wisdom and justice. It is through You authority is rightly administered. It is through You that laws are rightly enacted and judgements are decreed. God assist us today with Your spirit of counsel and fortitude. I pray that Your blessings would be upon this august Assembly, the Speaker of this House and all of its Members. God, may they always seek the ways of righteousness, may they always seek the ways of justice, may they always operate with a spirit of mercy and walk in a spirit of compassion. God, I pray that they be enabled by Your powerful protection, Your infinite wisdom, that they may lead with great strength, lead with... in great honesty and lead with great integrity. This we kindly ask in Your Son's name, Amen."
- Speaker Lang: "We'll be led in the Pledge by Mr. Halpin."
- Halpin 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. Mr. Wheeler. Mr. Wheeler."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Wheeler, K.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please let the record reflect that all Republicans are here to do the work of the people."

Speaker Lang: "I like that. Mr. Harris."

Harris, G.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For the House Democrats, I'd like to say that Representative Tabares is excused today."

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

We have 117 Members answering the roll. And we do have a
quorum. Mr. Butler is recognized."

Butler: "A point of personal privilege, please, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "You may proceed."

Butler: "I'd like to introduce one of my three Pages of the day so far. This is my sister, Sue Welker actually. She is a resident of Naperville in Mr. Wehrli's district. She is the 5th of 7 children. I am the youngest of 7 children. So, she's like a second mother to me. She has been a wonderful influence on my life. She is a graduate of Rush. She's a nurse by training but more than that she's known as Coach Sue. She used to coach the Naperville Central Redhawks Women's... Girls Swim Team. And for a long time she has coached the Naperville Waves Masters Swim Team in Naperville. And in 2007, I believe, she was the Masters Coach of the Year in the United States of America as a swimmer. So, please welcome my sister, Sue Welker, to the Illinois House of Representatives."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome, Coach Sue. We're happy to have you with us. Mr. Drury."

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

Speaker Lang: "Proceed, Sir."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Drury: "I'd like to welcome today up in the chamber behind us is my district director, he's here from Chicago, Ethan Woodward.

Please give him a round of applause and a Springfield welcome."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome. Thanks for being here with us today. Mr. Clerk, House Resolution 1112, Representative Jimenez."

Clerk Bolin: "House Resolution 1112.

RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ONE HUNDREDTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that we congratulate Susan Sullivan Danenberger and Danenberger Family Vineyards on producing one of the official Illinois Bicentennial wines."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Jimenez."

Jimenez: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is an exciting Resolution to celebrate our state's bicentennial and honor one of the wines chosen to be a bicentennial wine. And it's made right here in the 99th District. It's a Rosé and the name of the wine is LoveLocks. The owner of the winery and the centennial farm in New Berlin joins us today in the gallery. Susan Sullivan Danenberger, could you please stand? Susan began making wine just 8 years ago on their centennial farm, which is located just 16 miles away from us here. And I know everyone is very hopeful, and so am I, that we will adjourn for the summer tomorrow, but if you're staying for the weekend, Susan is hosting an uncorking event and a bicentennial flag raising on Friday night at the winery. And if you can't make it tomorrow night, please join us back in... in the Springfield area over the summer. She's got a lovely

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

winery and it's a great, great asset to Sangamon County. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Representative. Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. Congratulations. Chair recognizes Representative Bourne for an introduction."

Bourne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today I rise on House Resolution 1102. We have Randy Rhodes in the gallery, hopefully, he'll come to the front. So at the end of this month, Randy will be celebrating his retirement as a security officer here at the Capitol. But not only has he given years of service here in the Capitol, he also was my Police Chief and Fire Chief growing up. And we couldn't go to any community event without Randy there helping out or volunteering. So, thank you for your service to this state, thank you for the service to our community and congratulations on your retirement."

Speaker Lang: "Congratulations. Thanks for joining us. Good luck to you, Sir. Mr. Olsen is recognized."

Olsen: "A point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Olsen: "I... on this day, I'd like to introduce... the gentleman's going to be an intern in my office, Vincent Vena, he's in the gallery up there. He recently graduated from my alma mater, Downers Grove South High School. He'll be attending Ole' Miss in the fall. But this summer he's going to have fun interning in my district office. It should be a great summer and really happy to have him here at the Capitol today. Can we give him a warm welcome?"

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Speaker Lang: "Welcome to the House chamber. Thank you for being with us today. Mr. Riley."

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

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Riley: "Thank you. Members, if I could have your indulgence just for a few minutes? Recently I passed House Resolution 1014, which unfortunately was a Memorial Resolution. Many of us do these recognizing former Members but many times people in our community that left a mark on their community. And so, I just wanted to... to do one to have you recognize someone that ... and a family that's very special to me. Mariyah Howard... Mariyah Kaitlyn Howard lived in Beecher, Illinois and she tragically passed away March 31, 2018. Her uncle and her cousin are in the back in the... in the gallery. And I'm doing this for this great family, a family of service and Mariyah in many ways was just like that. She was born in Hazel Crest July 23, 1997, was as cheerleader at Illinois Lutheran High School in Crete and graduated from Beecher High School. And she also worked at Beecher Manor and enjoyed taking care of the residents, that's sort of a nursing home. So, you can get an idea of what this young lady did and how she was following in the footsteps of the family. And unfortunately, the family got a tragic call one night. A call that no one wants to get. Mariyah was tragically killed by a drunk driver. Many times loved ones leave us, you know on the basis of a disease or other kinds of things but a drunk driver. You know, she left and did not come home by something that was totally preventable. And so, what the family wanted to do is dedicate their lives in the spirit of Mariyah to talk about drunk

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

driving. Matter of fact, just the other day we had a Bill that one of the Members was presenting dealing with the BAIID here's some statistics which are somewhat device. So chilling. In 2013, the last year that we really had a lot of information about it, 386 people were killed in drunk driving crashes in Illinois. Also in 2013, about 10 thousand people died in alcohol-related crashes in the U.S., 31 percent, onethird of the total fatalities. Between 2003 and 2012, 3,866 people were killed in crashes involving a drunk driver in Illinois. And in 2012 they figured out the rate of deaths by age per 100 thousand population was 6.7 percent nationally and 6.0 percent in Illinois in the 21 to 34 age range, which you sort of can figure... figure that out. Katie Howard is a very beautiful person and there's many ways that we deal with our loss. And I want to read something from a blog that... that she wrote for her cousin, her little love bug. I had to write this blog because these thoughts are constantly running through my mind and I just miss you, so this helps my heart. Each day I have started doing an act of kindness whenever an opportunity arises. So, I challenge each of you who reads this to leave a 'Mariyah mark' in the world. When you leave your Mariyah mark keep it silent. When you brag about an act of kindness it defeats the purpose. Mariyah did so many silent acts of kindness; she was truly a bright light in this world who is missed by so many. I promise to keep your memory alive; I am honoring you every day. Love bug, I love you. Love you, Katie. And I think that, you know, we... we do those things all the time those random acts of kindness. But I would just ask all of you how we bring in the life of all the people that we

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

talk about when we do these memorials. The next random act of kindness that you do, I would wish that you would call it your Mariyah mark in the world. Thank you so much. Mr. Speaker, may I have a moment of silence in the memory of Mariyah Howard?"

Speaker Lang: "Body will take a moment of silence. Thank you, Representative. Mr. Spain is recognized."

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

Spain: "Mr. Speaker, it... I'm very pleased today to welcome a special guest who is seated here in the west side of the gallery. Carrie Frank is an intern in my office who began at the beginning of this spring semester. She is an organizational communications student at Bradley University in Peoria. She's continuing on with her graduate studies in nonprofit leadership. She's been interning in my office for the last several months and has graciously agreed to continue on with me. Carrie, you do a very great job and we all welcome you here to the Capitol today. Thank you for being here."

Speaker Lang: "Thanks for joining us today. Representative Manley."

Manley: "You know, I... I... A point of personal privilege, Speaker." Speaker Lang: "Go ahead."

Manley: "So, Representative Riley and to the family of Mariyah, I didn't stand up to talk about this but I'm going to just mention a few things. So, drunk driving has affected my family in a much different way. We did not lose a person, but in... if you look in Representative Manley history, you'll see a situation in 2012 where I, at great personal risk, prevented

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

a family member from driving drunk. And I can't even tell you how... I'm... I'm churning inside because sometimes when you do the right thing it comes at great personal sacrifice. But now listening to the loss of this girl and how it's affected her family and how tragic that was, I can... I can tell you how important doing what I did was. And so, I say to all of you don't let your family members drive drunk. You don't want that... you don't want to live with that. Other things are easier to live with, I guess I want to say. And to the family of Mariyah, my heart goes out to you. And I just wanted to mention that. On another note... sorry, Dan. My friend and soon to be colleague, my district director Dan Huspek, is here in the House. He's a longtime good Democrat and I'm... I want to welcome him not only to Springfield but then also on my staff. So, if you could welcome Dan."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome, Dan. Thanks for being here with us today.

Thank you, Representative. Representative Bellock is recognized. You have some guests."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. So, I'm excited today because I have my daughter here and I have my three grandchildren here, two of which are going to Page. It's Libby, Charlie and Catherine. So, I... if everybody could give them a warm welcome, I'd really appreciate it. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "We're happy to have you here with us. Thank you.

Mr. Ford."

Ford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege." Speaker Lang: "Go ahead, Sir."

Ford: "Mr. Speaker, in the gallery today we have guests. They're here because on May 30, 1921 a young black man named Dick

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Rowland was riding in an elevator in the Drexel Building at Third and Main in Tulsa, Oklahoma with a woman named Sarah Page. The details of what followed varied from person to person and accounts of the incident circulated among the city's white communities during the day and became more aggressive. I'm talking about the bombing of the Tulsa, Oklahoma Black Wall Street. In the gallery we have Revin Fellowes, we have Chantal Grant, Randy Ryder and Mamma D here to make sure that we don't forget about the Tulsa, Oklahoma bombing that also caused havoc here in downtown Springfield and across 26 different cities across this nation. So, please join me in welcoming our guests in the gallery above the Republicans. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Sir. House Resolution 1142, Mr. Costello. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "House Resolution 1142.

RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ONE HUNDREDTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that we congratulate Pinckneyville High School Bass Fishing team members Dalton Pyatt and Kyle Kreger, along with Boat Captain Scott Kreger, on winning the Illinois High School Association's Bass Fishing State Championship at Carlyle Lake."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Costello."

Costello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the General Assembly. Please join me in congratulating seniors Dalton Pyatt, Kyle Kreger and their boat captain, Scott Kreger, on winning the State Championship for Bass Fishing in the State of Illinois. They are, again, from Pinckneyville High School.

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Some incredible young men. And I would just like to also really thank Scott for the guidance that you've given and the time that you've spent with these two young men. Please help me to congratulate them."

Speaker Lang: "Congratulations. Sure happy you're with us on the House Floor today. Those in favor of the Resolution say... Excuse me. Representative Bryant. I thought you were rising to a different matter, Representative. Thank you."

Bryant: "That's okay, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege." Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Bryant: "I... I'd like to join Representative Costello in congratulating the bass fishing team. A lot of folks don't realize how important bass fishing is to our region. And my daughter-in-law was actually one of the... on the bass fishing team for Anna-Jonesboro. So this comes really close to our hearts. And by the way, she's refused to fish with my son because he's really no good and she's really good. So, I know how hard you guys work. Congratulations."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you. And again, congratulations. Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. Members, we're going to start on page 4 of the Calendar, Senate Bills-Third Reading. You may note on the Calendar tomorrow is the adjournment day. If you want your Bill called, it'd be a good idea to be in your chair because I'm not sure how many times we're going to go through these Bills. Additionally, I'm asking the Members, those that are paying attention... I'm asking the Members to hold the points of personal privilege down to the absolute necessities. I'm asking the Members not

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

to be repetitive in debate so we can move through these Bills as expeditiously as possible. Virtually every Member has a Bill on the Calendar and I think we'd like to get through as many of these Bills as we can today and tomorrow. So, if you cooperate with the Chair, I will cooperate with you. Page 4 of the Calendar... just like that. Page 4 of the Calendar, Senate Bill 486, Leader Currie. Out of the record. Senate Bill 585, Mr. Walsh. Please read the Bill. The Gentleman has a Floor Amendment. Put the Bill on the Order of Second Reading and please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 585, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. The Bill was read a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Walsh."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Floor Amendment #2 is add on language to the underlying Bill and basically it would give the county treasurers additional power to eject tax purchases that use illegal bid practices or to disrupt the tax sale. I move for its Amendment."

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. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 585, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Walsh."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Walsh: "Thank you. So Senate Bill 585, as amended, does two things. First, it codifies the fees for tax sales and caps them at their current rate. And then the second was what I just explained in the Amendment dealing with tax purchasers using illegal bid practices. As far as the second Amendment goes... or the second Floor Amendment goes that language is permissive, so it's not a mandate. I'd ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Breen: "And Representative, I... I know you're adjusting fees.

Please explain to us is... is there a fee increase in here or
is it... I know you said a codification of existing fees, but...
but... could it be perceived as a..."

Walsh: "There is no fee increase. So..."

Breen: "Okay."

Walsh: "...hang on once second."

Breen: "But currently they're permitted to issue fees uncapped?"

Walsh: "Right now, they are uncapped. This would cap them. So, it... let me see if I can find the... give me a quick minute here. Here we go. So right now, the automation fee is at \$10; that would be capped at \$10. The interest fee which covers county treasurer's costs and tax sales is currently \$60 and that would be capped at \$60. And then the indemnity fee, again, for the county collector, is at \$20 and that would be capped at \$20. And basically it just clarifies everything."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Breen: "Okay. Great. And... and the other part of the Bill, the main part of the Bill, was to stop some of the unsavory practices of people using shell companies?"

Walsh: "The... the fees... the fees were the underlying Bill that came over from the Senate. The Floor Amendment dealt with the tax purchasers."

Breen: "Ah. Fair enough. Thank you, Representative."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves, Members. I'm not going to be asking that too many times today. Please record yourselves. Mr. Smith. Please take the record. There are 113 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Crespo is recognized."

Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. A point of personal privilege." Speaker Lang: "Proceed, Sir."

Crespo: "So, we are all very proud and we have really competent staff in our... on both sides of the aisle. I just want to take a moment and acknowledge James O'Brien who staffs all our education committees. He's leaving. He's going to start law school at Chicago Kent. Hopefully he will finish, I never did. And I want to thank him for all his great work on the education committees. He's one of the best that we have and it's shame that we're going to lose him. Give a warm friendly applause for our good friend here. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Sir. Congratulations. You've done fine work. Senate Bill 2560, Representative Wallace. Please read the Bill."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2560, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Wallace."

Wallace: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise for Senate Bill 2560 and it's a Bill to make sure that there are errors... if there are errors on the internet regarding your criminal history that a company cannot charge you to remove those errors. I encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen."

Breen: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Breen: "And Representative, I... I see your Bill is something that deals with mug shots and booking photographs not being made available on a law enforcement agency social media website?

Is that..."

Wallace: "It can be made available but only in the instance of them trying to apprehend someone who may be a person of interest or someone who they are... who they have a warrant against and they're searching... of if they're searching for a missing person."

Breen: "And... and then you are adjusting the Consumer Fraud and Deceptive Business Practices Act to be able to sue private entities on criminal record information that's inaccurate or just in order to get some sort of a removal of information?"

Wallace: "It is saying that for-profit entities cannot charge an individual to correct and remove erroneous information from their websites."

Breen: "And if they don't do it within five business days, they're going to be able to get sued?"

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Wallace: "Yes, they could be subject to a fine."

Breen: "But... but a not-for-profit is not subject to this restriction and this lawsuit?"

Wallace: "I have not been aware of not-for-profit entities that are doing this. We have lots of for-profit entities that are doing this. There are some that are very popular."

Breen: "And then who are your... well, I have in my comments that the ACLU while they have no position have some concerns and are continuing to review the legislation. Have they taken a position on this?"

Wallace: "To my knowledge, no."

Breen: "Okay. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, while the part about not putting people's mug shots online in connection with civil offenses, petty offenses, business offenses, Class B and C Misdemeanors might have some merit I'm not necessarily seeing the need to add more litigation which Consumer Fraud and Deceptive Businesses Practices Act has some very strict penalties. And without some further delineation of what this is about and why certain entities are exempted from it and others are going to be charged with unlawful practices, with damages at \$100 a day plus attorney's fees, I... I don't know that the case has been made for the need for this Bill."

Speaker Lang: "So, this Bill is on Short Debate. I'm asking the Members not to put on your lights on these Short Debate Bills unless you have to. I'll assume Mr. Davidsmeyer has to. Mr. Davidsmeyer. Who waved me off. Representative Wallace to close."

Wallace: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a Bill that is about protecting erro... individuals from having erroneous

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

information being placed against them out on the Web. There is already litigation happening. So, I do encourage an 'aye' vote so that we can make sure that those who were not convicted or those who were erroneously put online have some recourse."

- 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. Please record yourselves. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. There are 66 voting 'yes', 50 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Rules Report."
- Clerk Bolin: "Committee Reports. Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2018: recommends be adopted Floor Amendment #3 for House Bill 5769, Floor Amendment #3 for Senate Bill 1851, Floor Amendment #4 for Senate Bill 2641, Floor Amendment #1 for Senate Bill 3085, Floor Amendment #1 for Senate Bill 3109, and Floor Amendment #1 for Senate Joint Resolution 73; and recommends be adopted, Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 for House Bill 201."
- Speaker Lang: "Senate Bill 2561, Mr. Carroll. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2561, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Carroll."
- Carroll: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Members of the Chamber. This Bill takes Tannerite, which is an explosive and sold in targets and makes sure that you have to have a FOID

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Card to buy it. Tannerite currently is available without one, but it's generally used in target practice shooting. So, I'd ask for a 'yea' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Breen: "And Representative, we considered a Bill like this I believe it was last year. Is that correct?"

Carroll: "It depends on when last year, Sir? I came here in October."

Breen: "Okay. I'm showing in my analysis Senate Bill 315 was identical. It passed the House by a vote of 61-50. The Governor then vetoed the Bill; it was never called for an override. If your Bill is identical to a Bill that made it out of the House with 61 votes and this Governor... same Governor vetoed it, why are you bringing this back to us..."

Carroll: "I think this..."

Breen: "...other than to waste our time?"

Carroll: "Well, I think this is an important issue of public safety. And I don't think I'm wasting time with public safety, Sir."

Breen: "Well, I voted for the Bill last time so I supported the Bill. But at the same time, it's just the same Bill over again, what... I mean, for a campaign issue? So that you can get the Bill this time instead of the other person who got to run it last time?"

Carroll: "I took this Bill because it's about public safety and that's my focus."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Breen: "Thank you. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, you know and it's Groundhog Day. Over and over again we're going to keep running these Bills that the Governor vetoed to try to do something. I don't know why. Vote the same way you did the first time or vote 'no', if you are just kind of sick of this sort of thing. But again, it was Senate Bill 315. It was run by Representative Conroy in this chamber, Senator Morrison, if you want to check your vote history and be consistent there. Thanks."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Carroll to close."

Carroll: "I ask for a 'yea' vote."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves, Members. Please record yourselves. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 59 voting 'yes', 56 voting 'no'. And Gentleman asks for Postponed Consideration. Senate Bill 2350, Mr. Carroll. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2350, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Carroll."

Carroll: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This Bill asks for local schools to have... require active shooter drills within 90 days at the beginning of school. Participation is required for all staff and students unless students have special needs. And I'm happy to take any questions that you have."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

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? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 110 voting 'yes', 5 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2619, Representative Willis. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2619, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Willis."

Willis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is an initiative of the Associated Fire Fighters of Illinois. Historically this Body has taken the training and background of our firefighters and law enforcement personnel to make sure that we have the best qualified members in that. We also now are also requesting that we take that one step further and we have the best training possible for our fire chiefs. There are a number of options for them to have the appropriate training or a minimum of 10 years firefighting service before they can become a fire chief. With that, I request an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Batinick."

Batinick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to go straight to the Bill. These kind of Bills are difficult 'cause we're always concerned about public safety. This is another mandate. I was just talking to one of my mayors. It's going to cost close to a couple hundred thousand dollars extra due to this. And when we're talking about public safety dollars, I believe, and you look at the list of opponents to this Bill, I believe that the people closest on the ground are the ones

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

that should be deciding the best way to allocate those public safety dollars. I wish we had an unlimited pile of money; clearly in this state we don't. We've been talking about LGDF cuts and... and other things. So I do not support this Bill. I urge a 'no' vote. I think the people on the ground, the people closest to the decision-making process should be making decisions with the public safety dollars, like, maybe they want more student resource officers in schools and other things. So, I urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "This Bill is on Short Debate. Representative McCombie is recognized."

McCombie: "Thank you, Speaker. To the Bill. As a previous mayor of a small town with limited resources, also limited folks who apply for these kind of a positions, and a mayor who has to appoint who does not have a city administrator, I understand the previous speaker's concerns and previous mayor... and other mayors as well. However, that being said, I'm always fully aware of the differences of a fire and a police officer. And to hire a public safety officer that does not have fire experience or to hire one that does not have police experience for a position that is going to have to handle both is really a disservice to the people that live in that community. So, I urge an 'aye' vote in this situation because it does best serve the communities and the people that live in them. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Willis to close."

Willis: "Thank you very much. This is a commonsense Bill. What it does is state those that are going to lead our fire departments should have firefighting training whether it is

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

through the classroom as an officer training or real on the job training as a firefighter. This is a public safety thing that I don't think we can put a price tag on..."

Speaker Lang: "Turn on Representative Willis, please."

Willis: "Thank you. If we do not have this we're actually going to find that we're going to hurt our fire service. Just one quick thing to respond to this, it does exempt those departments that already have in place a dual thing where you are both a police officer and a firefighter and volunteer departments are also exempt from this. I urge an 'aye' vote."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Same switches, same location, Members. Chapa LaVia, Rita. Please take the record. There are 87 voting 'yes', 24 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2667, Mr. Turner. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2667, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Turner."

Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Body. With House Floor Amendment #2 the only provision of the Bill it's requiring... requiring an enterprise zone applicant to demonstrate a plan to encourage participation in hiring of minorities, women and persons with disabilities. I'd ask for your support."

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

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Carroll, Zalewski. Please take the record. There are 106 voting 'yes', 5 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2830, Representative Kifowit. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2830, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Kifowit. Mr. Turner in the Chair."

Kifowit: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a simple Bill that looks at the board of trustees for the Fox Metro Water Reclamation District to change it from an appointed board to an elected board. Currently the Fox Valley Metro operates a \$9.5 million budget and has the ability to assess property taxes. Therefore, in the essence of no taxation without representation, we are giving the voters of this district proper representation to an entity that can... can levy property taxes."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Wheeler."

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

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

Wheeler, K.: "Thank you. Representative, how many... or how is it the board appointed right now?"

Kifowit: "The board is politically appointed and we are changing this to an elected board of the voters."

Wheeler, K.: "It's a politically appointed board because each of the Legislators that affect that district are currently the ones who make the appointments, correct?"

Kifowit: "No, that's not correct. The law is vague. In fact, recently several Members of the Legislature were not included

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

in the appointment of a recent board member. So, what you are saying is incorrect."

Wheeler, K.: "I... I... to the Bill. I vehemently disagree with the characterization of this Bill. This is a blatant power grab by my friends on the other side of the aisle to make it clear that Aurora will be able to dictate who gets to be on this board entirely when Aurora does not entirely make up the district. So consequently, Ladies and Gentlemen, if this were an election process that was set up so that each part of the reclamation district would be represented, that would be a different story. This is not that at all. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Chapa LaVia."

Chapa LaVia: "Thank you. To the Bill. Gentlemen and Ladies, this has been a political football for a long time. When I first came in here, this board was put together where the minor... majority of the people were the majority of the Party for the state. And as time came, I was able to manipulate this board a little bit and put a Democrat on that board. It's supposed to be a reflective body of the Fox Metro area. So before Leader Cross left, he put it back that it was... it was elected by, you know, going around and getting signatures on a letter saying we should go ahead and move this person forward. Now, it's always been a gentleman's game and we have played fair. This last appointment, which the Representative's talking about, was a move... a very strong Republican political move, not a Democratic move, because of the fact, Representative Wheeler, they never came to see myself ... and I gave you another 4 minutes, I know. They never came to see myself for a

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

signature, they never came to Senator Holmes for a signature, they never came to Representative Kifowit for a signature to be appointed. They went around us. And whether we said yes we'd like to see you or not, we were never even given the opportunity. So now, we're at a conundrum, okay? Republicans can fight over this; the Democrats are saying grab. But what we're doing is... this power Representative is doing the right thing. We're putting it back now into the hands of the public to vote on who they would like to represent them in this district that is very 50/50 Republican/Democratic district. And people should run for this position now because it is a paid position. They do get health care; they get pensions and they get tax dollars. So as far as for the transparency and accountability of this board now that we created... one of these 7 thousand boards... it's going back to the people. So, we can say its D or an R, but let's not do that. Let's say let it be represented by the people who pay to be part of Fox Metro and let them vote for the position. So, I stand in full support of what the Representative is doing. And this is transparent and accountable government. Take it back to the people, allow them to vote on the positions and put whom they would like in there to be in there. So, I... I support this legislation. And I hope you can find it in your heart to also because this takes it out of our hands, Representative. It gives it back to the people and that's where it should be. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Wheeler, your name was used in debate. Briefly, Sir."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Wheeler, K.: "Yes, Sir. Thank you very much. What we have here really is a failure of redistricting. One of the few times the Democrats didn't redistrict a way that they have total power and control over things. Ladies and Gentlemen, please vote 'no'. This Bill does not do anything besides give power to the Majority Party in Aurora. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Andersson is recognized."

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

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

Andersson: "Representative Kifowit, it looks like this is in the consolidated election, in other words, the municipal election. Will the… if the Bill passes, will the candidates be identified as Rs and Ds or will it be a nonpartisan election?"

Kifowit: "It's a nonpartisan election. We are taking politics out
 of this board."

Andersson: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Kifowit to close."

Kifowit: "Thank you, my colleagues. This is a Bill that has been mischaracterized by the other side. It's a Bill to put democracy to ensure that we give the people the power over who is levying their property taxes. This is the fundamental belief that there should be no taxation without representation. And we are giving representation to the people. I ask for your support."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2830 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting
is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record.

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

On a count of 66 voting in 'favor', 49 voting 'opposed', and 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 2830, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2773, Leader Lang. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2773, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. This Bill would allow local units of government to use the Illinois Finance Authority for bond financing of PACE projects. You may recall that we passed a Bill regarding PACE projects which allow certain business enterprises to work with local government to get dollars to be able to do alternative energy projects. It's going to be good for the environment, good for job creation and good for the local communities as well. I ask your support."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Ives."

Ives: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I stand in complete opposition to this Bill. And the fact that any of us, as taxpayers, should allow the Illinois Finance Authority to give bonding authority to municipalities for things like the PACE Program. It's not our responsibility. It's not the responsibility of government to do this. There's a private market for this. If a commercial property owner wants to actually put solar panels on their rooftops or a windmill in their backyard, go ahead they can do it. And they can do it with independent bonding from a private lender. They do not need the taxpayers to back up any of this financing which, if this does go belly up, if that commercial property goes into

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

arrears and gets sold off, then eventually the taxpayers would be the backstop if this all does not work out as planned. There's no need for government to do this. And I think that a lot of times we don't think about this holistically. What is the responsibility of government to fund or not fund or backstop? And what is not the responsibility of government? There is no reason for government to get involved in what can be already done in the private sector. And so, they can do this regardless of whether or not we pass this law or not. I urge a 'no' vote. We have better uses for our limited financing and bonding authority that we have as a state. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Lang to close."

Lang: "So, I believe the last speaker just doesn't like PACE financing, but that has nothing to do with this Bill. This Bill would allow the law we already passed to be partially administered by the Illinois Finance Authority. And they are fully aboard this Bill. They helped write this Bill. It's their Bill. They want to do this. And it will provide low-cost alternative energy for communities all over the State of Illinois at reasonable prices. Please vote for the Bill."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2773 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record.
On a count of 70 voting in 'favor', 42... 43 voting 'opposed', and 2 voting 'present', Senate Bill 2773, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Senate Bill 2838. Representative Manley. Can you

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

please move this Bill back to the Order of Second Reading and read the Bill?"

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2838, a Bill for an Act concerning education. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Manley."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Manley."

Manley: "Thank you, Mr... thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Floor Amendment 2 is a gut and replace Amendment, makes the following technical changes to the Bill. Adds that professional development plans must be shared with the State Board of Education and requires the Illinois College Board, the ICCB, to annually report on its website the amount of teachers who have approved professional development plans."

Speaker Turner: "Lady moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 2838. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

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

Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 2913, Representative Hoffman. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2913, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is an agreed Bill which would establish expedited processing for Medicaid long-term applications and renewals with diplomatic process for easier renewals by January 1, 2019, subject to federal approval. Extends deadlines for providers to submit changes in residential status and creates

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

training instruction for applicants, case workers and providers. I know of no opposition. I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Lang in the Chair. Those favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who... Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Turner. Please take the record. There are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2923, Mr. DeLuca. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2923, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. DeLuca."

DeLuca: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, Senate Bill 2923 requires township and road district clerks to certify certain payments made from the Township or Road District Treasury. This is an initiative of the Township Officials of Illinois. And it would align the requirements for township expenditures with those of other local governments and increase both transparency and accountability. There is no opposition and it passed unanimously."

Speaker Lang: "Those favor of the Bill vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'.

The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Ford, Guzzardi. Please take the record. There are 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'.

And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2927, Representative

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

- Kelly Burke. Please read the Bill. The Lady has an Amendment. Please put the Bill on the Order of Second Reading and please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2927, a Bill for an Act concerning education. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment 2 has been adopted. Floor Amendment #3 is offered by Representative Kelly Burke."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Burke."
- Burke, K.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment 3 is a gut and replace. I would appreciate adopting the Amendment and debating it on 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. Senate Bill 2939, Representative Chapa LaVia. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2939, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Chapa LaVia."
- Chapa LaVia: "Thank you, Speaker and men and women of the chamber. This Bill is brought to me by the Illinois Math and Science Academy initiative. Senate Bill 2939 provides four significant changes to the governing laws. It provides that IMSA will have the authority to admit non-Illinois students who have completed the academic equivalence of 8th grade, so it'd start a freshman class. And it would be 50 a year starting at about '22. Authorizes IMSA to access tuition fees and room and board from out-of-state students providing IMSA

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

with a significant revenue stream intended to go towards debt service and the construction of a new 8... 850-bed residential hall. It stipulates that no more than 25 percent of IMSA consist of non-Illinois residents. student body can Effectively a hold harmless provision by which the current in-state admissions at IMSA undisturbed. And last but not least, it provides that outof-state tuition and fees must be sufficient to ensure that no, once again, no state appropriations shall be utilized to fund the cost of the out-of-state IMSA students attendance. Now this piece of legislation, I've been working with IMSA actually for the last couple of years 'cause we've always tried to see how do we get out of the mess of not being able to be included in... in the ... the carnage that happens around budget time. Because there's a specific residential high school that is utilized by every district in the state, we have them under appropriations for higher ed. So, they are not... they are not treated or looked at like the other high schools in the State of Illinois. They are world renown. We have been very blessed to have some amazing people and graduates come out of there that still contribute to the facility. But over the years they've lost dollars because of our... our issues that happen down here. And I have to really acknowledge their thinking out of the box to find ways to generate revenue and not keep on coming back to the state for more and more money. A couple things that I want to throw out there; the reason why they started the freshmen year starting in 2022 would be that what we find is 39 percent of 8th graders who would like to go to IMSA choose not ... well, don't

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

eventually do that because they go into a high school and they get very acclimated into that school they go to. And there's less... less of a willingness to leave their sophomore year to go to another facility. This is a residential school in the State of Illinois that we created. And once again I'd like to say before I take any questions, the tuition and fee and room and board costs shall be charged to the students who are not Illinois residents the totality of which must be sufficient to ensure that no, no state appropriations are used to fund the cost of those students attending the academy. And I'm open for questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen."

Breen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to move to Standard Debate."

Speaker Lang: "We'll move to Standard Debate, but I would ask restraint so we don't spend an hour on a Bill. Mr. Breen."

Breen: "Sure. And... and then... then I will go straight to the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is taking an institution that many people have great pride for and radically changing it. In terms of... they want to build a new building. And they're coming to us saying, well, we're going to build the new building by bringing a bunch of out of staters into what is supposed to be an Illinois public school and they're all going to pay \$50 thousand apiece tuition, room and board and it'll all pay for everything and that's going to be all happy and nice at the end of the day. The plan doesn't make sense. Now, there's also part of the plan that says we're going to change the way IMSA operates. And... and listen, we're... right now IMSA takes folks after they spend a year at their local high

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

school. And they say, well, we don't like that because people actually get attached to their local high school, their community, where your property taxes go. They become a member of a community. And then all of the sudden, they don't come to IMSA. But I thought the whole point of IMSA is that there are certain students that just can't get the resources locally. Well, if they're happy at their local schools, that's not a problem. That's a solution. And the problem that they're going to do now is, all right, we want to pull those students away from the schools before they even have a chance to see will my local high school be able to meet my needs. We just passed a Bill that required... or at least we're looking at an Amendment about doing dual credit to get our community colleges working harder to help provide resources to kids that are a little more advanced. So Ladies and Gentlemen, there is no reason for this plan. It radically changes the nature of this institution. And me, for myself, I grew up in Naperville District 203; we had kids go to IMSA. They didn't need to go to IMSA. We had the best school in the state. So, please, think hard. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andersson."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Andersson: "Representative, just one question. On the… the 50 students who would be enrolled who are non-Illinois residents… you may have answered this I just didn't hear it… are we… are we in effect expanding the enrollment to cover that or would we be bumping…"

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Chapa LaVia: "We are. We're not detracting from the students that we are required in the law to take in annually or within their... their numbers. It would be 50 a year of non-residential schools to cap out at 150. We wouldn't go higher than that. We would..."

Andersson: "So, we're not... we're not changing the number of students..."

Chapa LaVia: "We're not changing the numbers that..."

Andersson: "...from Illinois..."

Chapa LaVia: "Correct."

Andersson: "...that can apply and hopefully get accepted?"

Chapa LaVia: "Right. We're adding to it and it'll only be 50 a year increase from '22 would be 50. The next class will be another 50, you're right. And the next class capped out at 150."

Andersson: "Great. Thank you very much."

Chapa LaVia: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Hammond."

Hammond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I want to thank certainly the Sponsor for bringing this Bill forward, but also to President Torres for really and truly thinking outside the box. Thinking of a way that IMSA would not be so heavily reliant on state funding. And in addition to that, by bringing some of the best and the brightest from the... throughout the United States into the State of Illinois and hopefully having them stay here. Thank God for that. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative McDermed."

McDermed: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to go right to the Bill. I may not have mentioned this, but my daughter is

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

actually a graduate of IMSA and there is a lot of discussion on the alumni message boards about this process. And the biggest concern that the IMSA alums have is that, in fact, each class of Illinois students will be reduced. By changing it to a 4-year school but maintaining the same number students, instead of 216 Illinois students per class there will only be 162 Illinois students per class, which greatly increases the competition for the school and also brings younger children into the mix. Many IMSA alumni have expressed the opinion that IMSA is a much more difficult and stressful place than college ever was. So, now we're taking 9th graders... we're taking 13- and 14-year-olds and subjecting this to the ... subjecting them to this IMSA grinder. And we're reducing the opportunity each year for Illinois students to be admitted to our very own Illinois school. The other big concern that the IMSA alums have is that we're changing seven small dorms to one giant dorm. Query, do we want 13- to 17-year-olds in a giant dorm as if they were college students? What does that do to the community that IMSA creates right now in each dorm? And the alums are really concerned about the experience that they young people are going to have there. IMSA alums really want their school to continue, but these are some very serious concerns particularly with the number of Illinois students per class going down to 162 in a situation where very few of our Illinois students have an opportunity to attend IMSA. This requires a lot of thought. I'm not even sure yet how I'm..."

Speaker Lang: "Please complete your remarks."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

McDermed: "This is my last sentence. I'm really concerned about continuing IMSA, but I'm also concerned about the quality of the experience for basically, you know, some very young people. Think very seriously about this."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ives: "Representative Chapa LaVia, do you know whether or not we...
of the seats that are offered for admission every single year,
are there excess students wanting those seats and if so, by
how many?"

Chapa LaVia: "At times there is a wait list, but it's a few... like Tenth Special Session, like 10, 20, 30, if that's what you're asking."

Ives: "I am asking if you have a wait list and if everybody's
 admitted who's allow... who wants in?"

Chapa LaVia: "We do. Right now though the current capacity is 650 beds. So that's the amount. So I... I can't hear you. Speaker, can you... Thank you. Could you ask that again, please, Representative?"

Ives: "I just wanted to know what is the wait list over the last 5 years, if you happen to have that information?"

Chapa LaVia: "I don't, but I can get it for you."

Ives: "Okay. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. What we're doing here is nothing more than selling admission to our highest quality public high school that's available to anybody in the state, not based on where you live in the district. You're selling admission. Now I'm not a... I'm not on board for that. This is an Illinois taxpayer supported institution regardless of how

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

you want to sell admission. And it needs to be there for Illinois residents only. This is not a way to fund a new building project. We need other alternatives than that. But you're not going to sell admission to a public high school. That is an outrageous idea, especially when you have a waiting list of kids who want to get into that very same high quality high school. And I have visited IMSA and it is an impressive place with impressive students and an impressive faculty. And that's why Illinois residents should be the first people and the only people allowed in a public high school of this nature. I'm actually a little bit offended that we would offer this up to other folks. Before you know it we'll... we will have international students who will receive preferential admission simply 'cause they can buy a seat into one of our premier public high schools."

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

Ives: "I don't think we want to go down this road."

Speaker Lang: "We've exhausted all speakers on this Bill.

Representative Chapa LaVia to close."

Chapa LaVia: "Thank... thank you so much. And thanks for the colleagues and their discussions. Representative Margo, I'd be more than happy to help you walk through that. I'm very concerned at what the alumni feel. This is why it's been pushed to 2122 (sic-2022) so we have time to develop on what this looks like. There is a cap on how many students we have. We have 650 beds, so that's how many residential we can have for the state. That is never going to decrease. We're only adding in 150 for non-state residents. But I would love to work with you and the alumni on a solution there. And I

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

understand if you can vote 'no' or 'present', that's fine. I still want to work with you on that. I need... I need people to understand that this last budget, and the budgets that we're having in this state in the last 16 years, have done nothing but decimated education, decimated education. And it's the place we should be putting more money into. And people have heard me about early education and the importance there and how it's an easy... easy access to equal footing regardless of how much money your parents make is early education. But we have never, ever... and listen to me... never, ever put money where we need to in gifted programs in education in the State of Illinois anywhere. And this is one lining... silver lining to a cloud that we have this amazing institute called Illinois Math and Science Academy. And once again, if you... if you've been there great. If you haven't, I want to take you back and see how it's badly deteriorating as far as whether it's the boiler, whether it's the air-conditioning unit, you name it. And this institute has found a way to find dollars to help supplant what we're not giving them. And these are the rocket scientists of this state. The money we don't give them they've gone to private donors already. Now, they've come with a really creative Republican ideas, if you ask me and business owners on the Democratic ideas of how we go outside government and get more money to provide for these students that we are in charge of making sure they get their education. So, I think this is an ingenious win-win situation. I do want to work with those regardless if you're voting 'no', 'present' or for it. If you have ideas, we want to hear them. This is your high school... residential high school program. And it is world

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

known. They compete at the world level; it's not just the United States. They get awards from around the world. So, we want to keep this... the resources flowing into this high school. I appreciate any... anybody that would like to help in this. I appreciate that. But I really do request an 'aye' vote so we can get the dollars where they're needed. So we can keep this... IMSA back in the eye of the nation. So, thank you. And I... I request 'aye' votes."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Members, please record yourselves. Ammons, Guzzardi, Lilly, Smith. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. There are 80 voting 'yes', 32 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Returning to page 5 of the Calendar, Senate Bill 2838, Representative Manley. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2838, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Manley."

Manley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I explained the Bill a little bit, the Amendment... the technical change on Second. This is a dual credit Bill, allows high schools to work in conjunction with community colleges to come up with a program to support students that are interested in earning dual credit. And I'll take any questions."

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

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

yourselves. Please take the record. There are 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 486, Leader Currie. Leader Currie. Leader Currie. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 486, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This is a measure that would establish the way in which the county assessor should valuate commercial solar systems. It... the... the proposal is that each system we would assume a \$218 thousand per megawatt amount. I know of no opposition. The assessing officers are in favor as is the Farm Bureau. And I believe that the School Management Alliance, which opposed the Bill in its original form, is now neutral. I'd be happy to answer your questions and I'd be grateful for your support."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Batinick."

Batinick: "Quickly to the Bill. I... I think this was just... this is an example of excellent negotiations. I don't know who's responsible for it, but in terms of how they decided to... to value it from a property tax standpoint I thought was spoton. I strongly urge my side of the aisle to vote 'aye'. 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? Have all voted who wish? Chapa LaVia, Davis. Please take the record. There are 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2927, Representative Kelly Burke. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2927, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Burke."

Burke, K.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 2927 is a product of the bipartisan, bicameral higher education working group that you heard about yesterday. And it is the establishment of a scholarship program called AIM HIGH. And it basically will provide money to our state public universities that they will then have to match. And they can use the money to get the students who are missing from our public universities. Students who both are ... out migrate to out-of-state schools. This will allow them to have some competitive... some competition with those schools. And also students who, because of financial need, often don't go anywhere at all. And it... what we found through our higher ed working group discussions that that's a very large number of students. We've got universities that have seats available. And we would like to give these institutions the opportunity and the tools to do... to do better at recruiting our Illinois students, our best and brightest. It is supported by every public university. And I will take any questions and I ask for an 'ave' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Brady."

Brady: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Brady: "Representative, could you just talk a little bit more as far as the merit-based goes of this program of which many of us on... on both sides of the aisle in higher education have worked diligently with... with you in our working group. I think we've had some 17 or 18 meetings going back to December of last year..."

Burke, K.: "Correct."

Brady: "...if I'm not mistaken when we first talked. But just explain for the purpose of our colleagues here a little more of the merit-based and what the dollars would mean there?"

Burke, K.: "Sure. So, what we heard from the enrollment folks at the universities was that there were some groups that... that were sort of slipping through... through the cracks. And the... the two groups are... are kind of star students who are being given in-state tuition or ... or discounted tuition at other state schools and are choosing to go there because they... they feel it's a better financial situation for them. And then also students who apply to our universities and are accepted and then don't go anywhere else, community college or another public or private university because of financial concerns. But they're qualified students and... and we're missing out on them. So, our idea was to craft a program that would... each university would be able to tailor to its own specific needs in terms of establishing what the criteria... the grades and the ACT and what not for the students because they all have kind of, you know, different student populations. But that... they would be able to ... we would allocate it to them and have it used for students who are Illinois residents who are attend..."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

- Speaker Lang: "Please bring your answer to a close. And then Mr. Brady can close."
- Burke, K.: "Thank you. And... and who are full-time students and who we fear were otherwise part of that out migration that we hear so much of or students that won't go. But basically it is... there is... it is means-tested, but it is an amount that will be able to attract a lot of middle-income... it'll be able to be used for a lot of middle-income people, which some of our financial aid programs don't allow."
- Brady: "Thank you very much. And thank you to the working group of which many of us were a part of, myself included. And we talk about being competitive in Illinois in higher education. This is one of the ways we can do it to truly help the students. So, thank everyone for their efforts on this. And I ask for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Thapedi."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

- Thapedi: "Representative Burke, how much money is being allocated under this program?"
- Burke, K.: "Well it... it's not in this Bill, it's subject to appropriation. You know, we have an... an ideal amount that we'd like to work through at \$25 million which would then be matched by the institutions in new... new aid. It's got to be on top of what they did the... did this current school year. So, it could be a potential for \$50 million if all of the schools are able to take advantage of it."
- Thapedi: "So, 25 million to 50 million. How is that money going to be allocated against the different universities? For an

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

- example, how much money will be available for Chicago State University to provide students with the ability to participate in this program?"
- Burke, K.: "So, it will be proportionate to the university's share. So, we'll... we'll look at all Illinois students enrolled in... in four years and then we'll look at each school's share of those students. And for purposes of... of that counting, we're able to count part-time and full-time students because some schools have a higher percentage of part-timers than others."
- Thapedi: "So, that would then mean that the University of Illinois would get the lion's share of it because an overwhelming majority of the students go the University of Illinois in the Champaign campus, the Springfield campus..."
- Burke, K.: "Right."
- Thapedi: "...and the Chicago campus, correct?"
- Burke, K.: "Correct. Their three campuses make up a large part of the public undergrad enrollment."
- Thapedi: "So, because Northeastern University, for an example, has a very small population, they'll get a limited amount of money?"
- Burke, K.: "It'll be in proportion to their enrollment, yes."
- Thapedi: "Same with Governors State. They'd get a small amount of money?"
- Burke, K.: "Correct."
- Thapedi: "And Chicago State would get a small amount of money as well?"

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Burke, K.: "Well, it... it's proportionate. And all of the universities are very much in favor of it. And they all can use these as their... the goal is to grow the enrollment..."

Speaker Lang: "Please complete your answer. Did you complete your answer, Representative?"

Burke, K.: "Yes."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Thapedi, do you have closing remarks? Mr. Drury."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Drury: "Representative Burke, a quick question. With this scholarship program will a student who is granted the grant find themselves in a situation like our MAP students were? That if there is no budget, that they may think they have a scholarship but in fact they receive no funding?"

Burke, K.: "If... if there is... if there is no budget, we've got a lot of problems. Those probably being one of them."

Drury: "Okay. So, I... I get ..."

Burke, K.: "It's subject... it's subject to appropriation."

Drury: "Okay. So, this is not going to be a continuing appropriation?"

Burke, K.: "No."

Drury: "Okay. Is that going to be disclosed? Has... has anyone worked on that issue? That, you know, we're trying to attract students there but one way to make sure students don't come here is to... to pull a bait and switch on them. Is it going to be disclosed up front in big, bold letters that, you know, this is Illinois; you are being given a scholarship but we may not fund it."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Burke, K.: "So, this is... and... and... this is a pilot program, which will... we will review the usage and... and... and the results by 2024. But to your... to your question, ISAC is charged with creating the... the rules about how everything will be spelled out. And so, I am very confident that they're going to have the correct language that will indicate that, you know, that there is subject to appropriation. But we can work that with ISAC and be, you know, happy to take your concerns into account."

Drury: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Welch."

Welch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. First of all, I want to thank all of my colleagues who served on the higher education working group, particularly the Chief Sponsor of this Bill, for this very important legislation here today. We have all seen in the media the numerous published reports of the out migration of our students. What we also need to be concerned about are those students who get admitted into our universities and in August and September never show up in school. The students who are leaving or not enrolling at all are doing it because of financial reasons. This Bill is a critical piece of a package of legislation. This Bill will help those students who deserve to go to college based on their merit. And the universities have committed to matching it. This Bill is ... we are referring to it as the Bill that will help us AIM HIGH, the Aspirational Institutional Match Helping Higher Education Grow in the State of Illinois. This Bill is good for our state, it's good for getting our students back into the seats of our universities. And I think this

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Bill should pass this House unanimously because we are working hard to lift up the Illinois economy. And we will do it through our higher education system. I ask that we all support Senate Bill 2927."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Lady yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Flowers: "Representative, I'm reading the analysis and the title of the program is AIM HIGH. And my concern about what it is that you're trying to do, is this not duplicate of what is already in place as far as institutions being able to give students scholarships?"

Burke, K.: "It is not duplicative. Institutions currently... every institution uses some of its institutional money to provide tuition discounting to students. What we're doing is incentivizing them to do more. And so, we're putting some skin in the game and we're asking those universities to put in the same amount. In addition to what they're already doing, we're requiring them in order to access the match program they've got to put a skin in the game. So, if a... an institution were able to... if an institution said this student is... we're going to use \$2500 out of our... out of the AIM HIGH allocation, they have to give another 2500 to that student. So now that student has \$5 thousand toward their tuition and fees. And again, it's on top of what they're already doing. And every public institution is wildly in favor of this legislation."

Flowers: "And also, Representative, I've read where it is in the intent... the intent to try to... the attempt to delegate scholarship funds among a racially diverse range of students.

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

The intent is also that any public university participating in this program should in its best effort..."

- Speaker Lang: "Please bring your remarks to a close, Representative."
- Flowers: "...in its best effort attempt to delegate. So, now what do you mean they are to do this in their best effort? I don't understand that. And especially because this is talking about the racially diverse. So, what do you mean it is an intent for them to do so, to make an effort? So, these children are they not... what if they qualify? What do you mean? I don't understand that?"
- Burke, K.: "So, it... it's to make clear... and this was a request in the Senate... just to make clear that the universities will as they try to do make sure that their allocations are, you know, spread over their demographics. And there are reporting requirements in the Bill. The universities have to report the information about who these grants are going to, to ISAC which will provide a report every year. And quite frankly, we'll have an opportunity within the Higher Ed Committee and the Higher Education Appropriations Committee when these universities come before us to get the information about who these are going to. And if we find that it's not up to... to snuff and we... we disagree with how the program is going, we can review it."
- Flowers: "Thank you, Representative. With all due respect, I've seen this type of legislation throughout my years here. And it has not been in the best interests of the children that it is intended for. And so, with all due respect I will have to respectfully vote 'no' on this legislation until it's made

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

clear and plain who this legislation is supposed to be for. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Burke to close."

Burke, K.: "Thank you. I think this a wonderful program. I think it will do a lot to change some of the bad news that we've heard on our higher education front. And... and help the institutions that have some challenges in... in their enrollment and recruiting. I think combined with some of the other things that have come out of the higher education working group, I think these are great tools that we're doing. And it's going to benefit Illinois students. So, you know, we're... we're going to continue to place value on having a diverse group of students attend our higher education institutions. And again, it is supported by every public institution as well as ISAC. And 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? Please record yourselves. Bristow, Yingling. Please take the record. There are 111 voting 'yes', 6 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 3103, Representative Mah. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3103, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Mah."

Mah: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Body. Senate Bill 3103 is a Bill that protects immigrant tenants from harassment, intimidation, threats or eviction based on their

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

immigration status. It contains language that was worked out with realtors and landlord organizations. They are neutral on the Bill. The Bill does not give any one group more rights than any other. Imagine, if you're a family... an immigrant family that has rented an apartment and you ask for a simple repair. The hot water tank is broken, and we all need hot water, but the landlord says, you're undocumented. I'm going to report you to ICE. Or you're undocumented, pay me \$10 thousand so I will make the repair. Or you're undocumented, perform sexual favors for me or I won't make the repair. I think that no matter where you stand on the immigration issues, these types... this type of treatment is wrong and should not be tolerated. I'd like to reiterate that realtors are neutral on this Bill. We've worked hard with any potential opponents to make sure that they've agreed with the language. And I urge your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen."

Breen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Due to the timing, I'll go to the Bill. We heard this Bill in committee and I understand that there was... there was a negotiation. But at the same time, when a Bill comes to the floor we're not here negotiating the Bill we're trying to figure out does this improve or reduce the... the state of our laws, the ability of folks to let property be... the ability of folks to rent property. And... and when you look at this Bill, certainly some of the more offensive provisions have been removed, but there are still significant issues that were identified in the committee. On page 5 of the Bill, for instance, there's an affirmative defense to eviction if the eviction was... or the demand for

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

possession was based solely or even in part on the citizenship or immigration status of the tenant. And the problem is there are still questions. Well, if you've got somebody on a monthto-month lease or an oral lease and you say, hey, you know what, I... I just don't want to take the risk. I'd rather not have you here because I don't know if you're going to be able to be here the next month. A landlord would have this affirmative defense used against them. And all of the sudden, they've got to let to somebody who may not be paying rent at all. And I know there's another... there's an exemption, but it's unclear. And as... as well, there are some issues that does prohibit a landlord from providing information to law enforcement about someone who is not in the country legally. And that... that is something that I don't know if it ... I'm assuming it's not in violation of Federal Law, but it's certainly something to look at very closely. And there's a point where we sit there and go, are we going to create a bill of rights for everyone who has any sort of status or ... "

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

Breen: "...any sort of status of any type, whether immigration status or citizenship status or otherwise? And at some point we just have to say, look, these Bills really are not helping. They're not improving our Code of laws here in Illinois. And so, I respectfully... at least I will be voting 'no' just because there's no... this is not the way to do this."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. DeLuca."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

DeLuca: "Representative Mah, can you tell us if a Home Rule municipality has an existing crime free housing ordinance how do you believe that this will impact that?"

Mah: "It... it doesn't preempt Home Rule at all."

DeLuca: "Well, it may not preempt Home Rule, but if... if they have an existing ordinance dealing with tenants in general, that may be problematic. Will the..."

Mah: "The... so..."

DeLuca: "...how will this impact that?"

Mah: "So, if the landlord has legitimate grounds for evicting a tenant, that would control the proceedings."

DeLuca: "So... are you saying this will not give them any additional protection against something like a crime free housing ordinance? This won't impact that in any way?"

Mah: "No."

DeLuca: "Okay. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Mah to close."

Mah: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just to reiterate, realtors are neutral on this Bill. And regardless of how one feels about the immigration issue, I'm sure we can all agree that no one deserves harassment, intimidation, threats of eviction or maintenance of poor living conditions based on one's immigration status. I urge your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Members, please record yourselves. Please record yourselves. Please take the record, Mr. Clerk. There are 62 voting 'yes', 48 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 3116, Representative Feigenholtz. Please read the Bill." Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3116, a Bill for an Act concerning

regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 3116 is essentially some cleanup language from similar Bills we've previously been working on here in Health Care Licenses. It's a clarification for under... for some podiatrists who were unable to enact written collaborative agreements after we passed the APN Bill. There's no opposition. I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. There are 116 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 3139, Representative Fine. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3139, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Fine."

Fine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill would make Illinois government more user friendly. It would have all three branches of government mirror the Federal Government's Plain Language Act of 2010. It provides easier communications for people reading government documents. This Bill restarts the Plain Language Task Force what was created in 2009 but never

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

fully implemented. The goal of the task force is to implement, monitor and maintain plain language in documents."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. There are 113 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 3201, Mr. Breen. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill..."

Speaker Lang: "Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. Senate Bill 3246, Representative Bryant. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3246, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bryant."

Bryant: "I'm not planning to move that Bill, Sir."

Speaker Lang: "Out of the record. Senate Bill 3388, Representative Gordon-Booth. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3388, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Gordon-Booth."

Gordon-Booth: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 3388 expands Adult Redeploy eligibility. Due to the current eligibility restrictions, some probation-eligible offenders with significant risks and needs are sentenced to less intensive, non adult redeploy programming. Or they're sent to the Illinois Department of Corrections where access to appropriate services and treatment is extremely limited. Counties throughout our state use Adult Redeploy Illinois

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

funds to start new programs, such as problem solving courts and special probation programs linked with services that enhance existing programs, fill in system gaps. This piece of legislation came over unanimously from the Senate; we have a bipartisan Roll Call. I ask for your 'aye' vote. I'm open for any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Breen: "And Representative, I... I wanted to see who... are there any opponents to your measure?"

Gordon-Booth: "No, there are no opponents."

Breen: "Okay. And then so this is going to all probation-eligible offenders, even those considered violent offenders. Does that cause people any sort of a concern? I know we had an earlier Bill that... that provide that all offenders were eligible for Adult Redeploy."

Gordon-Booth: "Yes, it is open to those individuals because they need services. They need to be rehabilitated because they're coming back into our society, which is why there's no opposition to the Bill."

Breen: "And the State's Attorneys are in favor of the Bill?"

Gordon-Booth: "They are."

Breen: "Okay. And... and I see that it appears that this program is less expensive than the cost of incarcerating those particular criminals?"

Gordon-Booth: "Criminals is a... is a word that I prefer not to use, but I would..."

Breen: "Those offend..."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Gordon-Booth: "...definitely say..."

Breen: "...offenders."

Gordon-Booth: "...that it is... it is less expensive to rehabilitate individuals and send them back into the communities to be productive members of society than it is to simply house them and lock them up."

Breen: "Fair enough. 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? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Representative Gordon-Booth, Scherer. Please take the record. There are 89 voting 'yes', 28 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Chair recognizes Mr. Butler."

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

Speaker Lang: "Proceed, Sir."

Butler: "I would like to introduce my two other Pages of the day, the Sturms. Maggie will be a sophomore at Springfield High School; Damon will be a 8th grader at Franklin Middle School here in Springfield. So, please welcome to the Illinois House of Representatives today."

Speaker Lang: "Glad you're with us today. Thank you very much.

Mr. Clerk, House Resolution 1114, Mr. Demmer."

Clerk Bolin: "House Resolution 1114.

RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ONE HUNDREDTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that we commend the educators and students of Dixon High School for their

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

- calm responses during the incident of May 16, 2018; and be it further
- RESOLVED, That we commend School Resource Officer Mark Dallas for his heroic service at Dixon High School on May 16, 2018; and be it further
- RESOLVED, That we commend Mark Dallas's former and current fellow members of the public safety services of Illinois, including the professionals who develop and maintain the police training infrastructure of this State, in mind of the fact that incident outcomes like these are the result of the careful, professional training that is the making of a true police officer; and be it further
- RESOLVED, That suitable copies of this resolution be presented to Officer Mark Dallas and to Dixon High School Principal Dr. Michael Grady."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Demmer, who I see is joined by Senator Bivins. Welcome, Sir. Mr. Demmer."
- Demmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a privilege and an honor today for me to offer House Resolution 1114 that recognizes a true Illinois hero from my hometown of Dixon, Illinois. This Body may remember a couple of weeks ago I spoke the day after what was a tragic incidence at Dixon High School unfolded. But one that thankfully, due to the heroism of Officer Mark Dallas, a person we're recognizing here today, thankfully due to the actions that he took that day many, many lives were saved, that no lives were lost. House Resolution 1114 includes the following: a 14-year veteran of Dixon Police Department, Mark Dallas has worked as a school resource officer for the Dixon Public Schools for 5 years.

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

And during the final days of the 2018 spring term, Wednesday May 16, a gunman entered Dixon High School and fired shots. In the words of Dixon Police Chief, Steven Howell, Jr., with shots ringing out through the hallways of the school, Dallas charged towards the suspect and confronted him head-on. Imagine confronting a gunman. Imagine protecting the lives of hundreds of students at Dixon High School. Imagine what goes through your mind, the training, all the preparation, everything that you have to do to put yourself in a position to save lives. Today, we're so grateful and thankful for his action. We're so grateful and thankful that no lives were lost and that a greater tragedy was averted. It's a pleasure to welcome Officer Dallas to the gallery today, along with his family, his wife Jennifer, his son Joshua, his daughter Lauren. And also other members of the Dixon Police Department, including Dixon Police Chief, Steven Howell, Jr., Dixon Police Lieutenant Clayton Whelan, Dixon Police Sergeant Michael Wolfley, Dixon Police Sergeant Doug Lehman, Dixon Police Sergeant Ryan Bivins, the Lee County Sherriff, John Simonton, and the Director of the Illinois State Police, Leo Schmitz. We're so thankful for the work that the Dixon Police Department does on a daily basis. And in the aftermath of this incident I said, on a day-to-day basis Officer Dallas interacts with the students at Dixon High School and is a valuable and trusted part of that communit. And on this date when his service was so desperately needed he responded and confronted him head-on. For your heroism, for your continued courage, thank you and God bless."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Demmer moves for the adoption of the Resolution. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. Congratulations and thank you for joining us today. Moving back to the Calendar, Members, page 7 of the Calendar, Senate Bills-Second Reading. Please be prepared, let's move through these as quickly as we can. Senate Bill 20, Leader Currie. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 20, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. The Bill was read for a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 20, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This is a measure supported by the State Chamber of Commerce, the ACLU and people who have been advocates for those who faced discrimination in employment. The effort behind the Bill is to clear the backlog in the state at the Illinois Human Rights Commission, a backlog that can go on for years. The proposal before you would change the structure of the Commission from 13 part-time members to 7 full-time members, each of whom will have some expertise in the areas that involve the... the Human Rights Act, the Human Rights activities. Each will have his or her own staff lawyer. We will have three new people directly to address the backlog. I'd be happy to answer your questions. And I will... I hope I will have your support for this reform."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Breen: "And Representative, I... I see that DHR is opposed; the Municipal League is opposed. What... what's the nature of their opposition?"

Currie: "The Department of Human Rights is not happy with the idea that people instead of waiting two years for the department to investigate a complaint and then another several years before the Commission that plaintiffs will have the opportunity to opt out of the process and go to court. But that was acceptable to the State Chamber of Commerce, as well as to those people who represent people who have been victims of discrimination on the job."

Breen: "And... and then there... there's some concern apparently that the 60-day opt out, which I... does that mean that you can go to Circuit Court within the 60 days instead..."

Currie: "Within the 60 days."

Breen: "...of waiting 60?"

Currie: "Exactly. And that was, as I say, instead of somebody waiting two years for the department to investigate, then following a long backlog in the Commission on Human Rights, this gives the people who have... are able to make their case an opportunity for a faster resolution."

Breen: "And... and there was some concern that doing the 60-day opt out might violate the... the EOC funding of some sort that they do... federal funding for the State Department?"

Currie: "No, we don't believe that it does."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Breen: "Okay. And then... some of the additional exposure because charges can now be filed within 300 days instead of just..."

Currie: "And... and..."

Breen: "...180 days?"

Currie: "...and we did that. That was in fact a recommendation from the Sexual Discrimination and Harassment Task Force as well as appearing in this Bill. And what that does is it mirrors what... or the deadlines for going to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. So, we're just mirroring Federal Law so people are not confused about when they have to file a complaint if it is ever to be heard."

Breen: "Fair enough. Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Jimenez."

Jimenez: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. I just want to thank Leader Currie for working on this Bill with members of the business community and a lot of interested groups. One of the most glaring statistics we heard in our Sexual Harassment and Discrimination Task Force is that it could take a complainant or a victim, as well as a business, up to 7 years to get through the process. And that was a glaring thing that we thought that we needed to get to work on. And luckily there had been working on that before including the Governor's Office. So, I encourage the Members of the Body to vote 'yes' on this Bill. It will be a significant reform in the Human Rights Commission. And we can get it on to the Governor's desk. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker."

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? Chapa LaVia, Rita.

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Please take the record. There are 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 34, Representative Hernandez. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 34, a Bill for an Act concerning government. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Hernandez."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Hernandez."

Hernandez: "Yes, thank you, Speaker. So, Amendment #1 will simply renew the opposition from law enforcement and the state agencies."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen, are you rising on the Amendment?"

Breen: "Or on the note."

Speaker Lang: "Well, we didn't get there yet."

Breen: "Fair enough."

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. But a state mandates note has been requested and has not been filed."

Speaker Lang: "For now this Bill will be held on the Order of Second Reading. Does that satisfy you, Mr. Breen? Kind of thought it would. Senate Bill 200, Mr. Hoffman. Mr. Hoffman. Out of the record. Senate Bill 682, Representative Feigenholtz. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 682, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

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

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 682, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is an... it's the... it's about opioids and the emergent need of getting people into care and removing prior authorization. There were hours, and months, and weeks of negotiation with managed care organizations, insurance companies, the Illinois Behavioral Health Association. And I believe we have agreement. We ultimately have to capture the moment when a person is ready to go into recovery. I think everybody is in agreement about this. And I'd appreciate 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. Please take the record, Mr. Clerk. There are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1531, Mr. Harris. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1758, Representative Gordon-Booth. Representative Gordon-Booth. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1851, Mr. Harris.

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1851, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendments 2 and 3 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Greg Harris."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

Harris, G.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Can we adopt the Amendments and then discuss the Bill on Third?"

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

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

Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #3 is offered by Representative Greg Harris."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

Harris, G.: "I would make the same request."

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. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1851, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

Harris, G.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill is the 2019... 2018 Medicaid omnibus package. It is a product of months of negotiation between the four caucuses, stakeholders and the Department of Healthcare and Family Services. It does these things: it sets up a child... a health care advisory work group, which will develop standards for and supervise the transition of DCFS wards and youth in care from fee for service into managed care Medicaid; it addresses problems in obtaining payment by the ambulance industry by creating a single form to be used for submitting claims and also collecting compliance data from MCOs, hospitals and nursing homes; it increases the rate for institutions which care for medically complex and develop... developmentally disabled children; it also establishes a new

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

rate of payment for psych hospitals that hold youth who are wards of the state beyond medical necessity who cannot be moved from those facilities into other settings; it also creates a MCO Transparency Act that requires transparency and public dissemination of information regarding the development of capitated rates paid to the MCOs, claims, benefits, denials, rejections and that type of data. And lastly, with Amendment #4 (sic-Floor Amendment #3) it establishes a... an emergency fallback program should the Federal Government not approve either the Hospital Assessment Program or the Hospital Assessment Bridge Program by July 1 of this year. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bellock."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Just to the Bill. We... I want to thank Representative Harris for all the work that he's done on this Bill. He was in charge of all of us. This is a great bipartisan Bill, bicameral Bill, with the Senate, the House, Democrats and Republicans. This was an off shoot somewhat of the Hospital Assessment Bill, which the same group spent four months on that. So, we had tried to address the issues a lot of them which... what Representative Harris just went over. And I just want to thank Representative Harris, Feigenholtz, Demmer, Lilly and Gabel who are all on that committee from the House. It was a great working group. And I think that we came up to a lot of solutions on these issues. The one form, the MC/DD rates. We didn't grant any other rate increases, there were a lot of other groups that wanted it, but we were trying to hold the amount of the money down so that the ... you know, it would fit into the budget. So, I just

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

want to thank everybody again. I wholeheartedly support this as one of the best Bills that we've done this year. And thank everybody that participated. And ask for your support. 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? Have all voted who wish? Andrade, Arroyo, Currie, D'Amico, Rita. Please take the record. There are 104 voting 'yes', 12 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2354, Representative Stuart. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2354, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2354, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Stuart."

Stuart: "Thank you. Senate Bill 2354 reflects the second of the package of Bills that you're going to see coming out of our Higher Education working group. This one is very student focused. One of the issues that we talked about was the difficulty some of our students have in completing their programs in a timely manner. And we're trying to do things to help make college affordable for students and their families. So, this was something... it's also agreed upon by all parties involved, all of our institutions, community colleges and four-year schools. So, it... it has two things that it does. It

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

asks the schools to make a reasonable attempt to advise their students who have expressed an interest in transferring to one program or another. And it also sets up a statewide policy, which is a reverse transfer program, which will help our community colleges retroactively award associates degrees to those students who... who have attained the credits necessary for them. I think it's going to be a great Bill. It's going to help make college affordable and accessible to more students across the State of Illinois. And I'd appreciate your support."

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, 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2362, Leader Turner. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2362, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Amendment #2 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2362, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Turner."

Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the Body. Senate Bill 2362 provides an exception to the prohibition on state-held property leases exceeding 10 years under the Procurement Code to allow the University of Illinois at Chicago to enter into a third-party financing agreement to pay for capital

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

- improvements necessary to bring the Eye and Ear Infirmary Surgery Center up to date. I ask for the Body's support."
- 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, Finnie. Please take the record. There are 115 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Chair recognizes Mr. Carroll. Was your light on, Sir?"
- Carroll: "No. Sorry."
- Speaker Lang: "No problem. Senate Bill 2421, Representative Cassidy. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2432, Mr. Martwick. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2432, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. But a housing note has been requested on the Bill and has not been filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Bill will be held on the Order of Second Reading.

 Senate Bill 2436, Representative Feigenholtz. Please read the
 Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2436, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2436, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Feigenholtz."
- Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 2436 came out of the Senate unanimously. This is a Bill that would amend

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

the Liquor Control Act and essentially allow for local control over the 100-foot rule. Many of you know that the Liquor Control Act is 70 to... a Section is 72 pages, 68 of those pages are exemptions. This will allow those municipalities who choose to have a local ordinance do so and if not... if they don't have an ordinance and don't set rules in place, we will still do those other exemptions here. I'm happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Breen: "Thank you. And Representative, I want to be clear about what the Bill does. And actually, the current state of our law is there's one set of laws for the 2.7 million people in Chicago; there's another set of laws for the 10 million people who live outside of Chicago. And in Chicago you can't put a facility that serves a drop of alcohol, whether a restaurant or what have you all the way to bars and strip clubs, you can't put any of them within 100 feet of a church, a school, a veteran's home, things like that. So, that's the state of the law currently in Chicago. In the rest of the state, you can put a restaurant or anything that isn't majority alcohol anywhere you like, but for bars and strip clubs, you have to keep those away from 100 feet of a church, a school, veteran's home, et cetera. Is that... is that a correct statement of the law?"

Feigenholtz: "Correct."

Breen: "Okay. So, what we're doing with this is we're changing the whole state's law by allowing an exemption to all of that.

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

So, you know, what we get in... what we get in the General Assembly... what we've been getting are these Chicago specific exemptions."

Feigenholtz: "Right."

Breen: "We don't get exemptions for the rest of the state because folks don't put bars and strip clubs, you know, they don't put them within 100 feet of a church, or a school or veteran's home... home for the aged. So, we're... we're exempting all of that."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen gets two minutes from Mr. Wheeler. Keep going, Sir."

Breen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, again, I... I just want to make sure the Body knows what they're doing here. Because I think most everyone agrees that there is no point to having a 72page individual Section of the Liquor Code because we've made a law for Chicago that is unworkable. The problem is we're changing the law not merely for the 2.7 million people of Chicago but for the 10 million people in the rest of the state. And I just want folks to understand that, if they go for this, they're voting to allow individuals in the rest of the state to put bars and strip clubs within 100 feet of a church or a school, essentially wiping the restriction off the books. The only reason I bring this up is because you'd think who in the world... who in their right mind would put a bar or a strip club within 100 feet of a church or a school or a veteran's home or a home for the aged, other than the fact that we are the state where they put a strip club next to a convent. So, the problem of changing this State Law... again, not for the 2.7 million in Chicago but for the 10

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

million in the rest of the state... I understand everybody and their brother's on this Bill. I can't support it because I don't think that that particular law we have of saying no bars, no strip clubs with 100 feet of a church, a school or a retirement home, veteran's home, et cetera, I don't think there's a problem with that law. I think there's a problem with the way we treat Chicago. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Hays for two minutes."

Hays: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"

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

Hays: "Representative, in essence, this is just suggesting that the good people of Chicago can decide this on their own. They don't need to come here. Every other city in the State of Illinois takes this to their city council or whatever the appropriate committee is and they make this decision on a local level. Is that correct?"

Feigenholtz: "Correct. Representative, I... I'm really glad you brought that up. I know that there are a lot of Members here who have experienced, especially in the city, a significant number of businesses that come meet with us after we adjourn with this problem. And essentially, I... I had a wine store in my district... they didn't sell one other item but wine... I met with them in June after we adjourned, which meant that they were paying rent at their business for... for... until we came back and filed and passed an exemption for them. That kept that small business with their doors shut and they almost never opened because of the cost. So, ultimately, this is a local control issue only. If the municipality that the

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

previous speaker was referring to chooses not to implement their own rules, that... they would still have to come back to us for that exemption, nothing changes. But this is an opportunity for those who want to... to put rules in place so that those small businesses, like the one I just described, can actually do business and open their door. This is supported by the State Chamber of Commerce, small Chambers of Commerce. It is balanced between local... if... if that's a decision..."

Speaker Turner: "Please make your final remarks."

Hays: "Thank... I appreciate that answer. And I would just suggest...

To the Bill. I think there's plenty of latitude for all of
the Members here if you... if you come down on the side of
voting 'yes' on these measures or 'no' on these measures this
is really about local control. I agree with you
wholeheartedly. I think the good people in Chicago have the
ability to make these decisions on their own like everybody
else does. I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Senate... Representative Feigenholtz to close."

Feigenholtz: "This... as you know, the Governor consistently has vetoed a lot of the exemptions we've attempted to do here. And ultimately this is what I believe is a good compromise that he will sign. And I would appreciate your support on this Bill."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2436 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting
is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record.
On a count of 97 voting 'yes', 17 voting 'no', 1 voting

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

'present', Senate Bill 2436, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Conroy, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Conroy: "Thank you, Speaker. A point of personal privilege." Speaker Turner: "Please proceed."

Conroy: "I'd like everybody to help me today to recognize that today is a very special day for a couple of people in our chamber. Today we need to celebrate two very important people, Representative Laura Fine and her husband Michael, who have a very inspirational friendship and love for each other that should inspire all of us. Today they celebrate their 25th wedding anniversary."

Speaker Turner: "Congratulations. Senate Bill 2447, Representative Yingling. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2447, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Yingling."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Yingling."

Yingling: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Senate Bill 2447 is an agreed upon Bill and it just says that records shall be transmitted electronically from the MCOs to HFS through a secured electronic format deemed sufficient by HFS. It also outlines that HFS shall consider concerns raised by the contractor's and potential burdens associated with producing these reports. I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 2447. All in favor say 'aye'; all

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

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

Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read Senate Bill 2447."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2447, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Yingling, did you already explain the Bill?"

Yingling: "Yes. I... I just explained the Bill. I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Breen is recognized for two minutes."

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

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

Breen: "And Representative, I... I see there was some opposition to this Bill. Have you obviated all of the opposition with your Amendment?"

Yingling: "Correct. The Amendment that we just adopted was drafted by HFS and that removes their opposition."

Breen: "Good deal. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2447 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record.
On a count of 115 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 2447, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

- Bill 2481, Representative Riley. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2481, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2 has been adopted. No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill for a third time."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2481, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Riley."
- "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Simply, Senate Bill 2481 does a number of things. Primarily what it does is increases the awards cap, the tort awards cap for claims coming before the Court of Claims from \$100 thousand to 2 million. It also includes a... an effective date... now the Bill is effective immediately. But what it does is it has a special provision such that those who... those families who are aggrieved by the loss of their loved ones at the Quincy Veteran's Home will be able to file a claim under the new cap. Third, what it does is it brings Illinois's tort awards cap in the Court of Claims more toward the midpoint of all states in America. Right now, we're tied for last with four other states in terms of our claim. And the fourth thing that it does, it really adds a modicum of relief and respect to the families of the people who died in those homes, who basically sent their loved ones to these veteran's homes and they were under the care of the state. And so, that's what the... the Bill does. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Breen."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield for two minutes."

Breen: "And... and then Representative, when did you say our 100 thousand was last changed?"

Riley: "It was 1972."

Breen: "1972. So, the rate of inflation from 100 thousand from 1972 to 2018 would be about \$600 thousand. Does that number seem right to you? I just went on *calculator.net* here at my desk."

Riley: "Well, I... I think that math may be correct. I... I haven't looked at it. I do know that 1972, you could buy a gallon of Super Shell for about 37 cents. Gives you an idea of how far we've... we've come with regard to when those limits were actually set."

Breen: "Mr. Speaker, I'd move for Standard Debate on this Bill."

Riley: "I'm sorry?"

Breen: "Standard Debate on the Bill, please."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no objection, this Bill will be moved to Standard Debate."

Breen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, certainly we do need to move the maximum award amount for our tort claims, the problem is we would be moving from a number that obviously it out of date to essentially the highest in the country as best... at least our analysis is showing us. And, you know, we... we've already got a place where we've got, you know, we're... we're rated as a judicial hell hole. We've got the Asphalt Pavement Association, the Road and Transportation Builders are all against this cap increase. All of our various agencies are against it. The Illinois

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Municipal League is against it. And so, while I understand the need to make the cap a bit, you know, bring it to 2018, bringing it to 2018 would be making it one-third or less of the amount that is in this Bill. And so, this is one of those things that really should be negotiated in a bipartisan way not rammed down our throats in a... in a unipartisan way and would presume to be vetoed by the Governor, if it gets to his desk. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Kifowit is recognized."

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

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

Kifowit: "Representative, what is your view of our veteran population that are in our nursing homes today?"

Riley: "My view is that these... and sometimes we throw around the... the word 'heroes' a lot. They're exactly that. And our veteran's homes are there to care for these people who gave up much of their lives in defense of this country. And so, we have a responsibility to be sure that they have everything that they need. And again, this is a situation where people who were essentially hale and hearty went into a veteran's home and... and things happened outside of their control and they tragically perished. So, I think it's our responsibility to be sure that anyone in our custody can view themselves as being in a very safe environment. Let me just clarify something else that was said, Representative Kifowit. First of all, nothing's being rammed down anybody's throat. Now, I know how we do sometimes with certain Bills and we set up a scenario and, you know, everybody is... you know, is going to go to hell if you don't vote for this Bill and that ... you know,

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

not this Bill. Let's not try to do that with this Bill. First of all, the \$2 million cap is not the highest in the... in the nation. There are 17 states... 17 that have no cap at all. So, the \$2 million cap puts us somewhere in the midpoint, number one. Number two, when this Bill was being negotiated it was being negotiated in a bipartisan fashion. There was a meeting; we had a teleconference when the Bill.. I had a separate Bill. There was a Bill at the same time going on over in the Senate. We did negotiate. There was staff there from the Senate and from the House. I was there. The Senate Sponsor was there. Senate Republicans were there. The Court of Claims was there. there's nothing more transparent and certainly bipartisan than that. And that is how we came up with the determination of what this Bill would look like. And even after one of the ... some of the Amendments that I made on this Bill when it came over here, everybody was still on board. So, that's what I'm trying to do for the veterans who are in these veteran's homes."

Kifowit: "Thank you. And to the Bill. The reason why this Bill is in front of us today is because 13 heroes and 1 spouse died in a veteran's home due to questionable neglect. The point in fact is that we had veterans who were under the care of the State of Illinois, we have family members, particularly the family of Doris French, who was left in her room with significant signs of decay that they could not even have an open casket for her funeral, being under the care of the veteran's homes that they were in in Quincy. It is appalling that we have such a low threshold, such a low disregard for the veterans and the individuals in our care. And it is only

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

right and only befitting that we allow recourse in instances of neglect, in instances where people are mistreated, of a proper amount. Two million dollars is a proper amount. And to be quite frank, nobody can replace these family members that have passed away. Nobody can replace the heroes that we lost in Quincy. But this can help the families and this is by far more honorable than the \$100 thousand we have today. And I request an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Keith Wheeler." Wheeler, K.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Wheeler, K.: "Representative, I'm looking through my analysis here and I do see a couple of opponents. And I believe you and I had a conversation maybe a month or two ago about this Bill regarding the Asphalt Pavement Association and the Road and Transportation Builders Association. Can you help me understand their... their opposition, their concerns?"

Riley: "Representative Wheeler, I don't know what their opposition is. Because I... as I think that I emanated to the entire Body, this process has been going on an extremely long time. And so, all of the entities that had a problem with the Bill could have come to me, not only come to me, they could have joined in the conversation. I did not know about a lot of this opposition until the day the Bill was coming out of committee. So, I can't help you understand where they're coming from. Maybe they can tell you, but all of this opposition came on at the last minute. I would say that many of them that happen to be departments under the Governor, you know, you can sort of figure out where that opposition is coming from. Another

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

thing that I wanted to point out that was said, the Illinois Municipal League it not an opponent of this Bill. They were not an opponent of this Bill. They were going to be an opponent when the Bill was in the Senate. They pulled their opposition. I've talked to the IML; they take no position on the merits."

Wheeler, K.: "Okay. Representative, I'm looking at our list of... of the states that do have a limitation and right now we are very near the bottom of the list that you mentioned earlier. But this Bill would put us tied for number one in the country with Missouri at 2 million. I know you said there were some states that don't have a limitation at all..."

Riley: "Representative Wheeler, that's not tied for first place.

If 17 states don't have a cap at all..."

Wheeler, K.: "I'd qualify that."

Riley: "Well, what..."

Wheeler, K.: "I said of the list... of the list I have in front of me, Sir. That's what I was saying."

Riley: "Well, I understand that. But again, that doesn't mean a whole lot. If 17 states have no cap at all. So, I would not say we're not tied for first."

Wheeler, K.: "Of the ones who are listed."

Riley: "You can say we're tied..."

Wheeler, K.: "I understand."

Riley: "...you can say we're tied for first amongst those who set a cap."

Wheeler, K.: "That's... and that's exactly what I said. So, I wasn't trying to mischaracterize it. I was just pointing out the

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

fact that we are going to have a limit; it's going to be the highest tied with Missouri that we see."

Riley: "Well..."

Wheeler, K.: "To the Bill."

Riley: "And you must... before you go to the Bill you got..."

Wheeler, K.: "Sure."

Riley: "...you have to remember, too, and we've done this quite a bit with other measures, we are just changing a cap. You still have to go before the Court of Claims. You still have to file a claim and you must win before you get anything. And the court has jurisdiction as to what that award is. I just want everybody to be cognizant of that. Thank you."

Wheeler, K.: "Appreciate that. Actually, I'm going to ask you one more question, if I could? Representative, this... this has come to light in regards to what happened in Quincy."

Riley: "I'm sorry?"

Wheeler, K.: "This... this issue has come to light from what happened in Quincy, correct?"

Riley: "That was one of the main drivers; that's correct."

Wheeler, K.: "Right. But it still affects every Court of Claims issues that we're seeing in the state. So, it's not just a Quincy-related award, it affects the entire system permanently. Is that..."

Riley: "Well, it... it affects those claims where people are under our custody or our jurisdiction."

Wheeler, K.: "Right."

Riley: "So, it doesn't affect every claim. But those people who are under our custody, our care, or jurisdiction, it would affect, potentially."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Wheeler, K.: "Thank you. Thank you. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, I understand the... the Sponsor's initiative here. At the same time, I think that when we look at a gallon of Super Shell in 1972 at 37 cents that's... if it went up by ten times what gasoline has gone up to since that period of time, we'd only be at a million dollars. So, I think we may be overreaching here a bit. And I think that there are concerns that I did bring earlier to the Sponsor that haven't been all the way addressed yet. So, at this point I... I can't support the measure and urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Chapa LaVia."

Chapa LaVia: "Thank you, Speaker. Will the Leader yield?"

Speaker Turner: "He will."

Chapa LaVia: "Thank you. I understand that Illinois damage caps have not been updated since 1972 and that it is the lowest in the country that we have. Who came up with this proposed cap on this Bill... or in the Bill?"

Riley: "The... the current cap... the \$2 million cap?"

Chapa LaVia: "Yes."

Riley: "Well, that was negotiated."

Chapa LaVia: "So, it was ... negotiated with all ..."

Riley: "With... with all of the parties..."

Chapa LaVia: "...individuals you had plus the Court of Claims, correct?"

Riley: "Well, yes. It... the people from the Court of Claims were there. As I stated before, this was something that everyone from both parties, all interested parties and, you know, the different entities that are going to be involved, we came up with what that cap number was."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

- Chapa LaVia: "As a military veteran, Leader Riley, do you think that a hundred thousand cap provides adequate access to justice for our veterans and their families who fell victim to the tragedy in Quincy?"
- Riley: "Not at all. As we said before, first of all, the… the cap… the \$100 thousand cap was outdated. We've stated when it was… when it was promulgated. The other thing that… that I think that it did also was, again, a life is… is priceless. But I think that low cap also dissuaded people from even coming up with a claim at all."
- Chapa LaVia: "I... I agree with you. And unfortunately, I didn't get a chance to speak up on Memorial Day which is a very reverent day. It's not happy Memorial Day; it's reverent Memorial Day for those who served. But we're talking about individuals that sacrificed with a blank check to the United States of America to fight for their country. And they should be held at the highest esteem. If something happens that is our fault before their death, that they have the ability to go to the Court of Claims and adjudicate it and make sure that they are paid justly and fairly. And I wholeheartedly support this Bill. And I hope you will too. Thank you, Leader, for bringing this forward."

Riley: "You're welcome."

- Speaker Turner: "Representative Frese, we have heard from three in support on this measure. Do you ride... rise in opposition?"
- Frese: "Mr. Speaker, I... I would like to put something on the record."
- Speaker Turner: "Do you rise in opposition to this measure?

 According to Standard..."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Frese: "No, I do not rise in opposition."

Speaker Turner: "...according to Standard Debate rules we have heard from three proponents and we have room for one more opponent. Sorry."

Frese: "Okay."

Speaker Turner: "Do you rise in opposition, Representative McSweeney? You may proceed."

McSweeney: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

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

McSweeney: "Trouper Riley, I... I've always found you a very fair person to work with. Would you consider separating out the veteran's component? I am 1 thousand percent in favor of lifting the cap for our veterans. What's happened in Quincy is a travesty, we all agree upon that. That would fly out of here, I think, with 117 votes today. Would you consider stripping that out? Because I can't favor the rest of it. It doesn't make any sense to increase it up to that level, but for the veterans I think everybody will vote for that. Would... would you, as the fair person as you always are, would you consider splitting up this Bill and just having a piece for the veterans? If so, I'll vote 'yes'; if not, I can't support it."

Riley: "Well, again, I am a fair person. And... and thank you for... for stating that. We're sort at the eleventh hour as far as this legislation is concerned. And again, it's not like anyone did not know about this. As I say, this was a negotiated Bill. It was a bipartisan Bill. Not only that, as I stated before, many opponents could have weighed in on the Bill. This was

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

something that we got together numerous times, staff, departments and we worked it out. The Bill is ready to go."

McSweeney: "Okay."

Riley: "I've already stated... and... and also the Bill had a number of notes on them. All those notes have been answered."

McSweeney: "All right."

Riley: "The Bill is what it is, I think it's a good Bill. I think what it does is it shines a light on what our responsibilities to those who are under our custody and care, what those responsibilities are. And so, I think the Bill is ready to go, Representative McSweeney. If you have to vote 'no', I... I respect that. But the Bill is ready to go and we should give an up or down vote."

McSweeney: "Right. And... and to the Bill. Again, I respect you. I can't support this Bill with everything else it has in it. I support the cap lifting for the veterans. I urge a 'no' vote. I would ask for the remaining portion of my time to allow Representative Frese to make a statement. I think it might be a statement about a conflict. If you would allow the balance of my time to be yielded to him, I'd appreciate it."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Frese."

Frese: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to make a point of...
for the record that due to a potential conflict of interest
I need to vote 'present' on this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Riley to close."

Riley: "Thank you very much for the debate. This is a good Bill.

And beyond the technical things that it does, again, what it does is it gives the families of the people who have sacrificed so much... sometimes, you know, we... we talk about

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

that but we give our veterans lip service than real honor. And I think that this Bill goes a long way to give their spirits and the families of the people whose lives were lost, as I say, a modicum of respect and a concern from this Body. Please vote 'aye'."

- Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2481 pass?'
 All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record.
 On a count of 79 voting in 'favor', 33 voting 'opposed', and 2 voting 'present', Senate Bill 2481, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed.
 Representative Carroll, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Carroll: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to make sure that my vote is shown as a 'yes' on SB2447. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "The Journal will reflect your request,

 Representative. Representative Welch, for what reason do you
 seek recognition?"
- Welch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Can the record reflect that I intended to vote 'yes' on Senate Bill 2447?"
- Speaker Turner: "Journal will reflect your request. Mr. Clerk, Senate Bill 2522, Representative Wallace. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2522, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. A fiscal note has been requested and not filed."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

- Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, please hold this Bill on the Order of Second Reading. Representative... Senate Bill 1707, Leader Lang. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1707, a Bill for an Act concerning health. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 1 and 3 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Greg Harris."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Lang. Representative Harris."
- Harris, G.: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to withdraw Amendment #1."
- Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, please withdraw Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1707."
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #3 is offered by Representative Lang."
- Speaker Turner: "Leader Lang."
- Lang: "Thank you. This Bill deals with mental health parity. And I would like to adopt Amendment 3 and discuss it on Third."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1707. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read Senate Bill 1707."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1707, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Leader Lang."
- Lang: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen.

 First, let me thank my colleagues for the bipartisan nature of the Sponsor board. It reflects how important mental health

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

parity is. Many of you know, this is something I've been working for years and because of the cooperation in this chamber Illinois has become a leader in mental health parity across the nation. This Bill will even create a wider gap between us and the rest of the nation. This does some very good things to make sure that the mentally ill and those with substance abuse needs get treated appropriately. It creates some new definitions in the statute. It puts some new requirement on the Department of Insurance and HFS to track data and to find out whether insurance companies are actually doing what they're supposed to be doing. It does many other things including giving data to the General Assembly about what's going on in the area of parity. It takes barriers away from people who need medically assisted treatment, who are in substance abuse needs. And overall, a pretty good Bill. The only opponent to it was CMS and they did not speak in committee. This Bill has been worked on for over a year. I know of no other opposition to it including the insurance companies who are impacted by it. I would ask your support."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Leader Bellock."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm just standing in support of the Bill. We've worked for a long, long time for mental health parity. I just wanted to clarify that this is not a Medical Cannabis Pilot Program. This Bill has been changed into the mental health parity. And I thank Representative Lang for all of the work he's done on it. And I support the Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Lang to close."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

- Lang: "Thank you. I appreciate Representative Bellock's comments.

 Let me thank the Kennedy Forum as well as the Illinois... as soon as I remember their name... the Illinois Association of Behavioral Healthcare Associations for their help in negotiating this along with all of our negotiating partners. I would appreciate your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1707 pass?'
 All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record.
 On a count of 106 voting in 'favor', 9 voting 'opposed', and 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1707, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1758, Leader Gordon-Booth. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1758, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. This Bill was read a second time previous day. Amendment 2 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Leader Gordon-Booth. Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill a third time."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1758, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Gordon-Booth."
- Gordon-Booth: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1758 is a simple change. We're looking to ensure that the Illinois Law Enforcement Training and Standards Board is allowed to own and lease property. We're also making some small changes to the reorganization of the board. It's a simple... it's a simple

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

- rule change. I ask for an 'aye' vote. I'm open for any questions."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Breen is recognized for two minutes."
- Breen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd move for Standard Debate."
- Speaker Turner: "This Bill will be moved to the Order of Standard Debate."
- Breen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor indicates that she will yield."
- Breen: "And Representative, I... I wanted to understand what... what you're doing here. You're removing the Illinois State Police member from the Board of the Illinois Law Enforcement Training Standards taking a 19-member board down to an 18-member board. But why would you remove the State Police from a Training Standards Board for law enforcement?"
- Gordon-Booth: "So, if you would recall, at one point this was the only training facility in the state. We now have three others in other geographical regions of the state. What this does is this puts their board on par with the other training facilities in other parts of the state."
- Breen: "And you're also removing the Law Enforcement Training Standards Board from the Governor's Office out to itself. What... what's the reason for that?"
- Gordon-Booth: "Well, the reason for that is that it has to do with the significant donation that was made to the development of this phenomenal training facility down in Decatur. So, the removal of that is because of the… the significant amount of the donation and the work that they've been able to do down

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

there. They're removing that from the ebbs and flows of what happens in the Governor's Office."

Breen: "Right. So, was that a condition of the gift?"

Gordon-Booth: "No, it's..."

Breen: "Does Warren Buffett not like our Governor?"

Gordon-Booth: "No."

Breen: "He doesn't like our Governor or he does like our Governor?"

Gordon-Booth: "I'm not speaking to that. I don't know how he feels."

Breen: "Okay. But... so, it was not a condition of the gift in any way. You guys just decided to pull it out of the Governor's Office."

Gordon-Booth: "No. It's important because part of what is necessary with this legislation is the ability to lease and own property and that then becomes difficult when that... when this facility's then governed by the Governor's Office as a part of an Executive Order. So, we're changing that with this legislation."

Breen: "Well, it's got to be governed by somebody. And... and you had said, well, you know because of this wonderful new building essentially we need to now reorganize this entity in some way because somebody gave us a building. You're saying it's not a condition of the gift, but then you say, well, but we get this gift. So we need to now reorganize."

Gordon-Booth: "If you recall, I stated at the beginning of my opening that the first portion of the Bill is that we're giving them the ability to own and lease property. So, if you have another entity that has jurisdiction over said property,

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

then do you really have ownership? The answer to that would be no."

Breen: "Well, that doesn't at all follow by logic at all. There's no logic there at all. The ... you ... and no one disagrees with taking a big building from Warren Buffett or whomever, as long as they're not putting strings on it that would make it inconsistent with public usage. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, the building donation is fine. Hey, that's great. I don't think anyone disagrees. The problem is using a building donation as an excuse to reorganize an agency, pull the State Police out of the board of the law enforcement training standards that sets law enforcement training standards makes no sense. And then pulling it away from the Governor makes it start... makes this Bill now look like a partisan power grab. And so, I don't see how with that at least we can support it. I don't know may ... maybe there's some good reason for it we just haven't heard it yet today. Thank vou."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Gordon-Booth to close."

Gordon-Booth: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think I stated very clearly exactly what we're looking to do. We're looking to give them the opportunity to own and lease the property that has been built through the gift of a donation, a private gift that was given, to allow law enforcement as we continue to go down this road of... of justice reform. And we clearly understand the importance of training as it relates to having officers that are better equipped to be in our communities and operate in a fashion that we all can be proud of. That is exactly what's happening at this facility down in Macoupin

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

County. If you are confused, I would suggest that you may take a visit to see some of the phenomenal work that's going on at the Law and Standards Training... the... the ILETSB training facility down in Decatur, Illinois. I think that, again, we were very clear with what we're trying to do. We just want to put this board on par with the other three training facilities that we have in the State of Illinois. This is not a power grab. That's why this Bill has no opposition. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1758 pass?'
 All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 67 voting in 'favor', 47 voting 'opposed', and 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1758, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 904, Representative Hoffman. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 904, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Amendment #2 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #3 is offered by Representative Hoffman."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Hoffman on Floor Amendment #3."

 Hoffman: "Yes. Mr. Speaker, Floor Amendment #3 would simply move

 from a two percent interest rate to a one percent interest
 rate for past due bills."
- Speaker Turner: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 904. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

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

Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill. Senate Bill 904."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 904, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Hoffman."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Hoffman: House. This is a... a Bill that has been proposed by the Illinois State Medical Society and is... is favored by all providers under the Workers' Compensation System. Currently the Workers' Compensation System a medical provider will provide services, whether it's an orthopedic surgeon, a hospital, physical therapy, a chiropractor, to workers and they're to be paid by the insurance company. Unfortunately, what is happening is of ... all too often and the... the testimony in the committee indicated that they're not getting paid even though the medical procedures had been approved... prior to them being performed. They're not getting paid for sometimes 18 months to 2 years. There was a testimony about an orthopedic company that hadn't been paid for services that were done way back in 2016. This would ensure that the one percent interest rate would be charged, that's currently in law could be enforced, that is charged for our past due bills. If the bill is not paid within 30 days, it would accrue a one percent interest rate and it would ensure that there could be a private right of action in order to make... make the bills get paid. It also has provisions regarding electronic medical records and... and indicates that the Department of Insurance must adopt them by September 1 of 2018. And

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

indicates that if the insurance company does not believe that there should be payment that is made under the medical fee schedule that there would be an Explanation Of Benefits. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "This Bill is on the Order of Short Debate.

Representative Breen is recognized for two minutes."

Breen: "I'd move for Standard Debate."

Speaker Turner: "This Bill will be moved to the Order of Standard Debate."

Breen: "Thank..."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Breen."

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

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

Breen: "And Representative, just... just so that... that the Body is clear, we... we had a recent Appellate Court case that held that doctors who are entitled to interest had no mechanism to collect the interest. And so, we're kind of stuck... they're stuck right now. It could have been years on even undisputed bills... or mostly undisputed bills and they don't get any interest that even though we provide it in the statute, they have no mechanism to collect that interest?"

Hoffman: "Exactly. And what has happened as a result of that case is that the doctors are leaving the Workers' Compensation System because they're... of nonpayment because there's no enforcement mechanism."

Breen: "And then I... I see that your Bill also adds so that... in the normal course, as I understand it, you would add an... an ability for those docs to then get their... their interest payments say through the commission. But I know that... I note

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

that you have put in there a remedy to go to Circuit Court. I know that's been a point of contention with the business communities. Is there a reason why the Circuit Court remedy was put in there?"

Hoffman: "Yes. Because when it comes to collection actions the...
the Workers' Compensation Commission is not in a position of...
of doing that. That's not their... that's not their forte.
That's the Circuit Court's forte. And what this would do is
simply say, when a medical process is performed you're going
to get paid for it. And the medical fee schedule indicates
the amount that you're going to get paid for it so there's no
dispute there. If there is any kind of a dispute it says the
insurance company would inform the provider of... through an
explanation of benefits, an EOB, as to why they aren't paying
the amount under the medical fee schedule."

Breen: "And... and then, I know there was also a concern about... I believe at least at some phase of the negotiations about the information that would be provided to the company or I believe... maybe it was the insurance company... about are you getting enough of the medical records to be able to make an assessment about the propriety or impropriety of the particular charge? So, if you could speak to that very briefly."

Hoffman: "Yeah. Well, obviously, if an... if an individual is injured at work and he goes to... to a medical provider and the insurance company is made aware of it and approves it, well, the provider should get paid. They've provided a surgery, they may have provided hospital care, they may have provided medical... other medical care, physical therapy. They should

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

get paid. I think what you're making... making a reference to is the electronic billing portion of this Bill. For years, and years, and years we've been attempting to have electronic billing made part of the Workers' Compensation System. However, the Department of Insurance hasn't done what is necessary in order to make sure that that takes place. So, what this indicates is that the director must adopt rules by September 1 of 2018 so that there is put in place an electronic claims system. It's done in all other types of health care throughout the United States. And this would just make it subject to the Workers' Compensation System."

Breen: "And I... and I guess..."

Hoffman: "In... in that area, we indicate what must be part of that electronic billing system in that area of the Bill."

Breen: "Right. And if you... if we could speak directly to that? So, it's on page 15 line 2. It said that it would... ensure that health care providers are responsible for supplying only those medical records pertaining to the providers own claims that are minimally necessary under the Federal Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996. So that's HIPAA. Is that... as I read that, it's... I know that that's language that I think there was some of the business groups were concerned that they're not going to get the information they need in order to make a better assessment of the claim. What... what's the... what's the meaning of that language in your... in your view?"

Hoffman: "It... it's my understanding that this is only given guidance to the Department of Insurance for the making of the rules of the medical... of the electronic billing system. It's

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

just giving guidance. If a... a defense attorney wants to get... wants further medical records who is representing an employer, they can subpoen the medical records under the Workers' Compensation System. None of that is changing."

"Fair enough, Representative. And I... Just to the Bill. Breen: Ladies and Gentlemen, this is obviously something we've all been... we know that there have been just vigorous negotiations going on with various Legislators involved on both sides of the aisle. And I... I know that a lot of folks are very unhappy about this Bill. We've got opposition from the Chamber, IML and a whole host of business groups. But we have just as long a list of proponents from... beginning with the State Medical Society and... and proceeding to many others. So, this is... I think certainly no one would call this a perfect solution or a perfect final version of this Bill. I know that though a lot of folks will likely support it just because of the ... really the... the justice claim of the doctors for their interest payments and to be able to have a mechanism to get their bills paid. But again, certainly this is a work in progress and something where reasonable people can very much disagree. I will personally be supporting the Bill, but I know there are going to be a lot of folks on both sides of the aisle on this particular measure."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Ives."

Ives: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I stand in opposition to this Bill.
Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Ives: "Representative Hoffman, we actually had some pretty lengthy discussions about this Bill in Labor & Commerce Committee and

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

most... most of us see it on both sides. Can you tell us to what degree were you able to sit down with both sides or did you sit down with both sides to come to... try to come to some agreement?"

Hoffman: "Well, I know that the proponents of the Bill, actually in your Leader's Office, had... had a meeting regarding the Bill. They couldn't come to a consensus, but in response to some of the comments from some of the Members of your side of the aisle, we initially had a two percent interest rate which would raise it from the current one percent. The Amendment that I just adopted reinstated the one percent interest rate. Unfortunately, under current law the way it... and... and because of the court decisions, they're not able to bring an action in order to enforce the payment and the interest rate. So that..."

Ives: "Okay."

Hoffman: "...this would provide that mechanism."

Ives: "Did you participate in any of the negotiations or any of the discussions with both sides in the room?"

Hoffman: "I participated in discussions but not the negotiations, no."

Ives: "Okay. So, I think that what's important for people to understand here is that clearly business is opposed to this Bill. And it is opposed because it's an overreach... this Bill is an overreach. Certainly, they're trying to correct something that needs to be corrected and the doctors are not getting paid on non-disputed medical bills in a timely fashion. And unfortunately, the problems that have generated this Bill reach back to 2005. So, it reached back to

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

administrations of Blagojevich, and Quinn, and now the Rauner administrations whose Work Comp Commissions, Department of Insurance has not worked together collectively with the employers, and with employees, and the medical doctors who provide relief from injury. They have not worked collectively together to actually enforce laws that were put into place in 2005 and again in 2011. And the biggest problem here is the electronic billing. So, I'd ask Representative Hoffman, again, is there anything in this Bill that requires medical providers to actually submit bills electronically?"

Hoffman: "Well, yes. It..."

Ives: "Are..."

Hoffman: "...what... what this provides... what this provides is an electronic billing system where the medical providers will be able to send the bills electronically to the insurance companies. So, yes."

Ives: "Why... obviously, they can already electronically bill and sometimes they do, but is there any... I... I don't believe that in this Bill it actually says medical providers must submit bills electronically. And I think that's part of the problem with the... the employer side, the business side. I'm not sure that that actually forces medical bills to be submitted electronically."

Hoffman: "Well, the Bill says that it requires employers... or excuse me, it requires insurance companies to accept electronic billing from the medical providers. So, by implication, that means the medical providers would be required to send it electronically."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Ives: "So... well, it actually doesn't say that. In fact, there are no penalties if a medical provider fails to comply with this law, but there are certain penalties if an employer doesn't comply. And there's no penalty if a medical provider fails to submit a bill electronically. Now, I have another Bill, HB5910 that I filed yesterday, that actually comes and actually says that it incentivizes a medical provider to submit it saying that you're not going to get your enhanced penalty until 60 days out instead of 30 days out if you don't submit it electronically. So, Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. I guess my point here is that this has been a failure of administrations reaching back to Blagojevich to not come together and actually implement electronic billing, which seems to be one of the biggest problems. And so, now you've got a case where bills sit out there for years, doctors don't get paid out. There's no penalty to do it, so now they've put this one percent penalty in if you don't pay non-disputed bills on time. But yet, for the employer, there's no assurance that they're going to get those bills electronically. There's no assurance that they're going to get access to the information that they need to actually determine causation and whether or not it's an actual work comp case. And again, this is a Bill that is going to be viewed by business as one more reason not to 10..."

Speaker Turner: "Please make your final remarks, Representative."

Ives: "...this is one more reason for businesses not to locate here because we have one of the worst regulatory environments for work compensation. This adds to that. I would like to see these two parties along with DOI, along with the Work Comp Commission come together and finally sit down and hammer out

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

an agreement. This Bill popped up about two weeks ago and has not had enough time to be worked out. And it's an overreach by the medical providers. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Williams."

Williams: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

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

Williams: "Representative, is it the intent of the language added to Section 8.2(d) to ensure that where a provider has designated a third party to bill on its behalf, the billing entity would be entitled to those rights afforded to the provider under subsection (d), including payment, issuance of an explanation of benefits for all and interest?"

Hoffman: "Yes."

Williams: "Thank you very much. This is an excellent piece of legislation. I'm looking forward to voting 'yes'."

Speaker Turner: "We have heard from three proponents on the Bill and one in opposition. Representative Davidsmeyer, do you rise in opposition to this measure? I need an answer."

Davidsmeyer: "I... I don't know. I... I just have a question about the Bill."

Speaker Turner: "If you don't rise in opposition, then we're going to Representative Hoffman to close."

Davidsmeyer: "I... I rise in opposition."

Speaker Turner: "You may proceed, Sir."

Davidsmeyer: "I... I could... you could sway me though, so. So... so, does this only apply to things that are already approved?"

Hoffman: "Just a comment, I hope that even though you rise in opposition my... my excellent closing is going to persuade you to vote for the Bill."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Davidsmeyer: "It... it very well could."

Hoffman: "Yeah."

Davidsmeyer: "I mean..."

Hoffman: "'Cause it's going to be... it's going to be an unbelievable closing. I'm just telling you."

Davidsmeyer: "...judging by past closings, probably not but maybe."

Hoffman: "I mean, you just wait. You just wait."

Davidsmeyer: "So..."

Hoffman: "What... what's the question? I'm sorry."

Davidsmeyer: "So, the... the question is, is this only dealing with things that are preapproved, preauthorized?

Hoffman: "The... the Amendment, I think it was Amendment 2, indicated that the private right of action only applies to bills that go forward. Not anything retroactively, only forward."

Davidsmeyer: "And... and my question is, does it have to be improved... approved by the insurance company before they can send the bill?"

Hoffman: "Generally, it's my understanding, the insurance company will approve it even before they provide the services."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. So... so, we're talking about something that the insurance company has already approved, the procedure is done..."

Hoffman: "Which is what..."

Davidsmeyer: "...and then they're not making payment because they haven't closed out the case?"

Hoffman: "No, they're not making the payment because there's no mechanism to enforce making the payment under current law as

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

a result of the court case that the previous speaker talked about."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. So, if they're... that electronic system's in place then we're... we're good to go?"

Hoffman: "Well, it's not only the electronic system which we're wanting to get in place. And I... I just... a previous speaker, right now the system is costing millions and millions of dollars in certified mail to send these bills."

Davidsmeyer: "Yeah."

Hoffman: "Why would a doctor send something certified mail when they can electronically send it to the insurance company? So, to your question, what this would provide for is a mechanism for collection of a bill that has been... basically been approved, the services have been performed and they're just not getting paid. And there's really no... there's no question as to the amount because we have this medical fee schedule that sets the amounts out."

Davidsmeyer: "Has... has the U.S. Postal Service taken a stance on this Bill?"

Hoffman: "They probably are opposed, right."

Davidsmeyer: "Just... just kidding. Thank you for your answers."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Hoffman to close."

Hoffman: "Yeah, I would just say this. It was previously indicated that business is opposed. Well, I believe the... the doctors and the hospitals of this state are businesses. The physical therapists run businesses. The Psychiatrists Society and their members are businesses. And to say that this is an overreach when the previous speaker made a great point, these are approved services, the medical fee schedule says what

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

- the... what the amount should be paid and they're not paying it. This just allows them to make sure that they are paid. And that was my brilliant closing. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 904 pass?'
 All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 105 voting in 'favor', 11 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 904, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Halpin, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Halpin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just ask that the record reflect I intended to vote 'yes' on Senate Bill 3103."
- Speaker Turner: "The Journal will reflect your request. Mr. Clerk, Rules Report."
- Clerk Hollman: "Committee Report. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2018: recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 2589."
- Speaker Turner: "Page 10 of the Calendar, we have Senate Bill 2546, Representative Guzzardi. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2546, a Bill for an Act concerning education. This Bill was read a second time previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. A Home Rule and

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

- state mandates note has been requested but not filed at this time."
- Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, please hold this Bill on the Order of Second Reading. Senate Bill 2579, Representative Slaughter.

 Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2579, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. Second... this Bill was read a second time previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Slaughter, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Slaughter on Floor Amendment #3."
- Slaughter: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to adopt Floor Amendment #3 and discuss the Bill on Third Reading."
- Speaker Turner: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 2579. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, Senate Bill 2579."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2579, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Slaughter."
- Slaughter: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 2579, as Amendment... as amended, represents a needed trailer Bill to the Bail Reform Act we passed last year. The Bill provides important clarifying language regarding the \$30 per day credit provision, as well as the provision regarding the automatic 7-day, 'second look' bail hearings. Lastly, Senate Bill 2579 adds language to allow the

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Illinois State Treasurer's Office to hold all bail refunds. The Bill is supported by the Illinois Probation and Court Services Association, as well as the Illinois State's Attorneys Association. To my knowledge, I know of no opposition. I urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Turner: "This Bill is on the Order of Short Debate.

Representative Breen is recognized for two minutes."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Breen: "Thank you. And Representative, just to be clear the… ICJIA had been against an earlier version of this Bill, but they are now neutral as I understand it. Is that correct?"

Slaughter: "That's correct."

Breen: "And then the State Attorneys are proponents of your Bill?" Slaughter: "That's also correct."

Breen: "All right. And does your Bill... is your Bill going to have any fiscal impact on the state or any of its subdivisions?" Slaughter: "Not that I'm aware of, no."

Breen: "Okay. And again, it's a trailer Bill to the original Bail Reform Act, so if folks were not in favor of the Bail Reform Act then they may want to take a good hard look just to make sure. But that's about it. So, thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Slaughter to close."

Slaughter: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2579 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting
is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record.
On a count of 110 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'opposed', 0

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

voting 'present', Senate Bill 2579, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2617, Representative Zalewski. Mr. Clerk. Okay. I'm sorry. Excuse me. Mr. Clerk, Senate Bill 2599 by Representative Slaughter. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2599, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. This Bill was read a second time previous day.

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

Speaker Turner: "Representative Slaughter on Floor Amendment #1."

Slaughter: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, I'd like to adopt Floor

Amendment #1 and discuss the Bill on Third."

Speaker Turner: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 2599. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

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

Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, Senate Bill 2599."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2599, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Slaughter."

Slaughter: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 2599 represents a penalty decrease for violating home confinement and electronic monitoring. Ladies and Gentlemen, being just a Member of Judicial Criminal Committee fully aware of the discussions we've had on penalty enhancements versus penalty decreases. And it's important to understand that a lot of folks that are so critical of penalty enhancements are

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

not doing it for political reasons, not only doing it because it has an adverse negative affect on our communities, but the research shows that it simply doesn't work. Study after study, locally, nationally, internationally, it shows that this doesn't work. On the other hand, in regards to penalty decreases, we're not just throwing punitive statutes in a hat and picking them out and asking for a penalty decrease. We want to do this where it's understandable; we want to do this where it's sensible and where it makes common sense. Senate Bill 2599 is a commonsense, sensible penalty decrease. Currently the penalty for escaping prison and violating home confinement is the same. They're both Class 3 felonies. Senate Bill 2599 will change the violation of home confinement from a Class 3 felony to a Class 4 felony. Shouldn't really have to explain it, the planning, the preparation, the strategy, the effort to escape from a locked, secured facility is... is totally different than violating home confinement. This is a note ... negotiated agreed upon Bill by the John Howard Association, Chicago Urban League, ACLU of Illinois, Illinois Sheriffs Association and also the Illinois State's Attorneys Association. Let's pass this commonsense change. I urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Breen."

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

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

Breen: "Just again to... to clarify and ensure the Body heard you, we are going to take something that is today a Class 3 felony, which is to fail to abide by the terms of your home confinement, and then reduce it so that it would be a Class

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

4 felony. So, it is a penalty reduction for the same crime. It's a clear penalty reduction. None of the other Amendments... there were some other Amendments you'd done earlier, but the only thing that's left in this version of the Bill is reducing it from Class 3 to Class 4?"

Slaughter: "That's correct. We're not going overboard; it's still a felony. But yes, you are correct."

"Well and... Ladies and Gentlemen, to the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, we allow folks home confinement so that they don't have to stay in jail. And a lot of those folks are sex offenders who have ankle bracelets and the like. The whole point of doing this is it's the same as jail. And so, it doesn't make any sense to reduce the penalty. As well, as everyone knows no penalty enhancements no matter how meritorious, no matter how much the people of the state want them are being allowed to be heard. Well, unless they're... you're a Democrat and it's a penalty enhancement that's okay with the Leadership of the Majority Party. So for that reason, I can't support any sort of penalty reduction. Particularly when this is an accommodation made to a defendant. There's no reason to now further accommodate them by reducing the penalty for... for them taking advantage of the good will of the criminal justice system. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Wallace."

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

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

Wallace: "So, you indicated that this would reduce an individual who is on electronic monitoring. If there is a violation,

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

it'll reduce it to a Class 4 felony rather than Class 3? Am
I understanding the Bill?"

Slaughter: "Yes."

Wallace: "And so, how does what the previous speaker just stated actually gel with what you're doing with this legislation? So, there were some statements that individuals are on home confinement because it's kind of an extension of being incarcerated. They're violating that home confinement. Is that..."

Slaughter: "I mean, we're just talking about drastically different situations. Coming home 2, 3, 4, 5 minutes late and violating your home confinement is different than plotting and actually executing the escape from a locked, secured jail or prison."

Wallace: "Thank you. I just wanted to make sure that we were very clear about that. To the Bill. The willfulness to ignore science... social scientific research on what punishment actually does in terms of deterring behavior or encouraging behavior is just so shameful. We continue to have this discussion around penalty enhancements and what Bills are not moving or are moving, but we're not having that discussion rooted in social scientific, psychological research. There is very clear evidence that increasing penalties does nothing to deter certain behaviors. And anyone who's been a parent or a quardian probably has experienced that firsthand. And again, as the Sponsor stated in his opening statement, there are numerous empirical studies that show enhancements don't help. On the converse, there are empirical studies that show that individuals participating in prosocial behavior will do better when they are absolutely no longer on electronic

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

confinement. So, if they do have a job, if they are going to a place of worship, if they are going to a support meeting for their addiction or some other 12-step program they may be participating in and they come home 5 minutes late, we should not be penalizing these individuals further. So to that end, I encourage an 'aye' vote for this very important piece of legislation."

- Speaker Turner: "Representative Slaughter to close."
- Slaughter: "Thank you. We've got to continue to look at ways to address this actually national crisis of mass incarceration and look at commonsense ways... commonsense ways to lower our jail and prison population. I urge a 'yes' vote."
- Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2599 pass?'
 All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves, Members. Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 48 voting 'aye', 64 voting 'nay', 0 voting 'present', Representative Slaughter moves for Postponed Consideration. Leader Lang in the Chair."
- Speaker Lang: "Senate Bill 2617. Excuse me. I missed Mr. Moylan and I would never do that on purpose. Mr. Moylan is recognized."
- Moylan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We know that you're just coming in off relief duty, but you're living offline there. We have a special announcement. We have a little... I would call it a little treat for everybody in the back room by Representative Demmer... Demmer's office. Pizza for everybody today. Thank you. And have a great day."

141st Legislative Day

- Speaker Lang: "How kind of you, Sir. I'm sure you went out and picked those up for everybody. Senate Bill 2617, Mr. Zalewski. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2617, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. This Bill was read a second time a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 1 and 2 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Zalewski."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski."
- Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to adopt Floor Amendment #1. It becomes the Bill representing the agreement language."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Zalewski."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski."
- Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #2 is a technical change..."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2617, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski."
- Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is an initiative of the Illinois Department of Financial and Professional

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Regulation. It represents an agreement with real estate appraisers and real estate appraiser companies to enter into... to define what a real estate... real estate appraisal firm is along with setting size and scope limitations. This is an, again, agreed upon with the industry. It's important to do this to become compliant with Federal Law. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

- 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Time's a wastin'. Carroll, Evans, Feigenholtz, Gordon-Booth, Moeller, Mussman. Please take the record. There are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2641, Mr. Turner. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2641, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. This Bill was read a second time a previous day. Amendment 2 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendments 3 and 4 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #3 is offered by Representative Turner."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Turner."

- Turner: "Floor Amendment 3 deals with some of the insurance liability information included in the Bill. I'd like to ask for its adoption."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

141st Legislative Day

- Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Turner, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Turner."
- Turner: "Floor Amendment #4 is a technical Amendment, just changes one or two words in the... in the Bill. I ask for its adoption."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. But a fiscal and judicial note have been requested but not filed at this time."
- Speaker Lang: "The Bill will be held on the Order of Second Reading. Senate Bill 2707, Mr. Davidsmeyer. Mr. Davidsmeyer. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2804, Mr. Reis. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2804, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. This Bill was read a second time previous day. Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2804, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reis."
- Reis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This Bill simply creates the New Harmony Bridge Authority and the Bi-State New Harmony Bridge Compact, allows the State of Indiana and Illinois to work together to try to save a 90-year-old bridge. Ask for your support."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will say 'yes'... Excuse me. Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'.

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Get into the spirit of things, Members. Have all voted who wish? Harper, Wallace. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. There are 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2817, Mr. DeLuca. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2817, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second... this Bill was read a second time a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

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

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2817, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. DeLuca."

DeLuca: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. Senate Bill 2817. If a unit of local government performs non-emergency construction, alteration, repair, improvement or maintenance work on the public way, the sanitary district may enter an intergovernmental agreement with the unit of local government allowing similar construction work to be performed by the sanitary district on the same project in an amount no greater than 100 thousand to save taxpayer funds and eliminate duplication of government effort. There is no opposition to the Bill and ask for your 'yes' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. There are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this

141st Legislative Day

- Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2844, Mr. Pritchard. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2844, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2844, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Pritchard."
- Pritchard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, this Bill creates a supporting teachers program where school districts can work with graduated high school seniors to develop a program that encourages them to go on to college and become teachers and gain some income while they're working for the school district so they can go to college. I'd be happy to answer any questions."
- 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Carroll, Connor, Crespo. Please take the record. There are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Ammons is recognized. The Lady does not wish to speak. Senate Bill 2864, Mr. Fortner. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2864, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2864, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Fortner."

Fortner: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 2864 is the renewal for the Structural Pest Control Act. It extends it for another 10 years and makes some minor changes to allow the department to properly make sure qualifications are correct. Happy to answer any questions."

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? Take the record. There are 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2892, Mr. Mitchell. Mr. Mitchell. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2892, a Bill for an Act concerning education. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2892, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mitchell."

Mitchell, C.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was just trying to follow your rule about not running. So, Senate Bill 2892 is a Bill phasing in a minimum teacher salary of \$40 thousand. There was some concern based on the Bill that passed out of this chamber that the ramp was happening too quickly. So, the IEA, in negotiation with others, decided to make it a four-year

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

phase in. For perspective, there was a 40 percent decline in the number of people applying to Bachelor's teaching programs. When we began the 2017-2018 school year, we were short in Illinois by 2 thousand teachers. Now my belief, and I think the belief of many on this side, is that one of two things can happen. We can either ask teachers to cure all the ills of society, to be parents, to be counselors, to be sort of the brother and sister that student never had or we can pay them poverty wages, but we cannot and we must not do both. So, I think this is a reason measure, especially given then money we're putting into the new funding formula to deal with our teacher shortage. And I believe it deserves an 'aye' vote. I look forward to your questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen."

Breen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, again, this is another Groundhog Day Bill. We've already seen the minimum pay for teachers Bill which would decimate certain downstate districts. I'm going to ask for Standard Debate, Mr. Speaker, if it was not already on there?"

Speaker Lang: "You can have Standard Debate, Sir."

Breen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So Ladies and Gentlemen, there...
there's no reason for this particular measure. It's the same
as before. This is not the way to fix our education issues,
having Representatives from Chicago tell people from south of
I-80 how to run their school districts. And so, there's no
good reason to do this from our state level. We're not going
to be paying the excess property taxes of the people in those
districts. We're not going to be helping them to really solve
the issues that are facing those districts. We've got a school

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

funding formula; we have a school funding mechanism right now. We need to let that work. And so, again, I would respectfully request a 'no' vote on this just as we did before a few weeks ago."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Pritchard."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Pritchard: "Representative, I share my appreciation for your trying to... to extend the time period that this Bill would take effect and you're doing it in actually five-year increments. And hopefully, that will help some school districts. But I'm concerned that we're forcing districts that have really a long distance to go to reach adequacy to have to increase their costs of operation. And I'm wondering if we are putting more money into the formula, wouldn't school districts be able on their own, if they're able, to raise salaries beyond what you're talking about?"

Mitchell, C.: "So, let me say a couple things to this. First of all, to the last Gentleman I would just say that while I appreciate the Gentleman from DuPage telling me what someone from Cook could or could not do, the bottom line is that this is actually something that's going to help downstate school districts that are losing teachers to places like St. Louis where they have a higher minimum salary. To your question, Representative Pritchard, I believe that ultimately this is a question of priorities. I think that while the funding formula is absolutely going to be helped... going to help to be one large funding source for this, it's sending the message that we want to pay our teachers more is going to be great

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

for teacher retention. And to the question of... of what's going to happen to school districts, we're only talking about 7 thousand or so teaching positions at the moment. So, I think that the cost, while significant, is something that if we prioritize and put more money through the formula can be covered. But I think us setting the minimum, a minimum that has not been updated since 1980, since before Michael Jackson released Thriller is pretty important to set as a baseline."

Pritchard: "But my point, and I agree with yours, that it's an issue of priority, but for a school district that doesn't have the EAV they're not able to make these payments. So, how do we help them in the short term?"

Mitchell, C.: "So, I think we should figure that out. Like I said,
I think that setting this in stone means that we are setting,
as a General Assembly, a priority that says we are going to
find a way to pay teachers what they need. Now, if that means
putting more money into..."

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

Mitchell, C.: "...if that means putting more money into the evidence based model, for example, to cover these costs, I think that's something that we should do."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Pritchard, do you have remarks you wish to finish?"

Pritchard: "No, that's fine."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

Ives: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. This Bill is redundant and unnecessary. These teachers are covered by a collective bargaining agreement that sets its salary schedule to begin with. So, that's negotiated

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

locally which is where it should stay. Maybe it's not 40 thousand, maybe it's 41 thousand, maybe it's 52 thousand, maybe it's 25 thousand, whatever it is it is, but it's collectively bargained at the local level already. The idea that you even had ever a state mandated minimum wage for teachers is ridiculous. Not to mention these school districts when they look at the entire... when they look at the teacher's salary, they don't look just at the salary, they look at the entire compensation packet. And if there's 2 thousand vacancies for teachers, then I assure you it is not based on salary, it's based on other metrics including that teachers are stifled in their classrooms by administrators who tell them exactly what to do and how to do their job in... for every single minute. That's why you have a problem with your teacher shortages. They get in there for the love of learning and the love to dispel, to give that type of love of learning to children and instead they're treated not as professionals but as simply somebody who's watching over the children. So, my point here is that this is all collectively bargained anyway. This Bill is redundant and unnecessary."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wheeler."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Wheeler, K.: "Thank you. Representative, I'm looking through the...
the process by which you... you elevate this minimum. And I'm
wondering to myself how fast can a school district, who is
not already achieving these minimums, going to be able to
catch up and... and what's the affect they're going to have on
their... their PTELL limitations?"

141st Legislative Day

- Mitchell, C.: "So, I... I can't speak to the PTELL impact. I would say that the reason why the negotiated version of this phases it in at 2500 a year was the idea was you would be creating predictability and you would let schools know what additional costs would be to reach the minimum; therefore, we set it into statute. So, I think that saying that we are going to set a minimum salary for teachers to be able to retain more of them, to make sure that we don't have, as we do now, Representative, teachers south of I-80 with master degrees living in poverty that we wanted to set this in stone. And we think that by putting more money through the formula, by making this a priority as a General Assembly, we can help school districts reach this minimum."
- Wheeler, K.: "Well, I appreciate that. I'm just going to present back to you, my friend, the... the property tax side of this thing is a really delicate issue where I'm at."
- Mitchell, C.: "Could you speak up a little bit, Representative.

 I'm sorry."
- Wheeler, K.: "Sure. I'm just letting you know that the property tax issue in my part of the state is a very sensitive issue. And anytime we send what is affectively an unfunded mandate to those districts it's... it's looked upon unfavorably because of the fact that we don't always send the money that goes with it. Now, in light of the fact that we are sending more money to our local school districts, maybe this could balance out. But the reality of it is, I believe that... that we are yet again putting another mandate in place, well-intentioned, however, unfunded. At the same time we are arbitrarily choosing what these dollars should be. And these are

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

collectively bargained positions. I... my friend, I just... I know where you're going with this. I just wish we could find another way to do these things that's more market-based and balanced out. With that, I'll yield the rest of my time."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Carroll."

- Carroll: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I stand in support of this Bill. I think it's time that we start appreciating the efforts of teachers in this state and... and rewarding them financially. When I hear the Representative talk about how some teachers with master's degrees are living near at the poverty level, that's disgraceful. These are the people that are educating our children. These are the people that are producing the future leaders of our... of our state and of our country. So, our teachers should be appreciated. I think \$40 thousand is a reasonable amount. I wish we could do it for a lot more, but I applaud... I applaud Representative Mitchell for bringing forth... bringing this Bill forward. And I think we should support it and show our teachers that we care. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative McDermed, we've already had three speak in opposition. Are you speaking in opposition? Then I'm sorry you cannot speak. Mr. Mitchell to close."
- Mitchell, C.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And thank you to everybody who spoke. I do believe that most people in here want to make sure teachers are paid a fair... a fair wage. But I reject the assertion that this number was arbitrary. This number was picked because we have teachers south of I-80 who are going to St. Louis because their minimum teaching salary is higher. Now, if you believe that someone who does everything right, everything we say someone should do. Go to school, get an

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

advanced degree, do something to give back to their community, should live in poverty then vote against this Bill. If on the other hand, you think that while we're asking teachers to be absolutely everything to all of our children, to make sure that they're their counselor, their teacher, their guide, the person who gives them hope, then we should probably not pay those people poverty wages. If we believe in science and engineering and technology and math and just having people who are good citizens we need to attract and retain good people to the teaching profession. And so, while you can say it's not all about money as the gently Lady from Wheaton did, you can't feed your family just on the fulfillment that you get from being a teacher. You have to pay your bills. So, if you believe that teachers, who are sacrificing everything to make our kids better, should be able to pay their bills you should vote 'aye' on this Bill. And I would request an 'aye' vote."

'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. Martwick. Sente. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 65 voting 'yes', 47 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2904, Representative Feigenholtz. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2904, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Feigenholtz."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Feigenholtz."

141st Legislative Day

- Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 2904 represents an agreement between the Physician Assistants Association, the Illinois State Medical Society and the Illinois Department of Professional Regulation. It does two things; it increases the ratio of the number of physician assistants that can practice medicine in collaboration with doctors from five to seven and eliminates the ratio requirement for PAs in counties that are designated as health professional shortage areas. Happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. I apologize. Let's go... 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. Representative, did you already explain the Bill? 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?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2904, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Now, we've satisfied the Constitution. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Moving to page 12 of the Calendar. Senate Bill 2999, Representative Conyears-Ervin. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2999, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Conyears-Ervin."

141st Legislative Day

- Speaker Lang: "Representative Conyears-Ervin on the Amendment."
- Conyears-Ervin: "The Floor... Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Floor Amendment of Senate Bill 2999 provides further protection for the employee and employer."
- 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. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2999, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Conyears-Ervin."
- Conyears-Ervin: "I... I explained the Bill under the Amendment and I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the... Mr. Breen is recognized."
- Breen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."
- Breen: "And Representative, I am showing on my analysis that the Chamber of Commerce is a proponent of your Bill? Is that accurate?"
- Conyears-Ervin: "Thank you, Representative. Yes, they are under the Amendment #2."
- Breen: "And then if... if you could just briefly explain to the Body what your now the full Bill together with all the Amendments does?"
- Conyears-Ervin: "With the adoption of the Amendment, this Bill provides that the employers in the state would provide reimbursement to the employees for necessary expenses or losses that an employee occurs within their scope of

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

employment which are directly related to the services to the employer."

Breen: "And then so, what would be examples of the losses that might be incurred within an employee's scope of employment?"

Conyears-Ervin: "So, any necessary expenses that is within the... so, for example, if the employer requires for the employee to purchase a cell phone that the employee would be reimbursed for that expense."

Breen: "So, this would... this would prohibit... so this would prohibit any unreimbursed expenses by an employer? Is that... is that correct? You would not... you'd have no unreimbursed employment-related expenses anymore?"

Conyears-Ervin: "What did... repeat that question, Representative."

Breen: "So, you know the Federal... Congress just wiped the exemption for unreimbursed expenses off the books. Does this now prohibit unreimbursed expenses from an employer?"

Conyears-Ervin: "From our understanding, no. The employer just cannot transfer operating expenses to the employee."

Breen: "All right. So again, but this is limited to those expenses that are required of the employee in the discharge of the employment duties?"

Conyears-Ervin: "Correct, Representative."

Breen: "Okay. Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wheeler."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Wheeler, K.: "Representative, we had some discussion about this in committee and I want to just ask a couple of clarifying questions so I understand what we're limiting to. So, is there

141st Legislative Day

- any clarification you can give me regarding what is... determines whether an expense is necessary or not? Is it the employee's determination or is it the employer's determination if a... if an expense is truly necessary?"
- Conyears-Ervin: "The discussion that we had in committee, Representative, was that if it did need to come down to someone to make that decision it would be the same as it is today with the Department of Labor."
- Wheeler, K.: "Okay. But I'm just trying to say, from the employer's perspective how you determine whether something is going to ultimately go to... you know, if you give the Department of Labor part of it, it's already gotten expensive is my point. So, the idea is just trying to help understand for the employer's perspective what they're going to be liable for if an employee makes a decision that may... that the employer may not have agreed with on what is actually a legitimate expense."
- Conyears-Ervin: "So, the expense has to be a primary benefit for the employer."
- Wheeler, K.: "Right. And I just see some gray areas. Coming from the IT world where... where you might choose an... a path to a solution that's maybe a third party option, a training option, there's ways you could... you could navigate in different ways. I'm just trying to understand what the liability to the employer is, that's all."
- Conyears-Ervin: "So, let me also say this, Representative. Nothing prevents the employer from having its own written policy as we discussed as well in committee."
- Wheeler, K.: "Yeah, exactly."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Conyears-Ervin: "Okay."

Wheeler, K.: "That's why I wanted to make sure we had that on the record."

Conyears-Ervin: "All right."

Wheeler, K.: "So, thank you very much. Appreciate it."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. There are 114 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 3052, Mr. Arroyo. Mr. Arroyo. Read the Bill, please. Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. Senate Bill 3062, Representative Mussman. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3062, a Bill for an Act concerning health. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3062, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Mussman."

Mussman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 3062 requires the Department of Public Health to develop and disseminate in any manner it sees fit information regarding the Bone Marrow Registry. This is in response to a constituent concern highlighting that too few people know enough about the importance of joining the registry. So, our pool of donors is way too small. Nine out of ten donors today actually come from Europe. Patients are dying because they

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

can't find a match or a high enough quality match, especially if they are African-American or of a mixed race. Just as with our strong Organ Donor Program, we want to increase awareness, encourage participation and save lives. It passed the Senate unanimously. And I want to thank all of the Representatives from both sides of the aisle that have signed on as cosponsors of this important legislation."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Guzzardi, Martwick, Slaughter. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. There are 117 voting 'yes', O voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 3081, Mr. Moylan. How about that. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3081, a Bill for an Act concerning housing. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3081, a Bill for an Act concerning housing. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Moylan."

Moylan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I learned a trick many, many years ago. Feed the masses before you call your Bill and everybody will be in a good mood. But..."

Speaker Lang: "Excellent try, Sir."

Moylan: "Senate Bill 3081 allows applicants to the Housing Authority's Public Housing list to request their position on the waitlist. And I respectfully ask for an 'aye' vote."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. And apparently pizza does work, Sir. Representative Hurley is recognized. You have a guest with you today?"

Hurley: "I... I have several guests."

Speaker Lang: "Well, who's the Gentleman to your right?"

Hurley: "This... this is Senator Bill Cunningham."

Speaker Lang: "Oh, we don't see him here much."

Hurley: "I know. But we're both here for a reason because we are both St. Barnabas grammar school alumni. And we have in both sides of the gallery right there and right there seventh grade class from St. Barnabas. So, if you guys would give them a warm welcome, we'd appreciate it."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome to Springfield. Thanks for joining us today. Who's left at school? Senate Bill 3085, Mr. Halbrook.

Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3085, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Halbrook."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Halbrook."

Halbrook: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Do we need to adopt that Amendment?"

Speaker Lang: "Just a brief explanation, Sir."

Halbrook: "Yeah. So, this just amends the Property Tax Code for properties that have been forfeited."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

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

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

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3085, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Halbrook."

Halbrook: "Yeah, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill just clearly... or simply does is the collector shall no longer publish delinquent or... or a notice for a delinquent or forfeited properties. Under Section 1035 of the Property Tax Code, properties are exempt under this Code. I ask for a positive vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Phillips."

Phillips: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Halbrook: "No."

Phillips: "Brad, what's the reason for this Bill?"

Halbrook: "Yeah. It had to do with a... a retention pond was being bought up and the neighboring landowners were being held hostage over it."

Phillips: "So, how's this going to resolve that problem? I mean, exactly. So, they... they bought this... the retention pond was bought by an outside source person?"

Halbrook: "Right."

Phillips: "And then all the people that had the housing around it... what... what happened to them?"

141st Legislative Day

- Halbrook: "Yeah. It was property held in common that shouldn't have been in this situation."
- Phillips: "I hear him. Brad, wants me to bring this to an end.

 Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Excellent. 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? Guzzardi. Please take the record. There are 112 voting 'yes', and 4 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 3131, Mr. Butler. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3131, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3131, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Butler."
- Butler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 3131 is a regulatory cleanup Bill on behalf of the Illinois Commerce Commission, repeals several out-of-date reporting requirements and obsolete provisions of the Public Utilities Act. And I would ask for an 'aye' vote, please."
- 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? Ammons, Burke, the other Burke, Mitchell, Zalewski. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 3141, Mr. Zalewski. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3141, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3141, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is an initiative of the Department of Revenue. It's sort of an omnibus Bill that they do every year to remain... regain compliance over a number of issues related to the sales tax, cigarette tax, tobacco products tax. I'd 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 see here that you are increasing some penalties including failure to maintain or keep records of any kind of the Cigarette Use Tax Act would be turned into a felony from a misdemeanor. Is that accurate?"

Zalewski: "As far as I know, that's accurate, Representative."

Breen: "Okay. And then, currently the fine is a thousand dollars, you're going to raise it to 5 thousand for the violation of Cigarette Tax Acts?"

Zalewski: "On the... on the cigarette tax?"

Breen: "Cigarette Use Tax Act..."

Zalewski: "I'm trying to..."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Breen: "...failure to maintain or keep records would be \$5 thousand fines... up to 5 thousand."

Zalewski: "That sounds accurate, Representative."

Breen: "Okay. And then you're going to increase the penalty for possessing 10 to 100 contraband cigarette packs to \$15 from \$10?"

Zalewski: "Correct."

Breen: "And then provide that cigarettes may only be sold in packages of 20 or 25? You're going to prohibit the sale of loose cigarettes or individual cigarettes, imposing a \$1 thousand penalty for the first offense and a \$3 thousand penalty for a subsequent violation?"

Zalewski: "Correct."

Breen: "So, those are new... boy. This seems like a pretty strict Bill, Representative. How did you possibly get it to the floor?"

Zalewski: "Well, this relates to an initiative of the Illinois Department of Revenue. We're trying to be accommodating to the agencies here. And since we... they asked for it. We... you know, my understand... my recollection in committee was that the department hadn't seen increases in these penalties in a while. So, they wanted to become updated with their statute... compliance statutes. So, as a result we recommended for the Bill to be moved to the full floor."

Breen: "Fair enough. And the… the audit findings included all of the new penalties and illegalities for loose cigarettes and things like that?"

Zalewski: "Correct."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Breen: "Interesting. Okay. And TFIs opposition was removed with your Amendment, correct?"

Zalewski: "Correct."

Breen: "Okay. Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Wallace."

Wallace: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to go straight to the Bill. As a matter of consistency, and a rare matter of agreement with the Floor Leader on the other side of the aisle, this is a penalty enhancement. This is inconsistent with the research that I've just talked about on a previous Bill offered by my seatmate or row mate here. And it just harkens back to things that have happened at the national level. And dare I say the name of Eric Garner here in our chamber. So, just to be consistent, this is a penalty enhancement. We know that those do not deter certain behaviors and specific behaviors. And we also know that there is a disparate application and impact on such pieces legislation on certain communities. So, I just want to be consistent in my stance on that. I'm not sure what to encourage other Members to do, but just please know that this is not an innocuous revenue Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski to close."

Zalewski: "I appreciate the previous speaker's comments. The desire here... I... I know oftentimes there's things we do that have unintended consequences. But just for the record, and for the previous speaker's own edification, this is designed to go after retailers who break compliance laws. I know there are unintended consequences as the previous speaker elaborated on. But I just want the record to know that the

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

impetus for the Bill is not related to individuals who sell these cigarettes; it's related to retailers who sell these cigarettes. I'd 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. Kifowit, Sente, Slaughter, Turner. Please take the record. There are 75 voting 'yes', 30... excuse me, 78 voting 'yes', 35 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 3179, Representative Mussman. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3179, a Bill for an Act concerning health. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3179, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Mussman."

Mussman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 3179 is an initiative of the Illinois Association of Rehabilitation Facilities Workgroup and comes out of the task force created in the wake of a *Tribune* series last year regarding issues in group homes for those with disabilities. It simply adds to the training of the Inspector General Investigators to now include House CILA settings and developmental training programs provided by community-based agencies differ from those in the state-operated developmental centers, so that during an investigation they

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

can even more uniformly apply regulations and policies and create accurate final reports to best protect and benefit our residents and the agencies that serve them. I'm happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Conyears-Ervin, Mah, Mitchell, Slaughter, Zalewski. Please take the record. There are 113 voting 'yes', 4 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 3249, Representative Moeller. Representative Moeller. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3256, Mr. Carroll. Mr. Carroll. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3256, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Carroll."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Carroll."

Carroll: "Yeah. Thank you very much. Sorry about running up again.

I just keep doing that all the time. This... this Amendment basically calls for the 72-hour waiting period that was in some earlier legislation. I've incorporated language from the Governor who had some additional things to add to it. So, it's a combination of those two things."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Skillicorn. Do you want to wait 'til Third Reading, Sir, or do you want to debate the Amendment? Thank you. Those in favor... Representative Ammons, can we wait 'til Third Reading? Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments have been approved for consideration. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Mr. Carroll, you already described the Bill?"

Carroll: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Lang: "So, we'll..."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate..."

Speaker Lang: "...we'll go back to Mr. Skillicorn."

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

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill. Sorry, Sir."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3256, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Mr. Skillicorn."

Skillicorn: "Third time is the charm. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Skillicorn: "Thank you for bringing this Bill. And just a quick couple of questions. So, it's a 72-hour wait period for the purchase of guns. Does that include concealed carry holders and FOID Card holders who already have 360 background checks a year and that are in addition to the Instant Background Check, the NICS check?"

Carroll: "Yes. As of now, they have... they are... the waiting period is applicable to them too."

Skillicorn: "So, it's applicable to all the residents in Illinois that already have FOID Cards that have 360 background checks a year, which is a background check that is more intensive than the Federal NICS Instant Check, correct?"

Carroll: "Yes, that's correct."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

- Skillicorn: "And the same thing with concealed carry holders, which would have a enhanced background 360 times a year. Is there any, you know, logic that people that have had repeated every single night a background check that they just have to wait another three days? I mean, literally I had a background check three days ago. I had a background check two days ago. I had a background check last night. Yet, I still have to wait another 72 hours and another 3 background checks?"
- Carroll: "Well, Representative, I... I would like to say that, you know, the... the thought behind this waiting period is not so much of... of making sure that when people get their guns they have a cooling off period in case they want to use them to harm other people or themselves. So, even though all those background checks are happening, we still want to have that cooling period in place. I think waiting an extra couple of days for a gun is not the end of the world. I don't know why somebody would need right away. So, adding a couple of days offers that cooling off period so people then can make better decisions."
- Skillicorn: "Sure. Can I move this to Extended Debate? Speaker, can I move this to Extended Debate?"

Speaker Lang: "Of course, Sir."

Skillicorn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, I'm going to address the Bill. And, you know, here is the scenario. Is... it isn't always about waiting to do harm, it could be waiting to go compete in a competition. If someone invites me to go shoot, you know, today's Wednesday, if someone wants to invite me to shoot on Friday, we'll be off right, we'll be out of Session. I would... if I would need to purchase a weapon, I can't do that. I... I

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

would have to decline that invitation because I'd have to wait the 72 hours. Even though I've had repeated extensive background checks because I'm a FOID Card holder and I'm also a concealed carry card holder. And I... I think that's a significant thing. There's also ... statistics will show that in Illinois FOID Card holders, most of them already own a weapon. So, it's not like they're going to buy something to do harm. They already own a weapon. And this is just a... a repeated irritation and aggravation of legal gun owners. And to give people an idea, Illinois has a FOID Card. We have one of the most stringent systems in the country. This background check is done every single night, 360 nights a year for every single... of the couple million FOID Card holders. They live in every single one of our districts. These are real people. These are not people with bad intentions. These are legal qun owners. And this is just further aggravation and infringement on their rights. So, I would urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ammons."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ammons: "Thank you. I just want to clarify just a couple of things in the Bill. First, does the House Floor Amendment... is this a gut and replace on the portion that deals with Bail Reform Act of 2017?"

Carroll: "Yeah. This is only about waiting periods. It removed the part out about the bail reform."

Ammons: "So, it is a gut and replace?"

Carroll: "Yes."

Ammons: "So, this is just dealing with the wait period portion?"

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Carroll: "Yes."

Ammons: "Thank you very much for clarifying that. Second... boy, you're all fast. Second question that I was going to ask on this particular Bill is if a person has a FOID Card... which this Amendment does not speak to FOID Card only holders. So, if I have a FOID Card, does it also provide an exemption for me if I had a FOID Card already?"

Carroll: "There's no exemptions."

Ammons: "I cannot ... I'm sorry. I cannot hear, Mr. Speaker."

Carroll: "Yeah. Can we have quiet here? Thank you. Yeah. You have to have a FOID Card to buy a weapon. So, there's..."

Ammons: "Right. But does it... does it give the exemption of a 72-hour waiting period?"

Carroll: "Does not exempt you, no."

Ammons: "Thank you so much."

Carroll: "You're welcome."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Barbara Wheeler."

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

Speaker Lang: "Absolutely."

Wheeler, B.: "Thank you. I... I was just asking the question to staff, but you're the Sponsor of the Bill so I'm going to ask you. What... this is exact language than the Amendatory language that the Governor proposed?"

Carroll: "Yes. We... it is... well, it is but we closed the gun show loophole that the Governor had in that. So, it's... it's basically the language of my original Bill, which was for assault rifles, adding it to all guns. And then we add... then we took out the gun... little loophole that the Governor put in. So, it's a combination of the two."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

- Wheeler, B.: "Okay. And then, right now the 72-hour waiting period current law is for what kind of guns?"
- Carroll: "I'm sorry. Can we... can you bang the gavel, Sir? I can't hear her. Can you repeat the question? I'm sorry."
- Wheeler, B.: "Sure. The current law for 72-hour waiting period is for handguns. Is that correct?"
- Carroll: "Yeah. The 72 hours is just for handguns. Every other gun in Illinois is under a 24-hour waiting period."
- Wheeler, B.: "Okay. Why do we need a 72-hour waiting period?"
- Carroll: "Well, it's a cooling off period. And... and studies have shown that when you would... when you would wait an extra couple of days for a gun, you... the... the chances of... of you doing bad acts will go down. So, it gives the opportunity for someone to cool off. And I will tell you as somebody who actually worked in a store that sold guns it's a very frightening experience when someone wants to come in a buy a gun right away. So, I think if we have that waiting period in place it offers us the opportunity for people to cool off. And I think asking someone to wait 2... wait, you know, 3 days for a gun as opposed to waiting... getting a gun right away is certainly... or within 24 hours is certainly very reasonable."

Wheeler, B.: "Okay. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Willis."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Willis: "So, you take in the language from the Governor and in addition closed the loophole, correct?"

Carroll: "Yes, that's correct."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

- Willis: "Thank you. So, also along with that let me just ask a question. And I'm hearing some people that are concerned about the 72-hour wait period. Have you ever gotten a custom made suit, Sir?"
- Carroll: "I am not like Representative Moylan, no, I have not had a custom made suit."
- Willis: "Okay. But a... all right, even not a custom made suit.

 Let's say, have you ever gotten a suit that you've had to have alterations done on?"

Carroll: "Right."

Willis: "Okay. And how long does that usually take?"

Carroll: "Takes probably a week."

- Willis: "About a week. And are you all bent out of shape because of that having to wait a week for a good suit."
- Carroll: "Well, the impulsive side of me is angry about it but the reasonable side of me realizes if you want something done right you're going to wait time for it."
- Willis: "So, waiting 72 hours for a gun, and this actually takes care of all guns now, is not unheard of? If you really want a gun, you can wait 72 hours to get the correct gun that you would want to be able to have in your collection or use for whatever purposes, whether it was a sporting event, going out hunting, whatever it may be. Is that correct?"
- Carroll: "Yes. I... I think that's a very fair thing. Again, if you... you... if you could... if you could wait for things, I think that you should have to do that. And it... it's not unreasonable to say, instead of getting something within 24 hours we get something within 3 days. So..."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Willis: "Right. In fact, oftentimes when you go to purchase a car they may not have the car you want on the lot either, correct?

It may have to come from someplace else."

Carroll: "That is correct."

Willis: "The last car I bought it took me a week and a half to get it. And it wasn't anything special, it was an American-made car, but it had to come from someplace else."

Carroll: "That is correct."

Willis: "Thank you. To the Bill. This is commonsense legislation. It is so much commonsense that the Governor himself put it in his Amendatory Veto. So, he feels this is a good piece of legislation. Therefore, if we have already put this in place, I would ask my colleagues on the other side of the line... other side of the aisle to join us with this. This is commonsense legislation. It does more than just have you make sure that your background checks are in there. It makes sure that we don't make rash decisions to get your guns. It is making sure that you're getting the correct thing. And I think most importantly it closes that out-of-state loophole for people that are going through gun shows. If you know it... if you go to a gun show, you usually are looking for something, make sure that we have everybody on an even playing field and that's the way we go. I urge an 'aye' vote on this. Thank you very much for bringing it forward, Representative Carroll."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bryant."

Bryant: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Bryant: "Representative, yesterday in committee we talked about concerns over the Grand American at the Sparta Shooting

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Complex and how this might affect that. During that... during that time... can you not hear me? I'll try to speak louder. How's that? Yesterday in committee we discussed my concerns about the shooting... the Sparta Shooting Complex and the Grand American Trapshooting Competition that goes on there. You indicated that your Bill kind of carves that out. I wanted to be sure that the Body knows that I've reached out to some folks who don't think that the language of this is adequate. There are still some... a lot of questions about that. For that reason, I'll be voting 'no' on this Bill. Still have concerns about how it would affect a very large economic driver in our region. And also the... just the Grand American in general for those who are sport shooting enthusiasts. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Guzzardi."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Guzzardi: "Representative Carroll, we discussed this Amendatory

Veto in a subject matter hearing in the Judiciary Committee.

Do you recall that hearing?"

Carroll: "Yes."

Guzzardi: "And you remember there was a representative from the Governor's Office discussing this particular set of provisions there, Mr. Risley, you recall that?"

Carroll: "Yes."

Guzzardi: "And... and Mr. Risley, I'm going to read from a transcript of the... of the hearing. Mr. Risley said that the Governor wants to extend the 72-hour waiting period to all firearms and if a stand-alone Bill reaches his desk, he said, I would fully expect he would sign his own Bill. And I asked

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

him, do you mean a stand-alone Bill on the waiting period? He said, Right, exactly. I said, That's a Bill that the Governor's Office would commit to signing? He said, I would fully expect so. Is that how you remember the committee hearing going?"

Carroll: "Yes. I remember a certain person who was speaking up, being very eloquent in his questions about this. So, yes."

Guzzardi: "That's very kind of you, Representative. To the Bill. I'm very pleased that this measure is before us. I commend the Sponsor for his persistence in continuing to follow up on this important life-saving measure. As we heard in... in committee, 72 hours, no, it's not a long time but most of the gun deaths in this country come from suicide. And we believe that a 72-hour waiting period and empirical evidence shows that a 72-hour waiting period allows people who have impulsive feelings to cool off. This is a measure that's going to save lives. And I commend the Governor and his team for supporting this stand-alone measure on a waiting period. I believe this is a Bill that should have broad bipartisan support. And I encourage an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wheeler."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Wheeler, K.: "Representative, I'm looking through our analysis here and I'm trying to make sure I clearly understand the difference between what you have proposed today and what the Governor had proposed in the Amendatory Veto about this particular issue. What are the specific differences, please?"

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

- Carroll: "Thank you very much for that question. And my original Bill was for assault rifles and had... it did not have a gun show loophole. The Governor's language had all guns but the gun show loophole in place. So, what I've done is I've taken all guns and taken out the Governor's gun show loophole and combined it into one."
- Wheeler, K.: "So, when we characterize this as the Governor's language we are partially accurate and partially inaccurate?"
- Carroll: "Yes. I mean, I think what the government... Governor put forward had some real merits to it. So, I wanted to combine both Bills to have a perfect Bill. So, he gave me feedback on the original Bill, rewriting that Amendatory Veto with that language in there. I remember seeing you at the press conference, so you obviously heard it firsthand. So, I wanted to make... combine these two together so we have the good... good language that both sides can agree upon."
- Wheeler, K.: "I understand that, that that is a theory. However, a clean Bill with that was what was discussed, I believe, in the committee somewhere that I was not a part of. However, this is what we're bringing today and that's not what was discussed in committee specifically."
- Carroll: "Well, you know, I mean... I'm sorry. Can you... I'm having trouble. I mean this is..."
- Wheeler, K.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The... the point I'm asking is... or I guess trying to clarify, Representative, is that what was discussed in committee was a clean version of what the... the Governor's AV had..."

Carroll: "Right."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

- Wheeler, K.: "...regarding the 72-hour waiting period, right? And this is not exactly that. It's your version plus one more measure?"
- Carroll: "No, it's the same Bill. It's just taking the two of them and combining them together. So, it's still a 72-hour waiting period, which is... the Representative from Chicago had mentioned during our hearing, the Governor agreed to sign. And this is taking his language and my language and combining them in... into one Bill."
- Wheeler, K.: "Right. I... I know that's what you're doing. My point to you is that it's not exactly what is a clean Bill based on what the AV language was. That... there was no loophole change, which has some inadequacies according to my... my friend from southern Illinois just pointed out. So, I... I wish sometime we'd just stick to what we're talking about and run the thing clean."
- Carroll: "Well, I did run the thing clean. And it passed this House very easily and the Senate very easily and the Governor decided that he didn't like the language and changed it."
- Wheeler, K.: "No, I'm talking about what was in the AV. That was what I thought we were bringing back today, but it's not. And that's my point to you, my friend. So with that, we... we don't have a clean Bill here. To the Bill, so I can be clear. This is not where we should be landing with respect to how we're treating the Governor's AV language. There are still issues that need to be addressed here. I'm not ready to vote 'yes'. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative McCombie."

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

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

McCombie: "Sir, have you ever purchased a... a gun at a gun show?"

Carroll: "No."

McCombie: "Are you aware of any of your Members purchasing a gun

at a gun show?"

Carroll: "I believe I have one over here that is saying yes, so

that would be ... there's at least one, yes. Two."

McCombie: "Can I assume that that purchase was..."

Carroll: "Two."

McCombie: "...can I assume those purchases weren't legal?"

Carroll: "I am not those people. I can't speak to what they did."

McCombie: "Can I assume by a show of hands they were legal gun purchases? My question is, is I... I don't believe that... that when you go to a gun show that your... this loophole is going to do anything because there is no loophole. So, I... I think it's irrelevant. And I just want to say that i... if... if gun shows are... if the people are purchasing guns illegally at gun shows, they should be being reported by those that are attending. So, I... I just think that this Bill is, again, just another attempt to go against the Second Amendment. And I think the bottom line is if you want to end gun shows in Illinois propose a Bill that says we're going to end gun shows in Illinois. Be honest about it and end this. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Carroll to close."

Carroll: "Thank you very much, Speaker and Members of the House.

I am really excited about this legislation. I think it will
offer us an opportunity for an important cooling down period.

And also make our laws applicable to people that come in from

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

- out of state to buy guns. So, I'd ask you for a 'yea' vote. And we'll go from there. 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? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. There are 72 voting 'yes', 44 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Ives is recognized."
- Ives: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise for a point of personal
 privilege."
- Speaker Lang: "You may proceed."
- Ives: "I'd like to announce that we have with us here today on the House Floor former House Representative and former State Senator, Tom Johnson. Tom is one of my constituents now and he's got a lot of good advice throughout the years. And he serves... currently serves on the Prisoner Review Board. So, I welcome him to the House Floor today."
- Speaker Lang: "Welcome, Tom. Good to have you here. Senate Bill 3304, Mr. Swanson. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3304, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3304, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Swanson."
- Swanson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What this Senate Bill 3304 does, it makes administrative changes to the Illinois Fire Protection Training Act. It's an initiative of the State Fire

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Marshal. This Bill received unanimous support in the Senate and the committees. There are no opponents. I would for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Flowers, Wallace, Williams. Please take the record. There are 116 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no', 1 voting... let's start over. 116 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 3387, Mr. Rita. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3387, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. Amendment #2 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3387, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Rita."

Rita: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 3387 is a... language is silent for simulcast funds for Fairmount Park. This fixes an audit issue that... everybody got quiet here, they think this is the big Bill... this... the language is silent dealing with simulcast funds for Fairmount Park. This fixes... it adds the language so they can receive the money for the simulcast funds for Fairmount Park Racetrack. It's an important issue for them."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Breen: "And Representative, so... just so that we're clear then on all the Amendments and the like, the Harness Horseman Association is no longer opposed. Is that accurate?"

Rita: "No, I'm not aware of any opposition to this."

Breen: "Okay. They had been apparently opposed to Committee Amendment 1. And so that..."

Rita: "Yeah. The... the Committee Amendment #2 replaced it and put this language for... changes the whole Bill for the issue of Fairmount Park."

Breen: "And the various... I see you're... are you adding business enterprise programs? Is that... is that I see here?"

Rita: "No."

Breen: "No? And then on video gaming, license fees we're going from... expanding the fee, the \$100 video gaming..."

Rita: "Amendment... Amendment #2..."

Breen: "...post licensing."

Rita: "...was a gut and replace and replaced the underlying Bill."

Breen: "Right. But I... are those... is that part of the gut and replace or is it not?"

Rita: "No."

Breen: "So, it is... the sole thing that you've got is the Fairmont...

Fairmount Park Racetrack purse distribution formula?"

Rita: "Yes."

Breen: "That's it? There's no video gaming? There's nothing else?"

Rita: "No."

Breen: "Okay. Fair enough. Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Yes. Just... just real briefly to the previous speaker.

All this does, it... it fixes an issue that came about with

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Fairmount Park gets its money for simulcast racing. The... the law said that it would only get it when there was live racing. There now are some times when Hawthorne or Fairmount or Arlington isn't racing. This just clears up that ambiguity. It doesn't expand gaming. All it does is make sure that they get their money."

'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 115 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 3452, Mr. Rita. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3452, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Rita."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Rita."

Rita: "I'd like to adopt Floor Amendment #2 and then discuss it on Third Reading, if that's all right."

Speaker Lang: "Just a brief explanation, Sir."

Rita: "The... it adds two years to the sunset for the ADW."

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. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3452, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Speaker Lang: "Did you just explain the Bill, Mr. Rita?"

Rita: "It's... yep. It's... it extends the sunset for the ADW, which expires this year, it's for two years."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Breen: "Representative, I... I want to... well, I know it's a little bit out of order, but I'd... on the prior Bill I am looking at Page 74 of your prior Bill and there was a hundred dollar additional fee, there's video gaming, other things in it. I... I'm very much confused as to... as to what we're doing with these Bills."

Speaker Lang: "Mr... Mr. Breen, that Bill's already passed. So, you can have a private..."

Breen: "Okay. I'm... I'm going to file..."

Speaker Lang: "...conversation."

Breen: "...I'm going to file a Motion to reconsider on the prior Bill because we didn't get an accurate statement on the floor about it then."

Rita: "It was..."

Breen: "So... I..."

Rita: "...we can talk about that prior Bill. I..."

Breen: "Well..."

Rita: "This one here basically extends the sunset with the it being..."

Breen: "I have nothing on this Bill. I just..."

Speaker Lang: "Let's... let's deal with this Bill, Mr. Breen.

Do you have any comments on this Bill?"

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

- Breen: "Okay. I'm sorry. just... I've just was... okay. Fair enough.

 I've got nothing on this Bill. I'm just going to file a Motion
 to reconsider on the prior Bill."
- 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Harris. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 89 voting 'yes', 24 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 3488, Mr. Welch. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3488, a Bill for an Act concerning government. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3488, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Welch."
- Welch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 3488 creates the No Registry Program Act. What this Bill would do is it would prohibit state and local government agencies from using state moneys to participate or provide support in any manner for creating, publishing or maintaining a registry program of persons based on their race, color, gender identity, age, religion, disability, national origin, or another protected group. There's no opposition to this Bill. We've worked with law enforcement extensively on this in the Senate and in the House. Law enforcement is completely neutral. I would ask for an 'aye' vote in favor of a Bill

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

that would say immigrants are welcome in the State of Illinois and no one is going to be harassed or intimidated. 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, record yourselves. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 93 voting 'yes', 18 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 3536, Representative Hernandez. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3536, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Amendment #2 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3536, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Hernandez."

Hernandez: "Thank you, Speaker. Senate Bill 1820... I'm sorry... 3536 aims to address early childhood staffing... wait. Yes, I'm sorry. Addresses early childhood staffing challenges particularly in community-based preschool for all classrooms. It would allow level five teachers working towards their Professional Educator... Educator License a chance to secure the license through the Alternative Licensure Program while staying in their current job. This Bill derives from the Early Learning Council work group meetings who produced the language. The Bill is supported by the early childhood advocacy community. And I urge an 'aye' vote."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

- 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? Ammons. Please take the record. There are 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 34, Representative Hernandez. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 34, a Bill for an Act concerning government. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 has been adopted. No further Amendments. A state mandates note has been requested and has not been filed."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Hernandez on a Motion."

Hernandez: "I move to rule the notes inapplicable."

Speaker Lang: "Lady moves the notes be held inapplicable. Mr. Breen on the Motion."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

- Breen: "And Representative, as I understand it your Bill is creating a duty on behalf of local municipalities and other units of government that have police agencies. So, how is that not a state mandate?"
- Hernandez: "So, Representative, I am aware that the State Police has concerns on the Bill. However, if this Bill passes, it really would aim at local law enforcement departments to pick up sort of what should be done already. And I really don't foresee this impacting our... our State Police or sheriffs for that matter."
- Breen: "And... and just to be clear because... because what you're saying is the State Police have estimated just for them it's

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

a \$425 thousand cost. But this mandate primarily is going to fall on local units of government. So, if it's 425 on the State Police, then the costs to the local units of government throughout the state would be many multiples of that 'cause they're the ones that are actually enforcing the mandate."

Hernandez: "So..."

- Breen: "So, that's what the... I mean, the state mandates note is to get the cost to all of the units of local government of this new mandate on them."
- Hernandez: "So, Representative, all I know of is what the State Police indicated that it would cost them \$425 thousand for two attorneys which I really don't believe it will occur if local government will... will end up completing these certifications, which is something they already should do. So, I don't foresee that. And especially when it has been publically noted that there... the average of these certifications that have been requested from the depart... from the department has only been 10. So, if you have local police departments already, you know, begin to fill out these certifications, I just don't even foresee them receiving any."
- Breen: "Again, Mr. Speaker, we object and request a Roll Call vote on the note."
- Speaker Lang: "Your request is granted. Representative Wallace, do you rise on the Motion on the note? Lady does not wish to speak. Representative Wheeler, do you rise on the Motion on the note? Please proceed."
- Wheeler, B.: "I guess I'm confused as to why there would be additional dollars spent from ISP or any of the local law

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

enforcement because this is their duty to fill out this paperwork and their duty to the victims of sexual assault and domestic violence is already in law, correct?"

Hernandez: "That's correct."

Wheeler, B.: "So, it's already in law that they perform these duties to these victims. So, I'm... I... do you have any idea why Illinois State Police or any law... local law enforcement or sheriff's department would assume there would be additional costs to doing something they're already supposed to be doing?"

Hernandez: "I'm... I'm hearing that they're worried that there may be litigation. But again, Representative, I don't see that happening. If it's already something... a process that already should be done, this Bill... this Bill would simply just enforce that the law enforcement departments just complete what already is in process."

Wheeler, B.: "Right. Yeah. I agree with you that there would be no additional costs for them doing and fulfilling existing law. I agree with you, Representative."

Hernandez: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Motion to hold the note inapplicable will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Crespo. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. There are 62 voting 'yes', 51 voting 'no'. And the Lady's Motion carries. And the note is held inapplicable. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "No further Motions or note requests."

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

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 34, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Hernandez."

Hernandez: "Thank you, Speaker. The 'Me Too Movement' has created a platform for women to bravely step forward to tell our stories in an effort to defeat the culture of intimidation, harassment and abuse that is prevalent in our society. But as we harness this movement of activism, we have a responsibility to ensure that the voices of all women, including women of color and immigrant women, are not... are included. Nobody should be left out... behind to live in isolation, fear and hopelessness. That is why I'm here in... why here in Illinois I enthusiastically bring to the chamber the Voices Act that is Senate Bill 34. The Voices Act creates a uniform standard for law enforcement so that crime victims will get a consistent level of support from... support from their local agency, while eliminating some of the barriers faced by immigrant crime survivors and exasperate the underreporting crisis we are grappling with in... in Illinois and throughout the country. The Voices Act provides guidance for certifying officials to issue a certification within 90 business days after they get the certification request. Officials can refuse to issue a certification if they determine that the applicant is not, in fact, a crime victim. Certifications do not grant any immigration benefit. U.S. citizenship and immigration services must evaluate the U and T visa application and is solely responsible for deciding to issue a U or T visa. The Bill requires only... only that a certifying

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

agency complete the certification in a truthful manner within 90 days. Ladies and Gentlemen, I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Breen: "Representative, I... I just want to clarify what your House Amendment... your Floor Amendment 1 did to the Bill. Can you just let us know? Is... is that... am I reading it accurately that you removed DCFS and Department of Human Services and the Illinois Workers' Compensation Commission? Is that... was that the impact..."

Hernandez: "Yes."

Breen: "...of your Floor Amendment 1?"

Hernandez: "Yes. And the Chiefs of Police also requested. So, we wanted to clarify that the... that the law enforcement and those who are filling out the certifications if they have any concern can add the concerns to the certification. We did remove the DCFS, the other agency departments that you just said, for the purposes because they just... it's just they don't view themselves as law enforcement agencies. And, Representative, I will tell you they're already doing it. So, just to appease and really get this Bill passed I omitted them or the Amendment omits it."

Breen: "All right. And I notice on... and Mr. Speaker, just in case we need to move for Standard Debate."

Speaker Lang: "Standard Debate is approved, Sir."

Breen: "Thank you. On page 7 line 1, that's subpart (g) subpart (g) of Section 10, it states that a certifying official or agency receiving requests for completion of certification

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

forms shall not disclose the immigration status of a victim or person requesting the certification form except to comply with Federal Law or State Law, legal process, or if authorized, by the person or... by the victim or person receiving... requesting the certification form. So, am I correct that it's not necessarily the victim who is the one requesting the certification in some of these circumstances?"

Hernandez: "It... it would have to be the victim."

Breen: "But is says, other person requesting the certification?"
Hernandez: "Or it may be their attorney or you know."

Breen: "I guess I... I'm a little confused because if what this does is allows that person the ability to apply for a T or a U visa, why would we then prohibit the law enforcement agency from disclosing the immigration status of someone who is requesting certification form? It may not even be the victim or you may have someone who is not actually a proper victim under the statute. Why... why would we take the gratuitous step of then prohibiting the law enforcement agency or the official who may learn of someone having violated the law to come into the country, they can now not disclose that information to any other law enforcement agency or to the appropriate authorities?"

Hernandez: "Representative, let me just remind you, this... you know, often I've heard from many why don't the undocumented just... just go through the process? Well, this is a process..."

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

Hernandez: "This is a process. This is the process. It's not necessarily one way... in a way that we would like it to be because it... it calls for them to go through this office if

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

they're a victim of a crime or they're a victim of human trafficking. So, it is a process. This happens to be just what we have noted through a report that we did statewide that 50 percent of our law enforcement is not filling out this certification. I don't think necessarily it's purposely, sometimes it may be, but I think it's maybe because there's a lack of education on it."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wheeler gives his time to Mr. Breen."

Breen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And Representative, I wanted to just clarify, too, that... so if a law enforcement agency doesn't comply then they would be able... they would be subject to legal process under your Bill, wouldn't they?"

Hernandez: "They have... they have immunity... I'm sorry. So, if they act in good faith, they have immunity. I mean, this has been discussions that have occurred quite considerably. There is no penalty, they are given immunity. I mean, this has to be purposely done."

Breen: "Right. But the Sheriffs' Association is still opposed to the Bill, I'd imagine on that basis. You know, I'll go to the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is not... it's not a bad idea as a concept. The problem is the way that this is being put forward. It's being opposed by our sheriffs because it may create liability for them. We've still got concerns. We've got an estimate from State Police of \$425 thousand in expense to them. And then we are... have been prevented from being able to find out what the costs are to our local police departments of this particular measure in the way that it's been going. And there is this concern that somehow we are also, at least it's... according to my analysis, we are... that certain parts of

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

this Bill were in the Trust Act, which was greatly controversial on this floor and may prohibit law enforcement from even disclosing the immigration status. Even if they'd learned that there was a crime committed in coming into the country, they're prohibited from disclosing that to the relevant law enforcement officials. And we've got this concern of legal liability on behalf of our law enforcement, our sheriffs are opposed again. And so, for all of those reasons while the idea of ensuring that this process..."

Speaker Lang: "Representative McDermed. I'm sorry. Were you completed with your comments, Mr. Breen? Mr. Breen. Turn on Mr. Breen's light."

Breen: "No."

Speaker Lang: "Go ahead, Sir."

Breen: "Thank you. And just, again, with all of the various concerns that have been raised about this Bill, it is not quite where it needs to be. It is has not been an agreed Bill as we understand those terms. And there's no reason this shouldn't be an agreed Bill come to this floor. And so, at this point, I can't support it."

Speaker Lang: "Representative McDermed."

McDermed: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I rise in support of this Bill. I think that many of us here in the General Assembly talk about how we would like to eliminate human trafficking, sex trafficking. We've taken many efforts to do this before I got here and since I've been here. This is another step in order to bring an end to sex trafficking. If we make it possible for the victims to step forward and receive some assistance with these visas, which they need to

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

step away from the folks that have trafficked them, we will be doing a very great service. This is a really important issue in my district. We have a home for folks who have been rescued from the sex trafficking trade in my district. It's very near to my heart. I think this is an important step to aid victims. And please vote 'yes'."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Wallace."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Wallace: "So, there's been a little bit of discussion about some of this language being already part of the Trust Act. Can you share what the difference is? Because my understanding is this was kind of called out of the Trust Act..."

Hernandez: "That's correct."

Wallace: "...in its original form?"

Hernandez: "That's correct. So, in... this is what I'd call a bit unfortunate because in order for us to move on the Trust Act it was requested that we take this out and continue working on. I thought that we got in a good place with law enforcement. I think we are in a good place and it's... it's headed in that direction. So, it was through a request that it was removed from the Trust Act."

Wallace: "And then, the prohibition to report to ICE is about the victim, correct?"

Hernandez: "I'm sorry?"

Wallace: "The prohibition of reporting a crime or immigration status to ICE, that's specifically directed toward the victim and protecting the victim of the crime?"

Hernandez: "That... that's correct."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Wallace: "Thank you. To the Bill. I want to thank Representative Hernandez for her work on this. I know that it's been quite a bit of time that she's been working on this measure. I am deeply disappointed that our sheriffs still stand opposed, especially given the fact that we should be making sure that victims of crime feel supported enough and have the ability to come forward. The name of this Act is so important, the Voices Act. This Act is giving back the voices to the victims who are silenced, not only because of the types of abuse that they are suffering, being trafficked or being victims of domestic violence or other forms of violent oppression, they are silent because of their immigration status and they feel they cannot seek help. Please help restore the voices of those who are victims in our country and allow them to be protected..."

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

Wallace: "...and allow them to be protected from their abuser. This actually will help us in the long run of capturing those who are offending individuals in our country. So, thank you, Representative Hernandez. I encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Barbara Wheeler."

Wheeler, B.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in full support of... of this particular Bill. Thank you, Representative Hernandez, for bringing this. I want to give an example of how in McHenry County this worked out very well, something good out of a terrible and tragic situation. There was a woman who was coerced and wooed into coming to America from her 'boyfriend'; she lived in Mexico. He promised her everything; a home, a family and certainly a pathway to citizenship. What she found

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

out though that she had become part of the trafficking... sex trafficking, labor trafficking; she became a prisoner inside the home he so lovingly promised her. Once she was able to escape, our domestic violence home was able to help her get law enforcement on her side. And because we have such amazing sheriffs department and domestic violence advocates, she was able to participate... she was scared out of her mind, she didn't have paperwork and she was, of course, suspect of any help because she had been abused for so long... but they were able to... to get her to participate in investigating her perpetrator who remains in jail today. And she does ... she is on a pathway to citizenship that did start with help from the domestic violence programs as well as with her U and T visa. So... I think it was a T visa. So, thank you so much for bringing this because what we need is law enforcement to understand the importance of them doing their job, filling out the certificate and helping these victims of human trafficking and of sexual assault. So, thank you. I stand in full support."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Hernandez to close."

Hernandez: "So, just a little information. According to the Illinois Coalition Against Domestic Violence and the U.S. Department of Justice, 85 percent of all domestic violence is perpetrated against women and 90 percent of rape victims are women. A Center for Disease Control and Prevention survey found that one in three women have been victims of physical violence at the hands of an intimate partner within their lifetime. However, these crimes go largely unreported. In fact, some... three out of four physical assaults and four out

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

of five rapes never get reported to police. For immigrant women the problem of underreporting is even worse due to language barriers and other anxieties compounded on top of an already horrifying situation. As State Legislators we have a responsibility and now an opportunity to do everything we can to eliminate barriers that facilitate the continued underreporting of sexual assault, harassment, domestic violence, and other crimes against women through the Voices Act. The Voices Act, without exception, will benefit all our communities. I ask for your 'aye' vote."

'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 76 voting 'yes', 38 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 200, Mr. Hoffman. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 200, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 200, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 200 is aimed at emergency medical technicians and paramedics who frequently are on call for the entirety of their shift. It makes it difficult for employers

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

to schedule breaks. However, they frequently have down time so that they can eat their... their lunch at that time. So, this would give them an exemption if they're a private entity and current law requires employers to allow employees who work at least 7 hours a one half hour continued... continuous hours a 20-minute meal break. This would exempt them from this because they have time to take their meal breaks."

- 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Guzzardi, Stratton. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes', O voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1979, Mr. Rita. Mr. Rita, Bob Rita. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2421, Representative Cassidy. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2421, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Cassidy."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Cassidy."
- Cassidy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to adopt the Amendment, which combines several other Members' needs, hopefully for the very last time, to add exemptions to the Act and then debate the Bill on Third."
- 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. Please read the Bill."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2421, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Cassidy."

Cassidy: "Thank you. It seems fitting my very first Bill in this chamber was... was a liquor license exemption and now it... it appears that hopefully I am going to be passing the last set of these, given that we passed Representative Feigenholtz's elimination Bill. This... this Bill combines some small businesses in my district as well a handful of others. In every case the surrounding areas have submitted the proper permissions 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, I... I recognize some of these names.

Did we... what happened here? We... we passed these over to the

Senate; they took them out and sent us something back? And

we're changing them out again or something? What happened?"

Cassidy: "No. In... other than the one that's mine, the bulk of them there was one erroneously included in a... a Bill carried by Representative Harris. And so, we just let that one die and put those in here... the ones that are supposed to be done in here."

Breen: "Right."

Cassidy: "There was one in that Bill that actually didn't have permission."

Breen: "It was the grocery store?"

Cassidy: "Yes."

Breen: "Right."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Cassidy: "So, this includes the ones that aren't the grocery store from that Bill."

Breen: "Great. Okay. Told you so. And none of these are bars within a hundred feet of schools? It's restaurants or other... other establishments, they're not majority liquor establishments?"

Cassidy: "Yes."

Breen: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Arroyo. Does not wish to speak. Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Feigenholtz. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 87 voting 'yes', 27 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2432, Mr. Martwick. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2432, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2432, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Martwick."

Martwick: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 2432 amends the Code of Civil Procedure as it pertains to foreclosure lawsuits. So, it makes four changes. One of the changes is it changes the law as it pertains to the jurisdiction of court and summons and..."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Speaker Lang: "Please turn on Mr. Martwick's light. Excuse us, Sir."

Martwick: "Thank you... as it pertains to service. It makes the change to the statute of limitation for a petition to reopen a foreclosure lawsuit. It changes... it makes a change of law as it pertains to color of title. And it makes a change as it pertains to the Mortgage Rescue Fraud Act. So, the background of this case is that it's response to an Illinois Appellate Court ruling that has sort of set off a chain of events regrading foreclosure lawsuits. And what we are trying to do is we are trying to tighten up the law around this. And basically, what we're trying to do is we're trying to affirm what we believe to be the law in terms of service of process. We believe what it has been, and what it is currently and what it should be. And so, we are placing that into statute. The... what this would do ... and the Bill would do is it would make three changes to service. It provides that a court's jurisdiction is not affected or negated due to a technical error in the summons. So, as long as three items are met; number one, the summons has been issued by the Clerk of the Court; number two, the summons actually identifies the person or entity be... to serve as a defendant; and number three, the summons is properly served. It limits the ... it changes the statute of limitations on the petition to reopen the foreclosure lawsuit from seven to two years. It says that a subsequent purchaser who has been paying the taxes and... and for the last two years has presumed to have a color of title. And it sets limitations on fee sharing arrangements for attorneys that practice in this area. So, I'm happy to ask

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

any... answer any questions. And I respectfully ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Thapedi."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Thapedi: "Representative, I... I have some questions with respect to legislative intent. May we move it to Standard Debate, please, Mr. Speaker? At the request of the..."

Speaker Lang: "It's approved, Sir."

Thapedi: "So, we... we've been through quite a bit on this issue in the Judiciary Committee that this is a... a big time issue 'cause there's a lot of litigation currently pending in the courts. Isn't that correct?"

Martwick: "Yes."

Thapedi: "So, what I'd like to do is I'd like to go through the legislative intent with you."

Martwick: "Thank you."

Thapedi: "All right. Isn't it true that a cottage legal industry has recently been created whereby hundreds of cases are now pending alleging that the initial summons is somehow defective in the foreclosure process?"

Martwick: "Yes."

Thapedi: "And the results of which, meaning a defective summons, is that homeowners may have the opportunity to fight to get their houses back, correct?"

Martwick: "Yes."

Thapedi: "And isn't it also true that this Bill will affect several cases currently pending in the state by either

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

reducing the number of cases in this cottage industry or decreasing the number of cases in this industry?"

Martwick: "Yes."

Thapedi: "Isn't it also true that there's an army of lawyers watching and waiting for our floor debates so that they can run into court and use the debate transcript to support their respective positions?"

Martwick: "I would imagine, yes."

Thapedi: "All right. Now, after these foreclosure cases surrounding the cottage industry, these cases sometimes affect subsequent purchasers following the foreclosure of sale, correct?"

Martwick: "That is correct."

Thapedi: "And in doing so, these cases can have either a direct or indirect impact on the cost of purchasing, owning, or selling a single family home that's been foreclosed upon, correct?"

Martwick: "Yes."

Thapedi: "And this Bill is... is partially designed to provide some certainty to the lenders, consumers and title companies that are involved in the foreclosure process. Isn't that also correct?"

Martwick: "Yes."

Thapedi: "And that's one of the reasons why that I requested the Housing..."

Speaker Lang: "Please continue, Sir."

Thapedi: "And that's one of the reasons why I requested the Housing Affordability Impact note, which has recently come back from IHDA, indicating that the Bill may in fact have an

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

effect on the cost of constructing, purchasing, owning or selling a single family residence, but there's insufficient information to determine the fiscal impact, correct?"

Martwick: "Yes."

Thapedi: "All right. Now, with respect to your Bill, is Supreme Court Rule 101 still valid?"

Martwick: "Yes."

Thapedi: "With respect to your Bill, is Supreme Court Rule 131 still valid?"

Martwick: "Yes."

Thapedi: "Is Ohio Millers Mutual Insurance Company v. Inter-Insurance Exchange of the Illinois... of the Illinois Automobile Club cited at 367 Ill. 44, 1937 case, still good

Martwick: "Yes."

Thapedi: "Have the requisite elements to be successful on a 2-1401 petition been changed under this Bill?"

Martwick: "No."

Thapedi: "Is Fleshner v. Copeland cited at 13 Ill. 2d 72 decided in 1958 still good law?"

Martwick: "Yes."

Thapedi: "All right. So, your Bill is designed to shut down this cottage legal industry but not to overturn any case law or Supreme Court Rules, correct?"

Martwick: "That is correct."

Thapedi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andersson."

Andersson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I... I just wanted to rise in support of the Bill to talk about what we're trying

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

to fix here. And I'm going to read to you out of a bankruptcy petition the scheme that we are trying to fix. Now, I'm not going to reveal the bankrupt person's name, but this was their... their concept. Which is the ... 'the blanks foreclosure litigation enterprise which has been described as a provider of group legal services plans appears to be built primarily on causing delay in foreclosure proceedings so as to collect monthly payments from the subject property's owners. To achieve the necessary delay, the associates of this group employ a number of schemes including transferring a subject property to a newly created entity with a series of numbers, dots and dashes so that it becomes difficult to properly issue a summons. By transferring a property facing foreclosure to the uninitiated, it might appear to contain typographical errors, but in fact those are by design intended to create the likelihood of improper service on the property'. That's what we're trying to fix is... is a circumstance where people are literally gaming the system. The people foreclosure don't benefit from it, innocent purchasers don't benefit from it. The only people who benefit from it are these schemers. So, I commend the ... the Sponsor of the Bill for this important piece of legislation to eliminate a very bad scheme. Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Halpin. Mr. Halpin."

Halpin: "My apologies, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "That's all right, Sir."

Halpin: "So... will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

- Halpin: "And just to clarify in more layman's terms for legislative intent, Representative, is this Bill intended to be a change in the existing law?"
- Martwick: "Well, it... it is a clarification of what we... what we believe that the existing law is and as defined by the Fleshner case that was cited previously. And... and it is... it is a codification of what we believe the law was, what it is and what it should be without addressing any other court decisions that... that have been made out there."
- Halpin: "And so, rather than being a change in law going forward, this is intended to let the courts know that this has been... the Legislators... the Legislature's intent of what the law should be all along?"

Martwick: "That's correct."

Halpin: "All right. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Drury."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Drury: "Representative, can you explain, just with respect to one of the issues this Bill is intended to address, the issue of the summons? What exactly would be required on a summons under... under your proposal?"

Martwick: "Well, what... what the Bill says is that the court's jurisdiction is not affected or negated due to a technical error in the summons so long as; number one, the summons has been issued by the Clerk of the Court; number two, the summons accurately identifies the person or entity be to served as a defendant; and number three, the summons is properly served."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

- Drury: "And so, when it says a technical error, for legislative intent, what does that mean?"
- Martwick: "Well, that... for legislative intent, I... I believe that a technical error would be a decision of the trier of fact."
- Drury: "Okay. But the... but the point of this law is to clarify the existing law so that there's not so much confusion in the court. So, I think it would help for us to know what a technical error is going... as we pass this Bill, if it does pass."
- Martwick: "So, again, I... the answer that I gave previously I... I would stand on that. I don't think that I can give you any more clarification because it's not in the Bill. The way the Bill was written it says that... that... a technical error to the summons. So, you know, to the extent I imagine that there are different types of technical errors. One technical error could be the complete elimination of someone to be served. I think that maybe in that instance a court might find that that is a fatal error. But if someone's name was misspelled, if... if they spelled Drury D-R-U-R-I-E, maybe they would find then that that was not sufficient. But I think that that should be... or that was sufficient. But either way, I think that that is a question for the trier of fact for the court not... not for us to decide."
- Drury: "And then you said during your opening remarks that this relates to Foreclosure Law, but actually we're... this issue related to summons. This is a change to the Code of Civil Procedure that will affect all civil cases filed in... in Illinois state courts?"

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Martwick: "Well... and I... I think that as I stated in... during legislative intent that it is not designed to change the law but rather to affirm and... and clarify for the courts going forward that this is the law under *Fleshner*, that has been the law, and should continue to be the law."

Drury: "But it... it's not just for foreclosure cases. This is changing the law... the Code of Civil Procedure for all civil cases filed?"

Martwick: "But that is..."

Drury: "This law will affect all civil cases?"

Martwick: "Yes."

Drury: "Okay. So then getting to the actual issue, there was a recent case it was the Arch Bay case. And in that case, the plaintiff's attorney... the plaintiff was a banker investment company seeking to foreclose on a property from Mr. & Mrs. Perez. Is that correct?"

Martwick: "Yes."

Drury: "And that bank on the summons didn't list Mr. or Mrs.

Perez's name as the... when it said to, there was nothing listed there, correct?"

Martwick: "That is correct."

Drury: "Okay. And so, this... under that scenario... under this... your law if a bank is seeking to foreclose on... on someone's home, Mr. & Mrs. Perez, and doesn't list their name on the summons, can that bank foreclose on the home?"

Martwick: "I... I wouldn't speculate. Again, I think that that would be a decision for the courts to make when that... when that challenge is brought before them. I mean, I'm... I'm not looking to tie the court's hands. I'm looking to affirm the current

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

law. But I think that there is still this flexibility for a court to look at each factual situation individually."

Drury: "Okay. But that... that's the issue. I mean, this is... this is a really big issue. What is the current law? So, if a bank seeks to foreclose on Mr. & Mrs. Perez's home and doesn't list Mr. & Mrs. Perez as the defendant, under the current law can the bank take Mr. & Mrs. Perez's home?"

Martwick: "Well, I... again, I think that that is right. That is... they still have to abide by all of these Supreme Court rules as was laid out. And... and they still have to abide by the law as is. And I think that's a decision for the courts to decide in that moment. Right? How do they... but so I... you know, I'm not going to make a decision as a court. I'm not a judge. I don't practice in this area. I'm not... I'm not going to give you a... I'm not going to speculate on how I would render a decision if I was a judge 'cause I'm not one. I... I will leave that for the..."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Martwick, please complete your answer. And then Mr. Drury can complete his comments."

Martwick: "My answer is complete, I think."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Drury."

Drury: "Okay. To the Bill. Everybody this is a really important piece of legislation. The case that prompted this legislation, the Arch Bay case, was a bank trying to foreclose on Mr. & Mrs. Perez's home. It did not list Mr. & Mrs. Perez as the defendant and then they took the home and Mr. & Mrs. Perez later learned that they had their rights. This is trying to reverse that, which would make it easier for banks to take people's homes away from them. So, I think that we should

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

really take this Bill seriously. We had a lot of discussion about this in the Judiciary Committee. This Bill is not soup yet and it is going to make an... it is going to change the playing field in favor of big banks. Now, this Body has done a lot in the last few years to make sure that people can stay in their homes, their homes will be protected. This Bill has the ability to turn that around. And the reason that I asked those questions about what is the current law is 'cause it is unknown. And so, when we say we're passing this Bill... and I respect Representative Martwick and what he's trying to do... the fact is, this Bill has the potential to harm a lot of our constituents whose homes are being foreclosed on by big banks.

It is a bad Bill and I ask that you vote 'no'. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?" Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Flowers: "Representative, you and I had spoke about this Bill yesterday and I, too, would like to follow up on the language dealing with technicality because we are talking about people's homes. And so, when you... when you're talking about a summons, do you think the summons should be correct as far as identifying the person in which the summons is supposed to be going to? As far as the spelling of the name?"

Martwick: "Well, I... that... what I think is... is not really relevant.

I... I think what the Bill says is that, and I'll repeat, that...

it... it provides that a court's jurisdiction is not affected.

Meaning that the court has jurisdiction over the parties,

even if there is a technical error in the summons, so long as
three items are met. Number one, that the summons has been

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

issued by the Clerk of the Court. That means the... you know, the attorney might prepare it, they present it to the clerk, the clerk certifies it, stamps and says this if official summons, right? Number two, that the summons accurately identifies... accurately identifies the person or entity to be served as the defendant. So, the summons accurately identifies the person being served as the defendant in the lawsuit. And three, the summons has been properly served. So, if those there items are met, then it... a technical deficiency does not negate the service. Does that make sense?"

"Right. But if the name is misspelled, you could truly

say that the summons hasn't technically identified the person in which it's to be given to because the name is not correct."

Martwick: "That would be a technical error, yes, you are correct."

Flowers: "And... but that technical error could cause one of our constituents a whole lot of trouble and they would have to take off time from work to prove that they're not that person's name that's misspelled on the summons, despite the fact the other two are correct. But the... the spelling of the

Martwick: "I'm not... I'm not certain that I completely follow your line of reasoning. But again, if a person..."

are we to assume that the rest of it should be correct?"

name... if you can't get the spelling of the name correct, how

Flowers: "Well, let me just make it clear."

Martwick: "...has been served and they've... if they've... if a person has been served with the summons, properly served and they've been identified and... and in this instance they, you know, they show up to court, well, that's part of the process. It's just part of the process."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Flowers: "Well, let me just ask this. So, have you ever received mail in your mailbox and you brought your mail in and you realized, hmmm, this is not mine?"

Martwick: "Yes."

Flowers: "Okay. So, someone can be given a summons and not necessarily show up in court but may... may not show up in court and choose to ignore that summons and little do they know that there's an arrest out for them because they did not adhere to the summons. But..."

Martwick: "I'm sorry. I'm sorry. I'm having a hard time hearing you, Representative. You... you said that there's an arrest out for them?"

Flowers: "There may be some type of warrant or something may be out. I don't..."

Martwick: "I... not on a civil..."

Flowers: "...know the..."

Martwick: "...process there wouldn't be."

Flowers: "Well, I'm glad to know that. But the fact of the matter is, that that person did not answer that summons with the misspelled name on it. And as a result of that person not answering that summons, then what? Because the person just assumed you couldn't be talking about me because this is not the way you spell my name."

Martwick: "Well, I... I'm... I apologize. I'm not following."

Flowers: "Well, let me just... let me ask you this 'cause I want to be plain and simple because..."

Martwick: "Sure."

Flowers: "...I know that if a person is working to do the proper summons they should at least get the name right. What does

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

current law say now about the spelling of a person's name? Or can you just put anyone's name on a summons and have two of the other items right and expect for them to show up in court?"

Martwick: "No. I... I mean you... the... we believe that... I believe that what this Bill is doing is..."

Flowers: "No, I'm not talking about..."

Martwick: "...is restating the current..."

Flowers: "...I asked you, what is the..."

Martwick: "...law. You said, what is the law?"

Flowers: "...current law?"

Martwick: "I think that this is it."

Flowers: "You think that's it?"

Martwick: "Well, that's what I believe and that's what I'm codifying."

Flowers: "No, what... what... there has to be something authenticated."

Martwick: "There is a case called... there is a case called Fleshner, it's a Supreme Court decision. And this is affirming what the Supreme Court said in that decision."

Flowers: "So, the Supreme Court said that you could make technical errors..."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Flowers, if you could bring your remarks to a close."

Flowers: "The court... the Supreme Court says you can make technical errors on a summons?"

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Martwick is going to answer and then Representative Flowers will close."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Martwick: "It... Representative, what it... what it says is, if you'll allow me to find it? One second here."

Flowers: "Representative, for the sake of time, I just would like to say... and thank you, Mr. Speaker for your time. I would like to say that this issue is too important to so many people that if you can't get the summons right it should be at least worth. Because we're... we're talking about a person's livelihood. It should be at least being able to get the summons right, if you're going to try to bring a person into court. And other technicalities or other missing items on that summons, you shouldn't just haphazardly be able to pass something out and give reference or inferences as this is authenticated and it is specifically for you or me and our names is not right or some other information that's on the summons is not correct. And I urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Zalewski: "So... so, Rob, I... I'm not in Jud-Civ and I have a lot of questions based on what the opponents are asking and the proponents. Starting with, our analysis says that the Attorney General's Office and the lenders are proponents of the Bill and the foreclosure defense attorneys are opponents to the Bill. So, can you reconcile that for us?"

Martwick: "So, what I can tell you is that when this Bill was originally filed in the Senate because of... I don't know, I'm not exactly sure why... but because of the breadth of it I would imagine in the changes that it's making there were initially a lot of opponents including the Attorney General, the

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Heartland Alliance, the Shriver Poverty Law Center and Illinois Housing Action Alliance. Through negotiations in the Senate and Amendments, they have all been removed as opponents. And these are the people who champion these causes making sure that the legal system is not taking away the rights of people. So, clearly they are okay with this legislation as it is."

Zalewski: "But there remains a bar of attorneys that are opposed?"

Martwick: "Yes. And these are the bar of attorneys that are... have...

the cottage industry that was talked about that has grown up
around this court decision that is now combing through old
foreclosure decisions looking for technical deficiencies in
the summons, reopening cases with an attempt to extort some
sort of settlement under the threat of taking homes away from
subsequent purchasers and returning them to the original
foreclosure defendants. And they're doing it with obscene...
really obscene sort of fee sharing arrangements. Some as much
as an 80 percent contingency fee."

Zalewski: "And does your Bill cure just the problem of the technical name on the summons issue? Or... it seems like there's a number of things the Bill does besides that issue, am I getting that right?"

Martwick: "It does. It... and so again, it... it's... it's, you know, it clarifies the law or restates what we believe to be the current law in terms of service. But then it also addresses three other things. One is statute of limitations for petition to reopen foreclosures, it reduces that from seven years to two years after the current owner takes possession of the property. It talks about color of title and... and when the

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

subsequent purchaser is deemed to... to be the... the lawful owner of the property. Again, reducing that from seven years to two years. And it change... makes this changes to the Mortgage Rescue Fraud Act. And again, this speaks directly to the contingent fee arrangements that are... are being sought out by these... this cottage industry."

Zalewski: "Okay. So... and then finally, my last question is back to the... the first portion that sucked up a lot of the debate. If I heard right, the Bill would codify what's in a Supreme Court case on this issue and reverse what's a subsequent Appellate Court case on this issue?"

Martwick: "No."

Zalewski: "Okay."

Martwick: "What it would do is it would codify and... and affirm what we believe to be the current law without addressing the... the idea that there can be other rulings under this law given separate distinct factual scenarios. So, that case was talked about by another Representative and, again, the court could find a way to, you know, there is room in this for them to address different factual situations."

Zalewski: "Okay. Thank you, Representative."

Martwick: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Jones."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Jones: "So, Representative, we went through this case at length in Jud-Civ and you were asked questions of legislative intent, which you seemed to back away from in one of the previous..."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Martwick: "I'm sorry, I... I didn't... could you... it's a little loud,
Mr. Speaker."

Jones: "I'm sure you can hear me clearly, Representative. So, let me speak louder."

Martwick: "Yes."

Jones: "In Jud-Civ we went through this case and you were asked several questions by Representative... a previous Representative about legislative intent."

Martwick: "Yes."

Jones: "You seemed to back away from that legislative intent in one of your answers."

Martwick: "No. And I don't intend to. So, if I did, I apologize."

Jones: "So, if..."

Martwick: "The chairman of the committee and I talked about legislative intent. He asked those questions. I answered them. And... and the way... I believe, and unless I'm mistaken, I believe the way that I am stating the legislative intent is exactly the way that I covered it. Which is that we are affirming the law in... in the Fleshner decision without addressing the... the idea that the... that other courts may... I'm not going to get into the factual decisions of other courts. So, I'm... I'm saying that there is room for other courts to... to make their own rulings or... but this is the guiding law."

Jones: "So, let's clear up two things. You were asked by Representative Flowers what is the current law? And you were asked... also asked a technical. So, in committee you got a copy of the summons that was in question, correct?"

Martwick: "I did, yes."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

- Jones: "So, on that summons the question that was asked of you was about defendants versus a see attached list, correct?"
- Martwick: "Well, yes. On... on that... in that... in that case there was a line for defendants and it was left blank. And on the second page there was... it didn't say see attached list, but it said a list of... or it said defendants to be served. And it listed all the defendants in the case."
- Jones: "So, the point that Representative Flowers was making to you that if a... if the name Perez was not on there, could a person's house be taken? Can you answer that question?"
- Martwick: "Well, I... I don't... and... and I guess I'm not comfortable putting myself in the position of a judge in a case. Right?

 I mean..."
- Jones: "Well, hypothetically you're an attorney, correct?"
- Martwick: "Well, I know. But hypothetically a judge could make any decision. A judge could say yes..."

Jones: "I'm not asking..."

Martwick: "...a judge could say no. And that..."

Jones: "...we're not asking... we're not asking about a judge. You're presenting the Bill that..."

Martwick: "Well, I know, but then you're asking me to make a decision as if I was the judge and I'm not going to do that."

Jones: "Well, Representative, you... you have this Bill that is going to change Civil Code. It's not just dealing with foreclosures."

Martwick: "Right."

Jones: "As the previous Representative stated, this is a major issue..."

Martwick: "Yes."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Jones: "...that you need to properly answer the questions that the Representative asked you about taking someone's home. And finally, Representative..."

Martwick: "Yes?"

Jones: "...we talked in committee about this tilting the scale.

Tilting the scale in favor of us making the decision of winners and losers. So, this tilting... this Bill will probably tilt the scale in the favor of banks. Do you believe that's the case?"

Martwick: "I... No, I... I absolutely do not. And the reason that I say that is that, again, the groups that were involved in the negotiations of this Bill in the Senate are... are the groups that you would expect would be standing up to make sure that those scales are balanced fairly. These are the groups that their entire existence is to advocate against things that would tilt the scales. And they are all okay with this Bill: Heartland Alliance, Attorney General's Office, Shriver Poverty Law Center. So, absolutely, I do not... I don't agree with that statement."

Jones: "So, Representative, your Bill has changed. The Attorney General's Office is on this Bill as supporting this as a proponent. Have no..."

Martwick: "They are no longer neutral."

Jones: "Let me finish my question."

Martwick: "Or maybe they are, I don't know."

Jones: "So, have you given the revised language to the Illinois
Attorney General's Office and asked if they support this Bill
and have they given you an answer that they support this
Bill?"

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Martwick: "The... the language in this Bill was not changed here in the House, it was changed in the Senate. All the negotiations were handled there. All of those parties are, I believe, neutral. I don't know that the AG slipped in favor. I'd... I'd have to look. Oh no, they are a proponent. Yes. And... and so, they are... so that... that was done while the Bill was in the Senate. The language is identical. So, no, I have not specifically spoken to them."

Jones: "Representative, what is the rush with this Bill? We have a lot of issues with this Bill. We vetted some of them out in committee. I would encourage you to pull this Bill from the record and let's work on this over the summer. Are you willing to do that?"

Martwick: "I... I am not. This is not my initiative. This was an initiative by a group that was... that was negotiated extensively across the floor. And I think it would be... it would be very improper for me to pull that Bill out of the record at this point. I think the Bill needs to stand or fall on its own merits at this point."

Jones: "What's the name of that group, Representative?"

Martwick: "The group? Well, the Illinois Attorney General's Office, the Illinois Trial Lawyers Association..."

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

Martwick: "Thank you. The Illinois State Bar Association, the Illinois Credit Union, the Bankers Association, the Land Title Association, the Creditors Coalition for Foreclosure Best Practices, the Community Bankers Association of Illinois, the Heartland Alliance, the Shriver Poverty Law Center, Illinois Housing Action Alliance. So, all of those

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

- groups were involved in this process. As well as my Senator, Senator Mulroe."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Jones, your time has expired, but I'll let you close with some remarks."
- Jones: "Ladies and Gentlemen, I would invite you to look at the board. This Bill is going to change our Civil Procedure and it has bad consequences not only for homeowners but it's a bad policy. I asked the Sponsor to pull this Bill from the record. I would ask that you consider voting 'no' on this Bill. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen, we've reached our limit on this Bill.

 Mr. Martwick to close."
- Martwick: "I... I appreciate the debate and I appreciate the concerns of the people who spoke against the Bill. But I... I would point out, number one, that this is designed to provide clarity to the legal system where there is not clarity right now. It's to provide clarity to the courts about what the existing law is. It tightens up some bad practices that are going on. And this was extensively negotiated by... by all sides. I think that this is a good Bill. I think this is good law. I respectfully ask for an 'aye' vote."
- 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Conyears-Ervin, Harper, Mah, Turner. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 99 voting 'yes', 12 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

declared passed. Senate Bill 1979, Mr. Rita. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1979, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Rita."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Rita."

Rita: "I'd move for Floor... the adoption of Floor Amendment #2.

What it does is puts a cap, a \$5 million cap on it which takes off the opposition of Cook County."

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. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1979, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Rita."

Rita: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1979, as amended, basically raises the cap for overpayment of property taxes in Cook County for those that overpaid their taxes prior to 2009. Current law has a cap of 2.5 million, we just raised that cap to 5 million on those that are... are seeking to be reimbursed for their overpayments."

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? Members, please record yourselves. Halpin. Please take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2522, Representative Wallace. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2522, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. But several notes have been requested on the Bill and have not been filed."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Wallace on a Motion."

Wallace: "Yes. I Motion to rule every single one of these notes inapplicable."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen on the Motion."

Breen: "We object and ask for a Roll Call vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Motion 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 62 voting 'yes', 50 voting 'no'. And the Lady's Motion carries. And all notes... note requests are held inapplicable. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "No further Motions or note requests."

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2522, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Wallace."

Wallace: "Thank you. I rise to present 2522, which is a consumer protection Bill. It's a Bill that makes sure that individuals are not assessed fees over and above what's necessary to drive a rental car. I encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Breen: "And Representative, we're showing on our analysis that the Chamber of Commerce and Enterprise Car Rental were opposed to the introduced Senate version and it doesn't appear that anything has changed since then? Did... do you have any change in your analysis?"

Wallace: "I actually have the Chamber, the AG and Enterprise as well as Avis as no position on my analysis. I do not have opposition. With... with the adoption of the Senate Amendment 3, that removed the opposition before it came to this chamber."

Breen: "With the adoption of Senate Amendment 2? Is that... is that the statement?"

Wallace: "3."

Breen: "With Senate Amendment 3? Interesting, our analysis doesn't necessarily show that. So, but again, when... when you said the rental car company can no longer charge any sort of a fee more than the amount of the tolls paid? What... what's the... what's the specific requirement in your Bill?"

Wallace: "Exactly that. If you are driving a rental car and the toll is a specific amount, the rental company cannot charge an additional fee of... over and above what say the State of Illinois charges for a toll."

Breen: "Well, only... and... and that's only if they don't... don't inform you... as long as they don't inform you of the... the existence or the opportunity to use their electronic tolling. Is that correct?"

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

- Wallace: "The Bill does provide that you should be informed that those electronic transponders are available. It provides that they cannot charge you more than \$2 per day. And it also provides that on the days that you have not gone through any tolls, you will not be charged for the rental of that transponder. It's a great consumer protection Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen, please bring your remarks to a close, Sir."
- Breen: "Fair enough. As long as no one's opposed and the rental car companies themselves don't seem to mind the… the consumer protection angle. It does look like this may be duplicative of what they do already. So, again, the… it doesn't seem like there's any reason to oppose the Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Harris, D.: "Representative, in reading the Bill it says a rental car company shall not charge a renter a daily fee on any day the renter does not drive through an electronic toll or only drives through an electronic toll collection system for which no alternative payment option exists. How does the rental car company know if there is a payment option... a toll that a... where a payment option exists? As an example, on the... on the northwest tollway there might be a toll exit that has both an electronic toll as well as I can feed the, you know, feed the change. How is a car... the rental car company supposed to know which... which exit and which toll type of equipment was at that exit? How are they supposed to know that?"

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Wallace: "The transponders actually tell you which points you've gone through. They can clearly tell if you went through one of the exits, such as the mini on I-90 that there is no cash option. So, that's actually being able to be traced by the points in which that transponder was triggered for payment."

Harris, D.: "I understand that. I guess... if a toll collection system for which no alternative payment exists. Okay, I'm not... I'm not sure that's as clear as it needs to be and I'm not sure I understand how the... the company is supposed to know that. But thank you for your answer."

Wallace: "Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davidsmeyer."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Davidsmeyer: "So... so, what you're trying to do is just say, if the rental car company does not notify you in advance that they can only charge this \$2 fee, then they can't charge any fee on days that you don't use it?"

Wallace: "That's... I think that's a decent summary. They have to make available to you the opportunity to rent the transponder and yes, they cannot charge you on days that you did not use the transponder."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. So, if... if you do go through tolls you pay the toll price..."

Wallace: "Yes."

Davidsmeyer: "...plus the... a max of..."

Wallace: "Two dollars."

Davidsmeyer: "...\$2?"

Wallace: "Yes."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Davidsmeyer: "I... I think it's a reasonable thing. I think you should be notified and I think this is a good Bill. Thank you."

Wallace: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Lang: "Representative McDermed."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

McDermed: "I find this Bill to be really, really confusing. So, do you have the option of not taking the transponder?"

Wallace: "Yes."

McDermed: "Okay. And if you don't take the transponder but incur a bunch of fees what does that do to..."

Wallace: "You're responsible for them. That's the case now and this Bill doesn't change your responsibility. This is to protect consumers by saying that a... a rental car company cannot charge you over and above what I-Pass, for example, is already charging you for tolls."

McDermed: "So, you can rent a car, you can say you don't want the transponder, you can go through as many tolls as you choose, turn the car back in and it takes the rental car company how many months to find you and try to collect from you? This seems to me to be like a toll skipper's dream. And I'm not sure that I agree with this Bill at all. I think it's a better plan to have a transponder and not have the rental car companies trying to find somebody from Idaho six months later and try to collect with them, which ain't going to happen. So..."

Wallace: "Well..."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

McDermed: "...I just don't like this Bill. I just think it's a way for people to avoid tolls. I don't like it. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Carroll."

Carroll: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the... I rise in support of this Bill. My wife, who is a class action attorney, as some of you know, actually had a case that talked about this specific issue with consumers and how consumers were getting screwed over on a regular basis by these transponders and rental cars. So, I applaud the Sponsor for bringing forth this Bill to protect consumers and that's what we are here to do. Is to protect consumers and the people of Illinois. So, thank you very much for bringing this Bill forward. I'm sure when you see my wife again she will thank you as well. Take care."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Wallace to close."

Wallace: "Thank you. This is not a toll skipper's dream. There are already provisions in place to track you down. And just not liking a Bill is not a reason to vote 'no'. I hope you have a very solid reason as to voting 'no'. It's a great consumer protection Bill. I encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Connor. Please take the record. There are 96 voting 'yes', 20 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Cavaletto is recognized on a point of personal privilege."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

- Cavaletto: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to welcome to the Capitol Dr. Francy K and her husband, Frank, and her relatives from Poland. Would you please stand? Let's give them a warm welcome to the Capitol here at the State of Illinois."
- Speaker Lang: "Welcome. We're glad you're joining us today. Thank you, Representative. Mr. Bennett is recognized."
- Bennett: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege, please."
- Speaker Lang: "Proceed, Sir."
- Bennett: "I'm very fortunate today to have with me a very special lady, my wife Kathy is here with us, and she's getting the chance to absorb all the information, the dialogue, the conversations that are being taken place here this afternoon. So, would you please help me give her a warm welcome from Springfield, if you would?"
- Speaker Lang: "Welcome. Welcome. Thanks for being on the House Floor. I'm sure you've been very enlightened by the debate. Senate Bill 35, Mr. Welch. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 35, a Bill for an Act concerning government. This Bill was read a second time a previous day.

 Amendment 1 was adopted previously. No further Amendments. A state mandates note has been requested but not filed at this time."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Welch on a Motion."
- Welch: "Mr. Speaker, I ask that the notes on this Bill be moved inapplicable. This... this isn't going to cost the state anything."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen."
- Breen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Breen: "And Representative, I... I think the idea is that it doesn't... it's not going to cost the state anything, but it may cost local units of government. So, does your Bill is any way do anything to impact local units of government?"

Welch: "No."

Breen: "So, entities and organizations that provide services related to physical or mental health or wellness, education, doesn't that include local units of government?"

Welch: "It's not going to cost them anything more than what they're already expending."

Breen: "Well, it would be nice to know before we vote on the Bill.

So, Mr. Speaker, we could object and ask for a Roll Call."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion 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. Crespo. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 60 voting 'yes', 54 voting 'no'. And the Gentleman's Motion prevails. The note is held inapplicable. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "No further notes are requested."

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

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 35, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Welch."

Welch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 35 creates the Immigration Safe Zones Act, which would require the Attorney General to publish model policies which limit immigration enforcement assistance that state funded agencies

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

must implement. What the Immigration Safe Zones Act would do is require the Attorney General's Office, no matter who the Attorney General is, to publish model rules to support sensitive locations, including publically funded schools, publically funded hospitals, public libraries and courthouses when faced with immigration enforcement. This is an... a Bill that is supported by a wide range of people in a coalition. There are no opponents to this Bill. We have sat down and worked with law enforcement. Law enforcement is neutral on this initiative. This is not a sanctuary state Bill. What this Bill does is requires the Attorney General, no matter who's holding the office, as the leading law enforcement officer of the state to publish guidance on this important, critical issue. And I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Demmer."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Demmer: "Representative, we had a debate in committee on this and I... I think I just want to renew some of the discussion we had there. First, is... is there anything that prohibits the Attorney General from publishing these policies today?"

Welch: "No, there is not. However, this Bill... this ..."

Demmer: "Have you asked the Attorney General why she has not published these policies?"

Welch: "I have not. Because it's not about the Attorney General, specifically, it's about any Attorney General. And as the..."

Demmer: "And any Attorney General is free to publish policies?"

Welch: "This would require her to publish policies on this issue."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

- Demmer: "Have you discussed this Bill with the Attorney General's Office?"
- Welch: "We have and they're not opposed to it."
- Demmer: "Did they give any indication why they have not exercised their available right to publish these policies?"
- Welch: "No."
- Demmer: "Over the course of the debate, did you ask if a Bill was necessary to force them to do something they already can do, but for some reason have chosen not to?"
- Welch: "I did not, but I... I believe because they're not opposed to the Bill, they're very supportive of the Bill, actually, that they believe it's... it's good legislation."
- Demmer: "Well, if... if they supportive of the Bill, why don't they just publish the policies?"
- Welch: "Well, again, you're focused on the current Attorney General's Office. It's our job as a Legislature to pass policy. We believe that this is a good policy that no matter who the Attorney General is that this would require them to publish guidance on it."
- Demmer: "We're not publishing the policy here though. We're telling the Attorney General, and that could be any different Attorney General over time. So, it might be an Attorney General who you agree with, it might be an Attorney General you disagree with, but we're requiring them to do something they already have the option of doing. And we're not putting the policy out there; we're just telling them that they have to make one up."
- Welch: "We're... we're have to... we're requiring them to give us legal quidance, yes."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Demmer: "Thank you, Representative. To the Bill. This Bill is... is unnecessary. The Attorney General clearly has the right to publish policies if she chooses to do so. She has, in this case, has chosen not to publish policies. There's probably a reason she has chosen not to publish policies. So, this Legislature is going to force this and any other Attorney General to publish policies in the area they've chosen not to do so. I think we should have a little conversation with her office about why they haven't done that. This Bill... it's unnecessary. It's not a... it's not a good use of the legislative time. And I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ammons."

"Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. I rise in support of Senate Ammons: Bill 35. I... I make note of the objection that was raised by the previous speaker and just want to draw the Body's attention to the purpose of the Body. In many cases we pass laws that other offices may or may not implement, but that is not our responsibility. Our responsibility here is to pass laws that are in the best interest of the people of the State of Illinois. And I rise to say that Senate Bill 35 is in the best interest of the people of the State of Illinois. We must have access to safe zones regardless to what you're status may be. And this Bill simply encourages, instructs, and make law the publishing of model policies in relationship to immigration and the enforcement assistance that may be necessary for members of our community. And so, I ask strongly for an 'aye' vote for Senate Bill 35. And thank you, Representative Welch, for all of your work on this issue. And I'll say in closing that in... in the last week or so we've had

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

an unfortunate incident for which if this Bill existed probably would not have taken place for members of our immigrant community. And so, I hope that this Bill moves forward from this House and on to the Governor for his signature and implementation for the State of Illinois. Thank you so much."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Welch to close."

Welch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Immigrants in Illinois often live in fear due to ruthless enforcement tactics used by immigration agencies in sensitive locations. Recently ICE published updated guidance indicating their intent to conduct arrests in courthouses around the country. Families are often afraid to take their children to school or just to seek medical attention and attend court hearings. By passing this policy and requiring our Attorney General to guidance, school districts, universities and the hospitals will be those places that you know you can go to without living in fear. We believe that this is a good policy that would send the signal to the 2 million immigrants that are already here, and those seeking to come here, that Illinois is a welcoming state and continues to be a welcoming state. And I would ask for an 'aye' vote in support of the Immigration Safe Zones Act."

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. There are 62 voting 'yes', 53 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2540, Mr. Crespo. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2540, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. This Bill was read a second time previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Crespo, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Crespo."

Crespo: "I believe I need to adopt the Amendment #2?"

Speaker Lang: "A brief explanation, Sir."

Crespo: "Yeah. It basically requires that any report submitted to the General Assembly, under this Bill, be done electronically."

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

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

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

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2540, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Crespo."

Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. The Bill amends the Grant Accountability Transparency Act and this just basically creates a system for stop payments orders from the state granting agency, basically streamlines the stop payment process."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Breen: "And Representative, just to be... for the information of the Body. The Governor's Office on Management and Budget, GATU the ICCB and the Comptroller's Office are all in support of your Bill?"

Crespo: "That's correct."

Breen: "And this was part of the findings of the Legislative Audit Commission?"

Crespo: "Correct."

Breen: "Thank you. Thank you for bringing it."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ammons."

Ammons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a brief question?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ammons: "Thank you. Representative Crespo, just to clarify this provision... this change does not apply to organizations that may have a legitimate grant that's in a GATU system that tracks grants to organizations. This is for places that they are removing payments to that should not receive them. Can you clarify that point on this Bill?"

Crespo: "This... basically when a decision is made that they need to stop payment for not rendering the services, this streamlines the process so the OMB will need to notify the Comptroller to make sure they're both in sync."

Ammons: "So, someone who is supposed to do a service for the state may have received some prompt payment for providing service."

Crespo: "That... that's a good example."

Ammons: "We could be in stop payment on that?"

Crespo: "Right."

Ammons: "Thank you very much for clarifying that."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

- 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? Riley. Please take the record. On this question, there are 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2546, Mr. Guzzardi. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2546, a Bill for an Act concerning education. This Bill was read a second time a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

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

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2546, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Guzzardi."

Guzzardi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Members. This Bill corrects an inconsistency in the Labor Relations Act. Right now, graduate employees... graduate students who are employees of their university are allowed to join the labor union at their university if they are teaching assistants or if they're administrative assistants, but if they are research assistants they're not allowed to join that union. That's an in... it's an inconsistency. It's very frustrating for graduate students as many of them transition back and forth between those roles quite frequently. We simply believe there should be equal treatment for all graduate assistants. And that's what this Bill provides. I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Ives: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll go straight to the Bill. All this is is an expansion for a union that has no respect for our military. No respect at all. This same union has zero respect also for our students. This union went on strike near the end of the term when students are most likely to seek assistance from graduate assistants when they're trying to complete it. I'd like Extended Debate on this, please. I'll just put that into the record too."

Speaker Lang: "Can... would it be all right if we did Standard Debate? Would that be all right?"

Ives: "Extended?"

Speaker Lang: "If you want Extended, that's what you'll get."

"Thank you so much. But make no doubt about it, this same union right after having gotten everything they wanted and more from their union contract, including that if there's grievances against microagressions, whatever that may be, from a student. That same union then posted on the front of their website a petition from a radical group urging all STEM graduates from the University of Illinois to not work in the defense industry. They had a petition on the front page urging people with some of the highest credentials when it comes to computer science and electrical engineering and aerospace engineering, all of the above, they're urging them not to work in the defense industry. This is a union that is radically leftist and they don't appreciate the fact that they live in an American society that is free and protected by our military. This union should get zero respect. And it should get no expansion whatsoever. Especially when you consider the fact that I'm a mother of sons who are serving

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

in the military, one of who went to the University of Illinois, graduated with electrical engineering and now is serving in the country. He graduated from there from the ROTC Department. And yet, they want these graduates in STEM not to support people that are serving the military. Not to be that top notch engineer that are protecting our country. Not to be the ones who are engineering sophisticated machines that allow us to be protected. This same union. This same union has so little respect for the taxpayers of not just the State of Illinois but the Federal Government that they don't even realize that the University of Illinois takes in over \$60 million a year in research grants from the Department of Defense alone, just the Department of Defense. You should be a 'no' vote on this union... on this Bill 'cause you should be a 'no' vote for this union. Radical union that has no respect for the American people, the American taxpayer and the American military. Good God, in the light of the Memorial Day that we just went through, vote 'no' on this Bill. Vote 'no' and send this union a message that you're not going to tolerate this type of rhetoric from them. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reick."

Reick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will, I've got some questions for you."

Guzzardi: "Happily yield, Representative."

Reick: "Thank you very much. When we discussed this Bill in committee, the University of Illinois was an opponent to this Bill. Is their opposition been removed by anything that's been done since?"

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Guzzardi: "So you know, it's puzzling, Representative, because the University of Illinois didn't in fact slip in opposition to this Bill nor did they testify in committee. I've seen them slip in opposition before to Bills; I know they know how to do it. So, the only inference I can make is that they're opposition to this Bill isn't terribly serious."

Reick: "I also see now opposition by the Governor's Office. Are you aware of any reason for that?"

Guzzardi: "I'm certainly not, Representative."

Reick: "The... the question I have is, we talked about this again in committee. We had a discussion of the work rules that are available or that are a part of this contract and I don't believe I was given an adequate answer. Research assistants are those who have limited or no teaching expectations as part of their contract; whereas, teaching assistants of course are... their... when part of their duties are to teach. Now, that being a distinction between the two types of... of roles, how is it that you can say now all of the sudden research assistants should be folded into a... a union that represents those whose primary function is teaching?"

Guzzardi: "Well, so, the... I... just... two things. First of all, to clarify, Representative, administrative assistants, graduate students who are administrative assistants, are currently part of the union. They also don't have teaching responsibilities. So, there's not a bright line here between those who teach and those who don't. But let me also say that research assistants... the reason I believe they should be part of the union is because they are performing labor, compensated labor, on behalf of the university. And anyone who is familiar

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

with graduate student settings will tell you these research assistants are spending 30, 40, 50 hours a week in the lab performing research that helps the university get grants, that helps the university enhance its prestige. These are workers by any construal of the word."

Reick: "But... but..."

Guzzardi: "And therefore, they ought to be considered members...
they ought to be eligible..."

Reick: "...but we've also..."

Guzzardi: "...members of the union."

Reick: "...we also, I believe one of our Members on the Labor Committee pulled up a... a memo from the University of Illinois saying that they oppose the Bill simply because... or not simply because... but because of the fact that the research assistants the work that they do is in furtherance of their own academic studies and not necessarily and not as part of something that enhances the..."

Guzzardi: "Right."

Reick: "...prestige or the wealth of the university itself."

Guzzardi: "So, unfortunately, that's contradicted by the university's own handbook, which I will read to you right now. Hours of work for research assistants are separate and distinct from the time required for an assistants own academic coursework. So, the university itself in black and white acknowledges that the time they're doing working, whether it's research or teaching or administrative work, that is work time that is separate and distinct from their academic time. So, the university is saying they're working.

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Therefore, they're workers. Therefore, they should be able to join the union."

Reick: "I go... I go back to..."

Guzzardi: "It's a pretty simple..."

Reick: "...the question then of the contract itself or the union..."

Guzzardi: "Sure."

Reick: "...agreement itself. What are the... what is the definition...
what are the work rule requirements contained within the... the
agreement that the university has with the union?"

Guzzardi: "Well, Representative, the... the negotiations that took place recently covered a number of areas including wages, fee waivers, appointment terms, et cetera. But as you know, unions often negotiate contracts on behalf of members who have a number of different functions, right? So, the union might represent, I don't know, teachers and janitors and engineers. And they negotiate a contract on behalf of all of those people with separate terms for each different work group. Right? They're not saying that the janitors have to teach classes. They're saying this is the terms for one group; this is the terms for another. So, it's not at all inconceivable that the union could represent employees with different functions and negotiate different terms for each of those sets of employees. In fact, that happens every day."

Reick: "Well, I will go back to the issue of the university saying that the function served by research assistants are more for their own benefit than that of the university. To the Bill. I don't see how expansion of the role of the union to cover research assistants when what they're doing is... is incidental. The... the work... the... whatever they do is incidental

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

to their... to their role as enhancing their own academic credentials. I... I don't believe that this... that this is a... is a proper expansion of the... of the union. I don't believe that these should be let... allowed to be brought into the union. And I urge a 'no' vote. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wheeler."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Wheeler, K.: "Here we are, my friend."

Guzzardi: "Representative, it's a pleasure to see you."

Wheeler, K.: "Let's go back to the discussion we had in committee, briefly. And I'm looking at the language of the Bill, specifically here."

Guzzardi: "Sure."

Wheeler, K.: "If you want to bring that up and go with me, I'll be happy to wait for you if you want to send it."

Guzzardi: "No, I've got it right here. Thank you."

Wheeler, K.: "Perfect. Thank you. Actually, there's not a lot of language to this."

Guzzardi: "Correct."

Wheeler, K.: "Can... can you help me understand in your opinion as to why or why not the original language, the intent clearly excluded research assistants from the definition of a student?"

Guzzardi: "You know, I can't speak to the original drafting of this language. As I said in committee, I feel that it represents a misapprehension of how graduate student work actually works. That by excluding research assistants you're creating this sort of meaningless distinction between

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

categories of graduate students. And that they all, in fact, are doing meaningful work for the university. And therefore, all ought to be eligible to join the union. That's precisely the error that this Bill seeks to correct."

Wheeler, K.: "Is there research work done well at the University of Illinois, my wonderful alma mater, that may be paid for by a private entity that would be paying the… the research worker directly versus paying them through the university?"

Guzzardi: "I imagine there might be, I can't say for certain."

Wheeler, K.: "And I guess that's kind of where I'm coming from.

I'm wondering to myself if, you know, this is like not something I've thought about a lot. It's just off the top of my mind here. It came to me as we read through this one more time that are there other entities where you may be doing research for one entity one week and then the university the next week and maybe back and forth or different projects? I don't know the answer to that then."

Guzzardi: "So... so, yeah. The... these research assistants... when you have a research assistantship through the university, your employer is the university and you're working for them and the university is compensating you. If you're performing research for an outside third party, if you're being contracted by some other company to do research for them, you would negotiate the terms of your employment with that employer."

Wheeler, K.: "Well, and that's what I'm trying to say in that case."

Guzzardi: "Right. So, there's..."

Wheeler, K.: "So, I..."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Guzzardi: "...there's a bright line there for sure."

Wheeler, K.: "Okay. I'm going to back to our analysis here, very quickly, Will, 'cause I don't want to take the whole afternoon up with this. But the... the comment here says the University of Illinois objects to the bargaining unit and DRA and professional graduate students because the research does not work as a final part of the graduate education. I know you read something else differently there, but we've got to figure out why there's a disconnect here and why U of I is not more involved in this process. In my mind, it would clear up a lot of confusion perhaps in... in us understanding what the original intention was and what your intention is now."

Guzzardi: "Sure. Yeah, it's... I think the university has... is putting forth a rather confusing position on this Bill. They clearly acknowledge in their work rules in their handbook that these research assistants are doing work, that they're workers; and that, therefore, they're doing work. So, it's inconsistent for them to suggest all of a sudden that these people are somehow just doing this for fun or are interested in you know, pursuing their own academic studies. They're compensating these folks. They're setting the rules of their employment and they're creating meaningful work product that helps enhance the prestige and value of the university. So, it seems pretty black and white to me that they're employees and they should be able to join the union."

Wheeler, K.: "Well, I'll say one thing before I close here that...
that... my friends at the U of I, when I was a student many
years ago there, were some of the best in the world at what
they were doing and they were doing cutting edge things. So,

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

I... I certainly think there's value to what they do. However, to the Bill, very quickly. I... I wish we had more engagement from the U of I on this and in clarity so we could... could move forward with a unified voice in this, we're not there yet. Unfortunately, I'll be voting 'no'. But I appreciate the conversation."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Riley."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Riley: "Representative Guzzardi, wouldn't you say that any differences between a research assistant, teaching assistant at different colleges and universities is really in the eye of the beholder, that a lot of times these terms are sort of used interchangeably?"

Guzzardi: "I would say that. And I would say that students often are in both roles during the course of their employ at the graduate program that they transfer back and forth that the students themselves are operating interchangeably between the roles."

Riley: "You know a lot of... a lot of things have not changed in research assistants and teaching assistants at the graduate level. I was one back in the... in the dark ages. Those that still exist right now are doing much the same kinds of things. And I know in testimony, you know, sitting on Approp-Higher Education I've often asked some of the higher education institutions, you know, if you've got research assistants doing a lot of things, you've got a lot of them, you know, why don't you hire more tenure track faculty? But I think that that's also a realization about the rigor that these

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

people are actually performing. And a lot of what they do is not necessarily furthering their own degree, getting their master's or PhD or whatever they're doing, they are doing and adding to the research of a lot of really great researches at these institutions, wouldn't you say?"

Guzzardi: "I would say so, Representative."

Riley: "And... and let me just state, you know, oftentimes and I... I think I said a few years ago, everybody likes to say, well, there's a study or research says. And one of the things I said a couple of years ago is, state what it is. Just don't say that, those are sort of weasel words. Well, I'll give you an idea of some actual research that was done. In 1984, and I'm sure these things are still going now, there was a... what they call a program project looking at speech and swallowing in cancer patients. It was cosponsored by the National Cancer Institute. And a lot of the research was done by graduate assistants at that particular time. There was also a study in 1977, and there've been subsequent studies, where people were looking at dual labor market economic analyses of manpower training programs. And that was done by research assistants. They didn't get paid. They didn't make a whole lot of money, but a lot of good research was done. So, to the Bill, Mr... to the Body. To the Bill. This is a Bill that makes a lot of sense. It makes a lot of sense. And what it does is it recognizes the kind of work that these people are doing. And last time I checked, no matter what your status is as a research assistant or whether you're... you're in a union or not, I don't think you've lost your First Amendment right. This Bill makes a lot of sense. Vote 'aye'."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Guzzardi to close."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let me just briefly address the points made by the Lady from Wheaton who said that we should not support this Bill; in fact, this union shouldn't exist because she disagrees with the political stance that the union takes. That these people's First Amendment rights should be stripped of them because the gentle Lady disagrees with a political stance that they take. People's First Amendment rights should not be accessible to them because we disagree with their politics. You guys have a word for that; it's called snowflake'. That's what you guys say to us when we say people shouldn't be allowed to speak because we disagree with their politics, you guys call us snowflakes for that. I would say that the First Amendment rights of these workers ought to be protected irrespective of whether we agree with their political position. This is a simple matter of equity. Graduate students or TAs or research assistants or administrative assistants they should be treated the same. Let's not make this Bill about anything that it's not. It's a very simple Bill. I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you, Members."

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 take the record. On this question, there are 66 voting 'yes', 49 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2641, Mr. Turner. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2641, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. This Bill was read a second time previous

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

day. Amendment 2 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendments 3 and 4 were adopted previously. No further Amendments. A fiscal... fiscal notes have been requested but not filed at this time."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Turner on a Motion."

Turner: "I'd like to move to have the fiscal note deemed inapplicable."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wheeler."

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

Speaker Lang: "The Sponsor yields."

Wheeler, K.: "Representative, the... the rules have been requested for this particular Amendments 3 and 4. You intend to hold those inapplicable, is that correct?"

Turner: "I am moving to deem the fiscal note inapplicable."

Wheeler, K.: "Okay. Okay. I see the ones that are already applied.

We object to that and would request a Roll Call vote, Mr.

Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Those in... those who support the Gentleman's Motion will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 61 voting 'yes', 47 voting 'no'. The Gentleman's Motion prevails. The note is held inapplicable. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "No further notes have been requested."

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

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2641, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Turner."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Body. Senate Bill 2641 makes changes to the Illinois Vehicle Code in an effort to make the same regulations that currently apply to car rental companies apply to personal car facilitation companies, i.e. peer-to-peer carsharing companies. A peerto-peer carsharing company will be subject to, most importantly, the following regulations: taxation, liability, financial responsibility. And it would also have to comply with rules and regulations currently imposed on rental companies including requiring that a user meet the minimum age, inspecting driver's license, providing users with an emergency telephone number for roadside assistance and other customer service inquiries, keeping a record of the motor vehicle's registration number, along with the renter's name and address, registering with the Department of Revenue for automobile renting, occupation and use tax certificates. I'd ask for the support of the Body."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Welter."

Welter: "Mr. Speaker, does the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Welter: "Representative, was this Bill negotiated with the affected industry members? Was there a... a meeting with all interested parties to try to work out some of the concerns?"

Turner: "I, like you, Representative, have been visited by many people interested in this piece of legislation on both sides of the aisle... I mean, on both sides of the issue. And I have not been presented with any legislation to... to amend this Bill in a certain way. I've just... heard about the procedure and that I should slow the Bill down."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Welter: "Okay. So, there's been no proposed language or anything presented to you at this time?"

Turner: "No, Representative."

Welter: "Okay. Representative, do rental car companies pay taxes when they purchase their cars like ordinary citizens would when they purchase a vehicle?"

Turner: "Can you repeat the question, Representative?"

Welter: "Do rental car companies pay taxes when they purchase their cars like ordinary people do when they pay sales tax when they purchase a vehicle?"

Turner: "They're exempt on the purchase."

Welter: "Okay. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. Members, this is not an agreed to Bill. In fact, I... I don't believe it's even close at this point. With this legislation, we are rushing to regulate a new and emerging industry that has to do with the mobility without the discussions being held that I think need to happen. This Bill is a tax Bill. It's adding a new tax to one sector of the car serving industry without truly bringing the others to the table. This Bill does not provide parity to the rental car industry. Instead it tries to eliminate or stifle a new and innovative business model that would allow more consumer choice. This Bill needs a lot of work and I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there are probably some very good things in this Bill and I don't doubt that. But this Bill was written by one car... by one rental car company, one rental car company, brought to the floor probably about two... two weeks ago. We have here a

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

conflict of new technology and current law, very similar to what we had with Uber and Lyft and Airbnb. If you remember with Uber, we had a Bill introduced and... and there was a lot of give and take and Uber finally came up with agreed language. In Chicago where Airbnb was... there was a concern about Airbnb in the... the rental units that are being used up there and they weren't paying the taxes, they got together with the City of Chicago and they came up with agreed language to... to regulate the Airbnb. Very similar thing here. We have a new technology. I've never used it, some people probably have. But we have a new technology and we have one rental car company simply pushing back. And saying, no we want... they absolutely have to do it our way. I think that's wrong. While I think they probably have some good ideas, I also think that this should be a negotiated settlement. I think we're rushing to judgement here. I really ask you to look at this. And I know there are a lot of folks who have already signed on. But again, it is a new technology that needs... that needs thoughtful consideration as to how we regulate that new technology. So, before we rush off and say, okay, that ... that rental car company wrote the Bill so let's just give them exactly what they want, let's pull back and say, come together, come up with some sort of an agreed Bill that makes sense that's... that's complimentary to both sides. I'd recommend a 'no' vote before we rush out on this. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Skillicorn."

Skillicorn: "Due to a potential conflict of interest, I will be 'present' on this Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wehrli."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Wehrli: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I'd like to thank Leader Turner for bringing this legislation forward. This is... for many of the reasons that he so eloquently stated, this is a good Bill. What he stated though is only on the renter's side of things. I... I want someone to imagine if you're driving down the highway and you get hit by one of these cars that's... that was rented to somebody that may not even have a driver's license, may not have insurance, what are the repercussions then? We need to put some framework behind how these businesses operate. I... I am a strong believer in limited government, but we can't have no government when it comes to things like this. This is a good piece of legislation. I strongly encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Evans."

Evans: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Question to the Sponsor?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Evans: "Leader Turner, we know we have ride sharing and I think we had some robust conversations about ride sharing versus taxi. But ride sharers call their business model and their call their businesses 'ride sharing'. What are these companies who today they may say... or some of the supporters may say, vehicle sharing, but what do they identify themselves as doing?"

Turner: "Peer-to-peer carsharing companies, Representative."

Evans: "And on their advertisement they utilize that they're renting cars, there's a car rental, correct?"

Turner: "One of the largest participants in the industry advertises this as a better way to rent."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Evans: "To rent? Also, if you look, is there any safeguards against individuals setting up their own quasi rental companies with a limited amount of cars, 30 or 40 cars? Is there any safeguards against that?"

Turner: "No, there isn't currently, Representative. And that's kind of... part of the genesis for this legislation. You could easily have a used car dealership owner or somebody who has a car lot with multiple cars on it that are not moving and put their cars up on this platform and rent their cars out to other people. The fact of the matter is, they're not paying any taxes to the State of Illinois, there are no consumer protections involved in it, there's insurance liabilities that aren't answered. And those are the sort of things that we're trying to address with this piece of legislation."

Evans: "And thank you, Leader Turner, for bringing this. And to the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, I believe in innovation. I'm young or what have you. But we should not allow individuals who want to call something sharing to avoid going through the process of what a normal business would go through. We can't let restaurants just call it food sharing and we can't just allow any little old business to set and call it sharing. This is clear cut what it is, it is avoiding being a rental car company. And I request your support. Thank you, Leader Turner."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Turner to close."

Turner: "Just a few points. To those that talked about the process and this not being... this Bill having moved too fast, you know, we made four Amendments on this Bill. This Bill came through committee twice. We had one opponent speak in opposition and

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

the second time it came through there were no opponents who spoke in opposition. I didn't receive any draft language since I've introduced this Bill. And to... to just put off something like this when we have consumer protections that need to be addressed, that we're trying to take care of in this legislation, I think is just not good policy. It's bad government here in Illinois. And so, we need to put these protections in place, regulate this industry, generate their revenue... the tax revenue that will come from this industry that has been operating in Illinois unregulated in a grey area for over two years. Turo has been in business since 2009. There are hundreds of thousands of cars that are totally operating unregulated in Illinois right now. And there's no tax revenue coming to the state from it. That's not good for the state. I urge an 'aye' vote."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 78 voting 'yes' 34 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2651, Representative Chapa LaVia to handle for Representative Tabares. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2651, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Tabares."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Chapa LaVia."

Chapa LaVia: "Yes, Speaker and Members of the House. House Floor Amendment 1 is a gut and replace Amendment and it becomes the

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Bill. It retains the engrossed Bill, requires the Election Authority is report on the conditions of their voting equipment every two years."

Speaker Lang: "Sorry. Please proceed."

Chapa LaVia: "Is this on Second or can we..."

Speaker Lang: "This... this is an Amendment, Representative."

Chapa LaVia: "Okay. If we can adopt..."

Speaker Lang: "Please tell us about the Amendment."

Chapa LaVia: "Yes. If we can adopt the Amendment. But what... it does two things. It specifically requires that the... the Election Authority's report on the conditions of their voting equipment every two years to the State Board of Elections and that the State Board of Elections post this information on their website. The second point, it requires individuals or organizations to use P.O. Box for vote by mail applications to provide contact information and turn over applications within a certain timeframe. And third, it requires the State Board of Elections to adopt rules to establish a cybersecurity program to support the Election Authority's effort to defend against cyber breaches and utilize no less than half of the federal funds provided by the State Board of Education for this purpose. I'll take any questions."

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. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2651, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Speaker Lang: "Representative Chapa LaVia."

Chapa LaVia: "I went... I went over the Bill, Sir. I'll take any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Fortner."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Fortner: "Representative, when we talked about this in committee one of the concerns that was raised by the State Board of Elections is they are already underway in trying to deal with the cybersecurity threats that really arose when we were hacked back in the summer of 2016. And in those committee discussions I think we were all of an agreement that we wanted to make sure that there was nothing in what was being proposed in this Bill that would slow them down in any way. So, I'd like to ask a couple of statements for the intent of this Bill to make sure that they're going to be able to get their work done and keep doing it on a timely fashion. Is that okay?"

Chapa LaVia: "I agree 100 percent. I couldn't have said it better."

Fortner: "So the first question is, it is our intent that nothing in this language is designed to impede their ability to work with other state agencies and the counties that are doing this in order to put together an appropriate cybersecurity plan for state elections?"

Chapa LaVia: "Correct. There's nothing in this Bill that would impede them of doing their jobs at the other departments."

Fortner: "It's also our intent that as part of the rulemaking process that is required with the public hearings in this

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

legislation that it is our intent that if they wish to seek an emergency rule in order to proceed in a timely fashion, it is our intent that they be able to do so?"

Chapa LaVia: "Ab... absolutely."

Fortner: "And that as they move forward that in their rulemaking there are terms like cyber navigator that are not fully defined in here, that it is our intent that through the rulemaking they can define what that means so that it really works well with what they're putting together for their cybersecurity?"

Chapa LaVia: "Cor..."

Speaker Lang: "Please bring your answer to an end and your comments to a close, Sir."

Chapa LaVia: "Thank you. Yes, I want to thank Representative Fortner for putting this into record. Yes, we will. In fact, knowing the chairwoman, if we see that we have to put different definitions into statute to fit into their work that they're doing, we'd be more than happy to get that done for... in January."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Fortner."

Fortner: "Thank you. So, yeah, and I... I appreciate that. I want to make sure that the Body knows that we appreciate the work on the Bill that has been bipartisan. We had some initial concerns when this language came up; the State Board of Elections reached out. The... the director appeared before the committee and they were very concerned because they have been very aggressively engaged trying to address the results of our system being hacked in the summer of 2016. We certainly want them to continue on that pace and as part of that, to

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

access the federal funds that are available to help Illinois with its cybersecurity. And we certainly don't want to delay that process through what would be a conventional rulemaking process. And so, I... I thank the Sponsor for clarifying that it is our intent that they... we are not doing anything to slow that down with this. This simply provides the back end transparency to the process. But it does not slow them down or impede them from working with all the entities of the state that they need to, to make us secure in our elections. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wheeler."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Wheeler, K.: "Thank you. Representative, I'm looking at our analysis here and I'm looking at... there's two questions I have for you. One is regard to the vote by mail sent to post office boxes. Was that in response to a specific situation that occurred earlier?"

Chapa LaVia: "It has to do with the Rock Island incident, yeah."
Wheeler, K.: "Okay. That's... I... I just wanted to clarify about that's what you were working at there. And then, I just wanted to follow up on what the Representative from West Chicago had just mentioned regarding the cybersecurity efforts of the State Board of Elections. Many of us saw that our Illinois State Board of Elections was featured in the... I think a 60 Minutes piece regarding cybersecurity issues. And my analysis doesn't seem clear to me. It says they're required to access federal funds. Are those federal funds for cybersecurity measures or federal funds just to run the election process?"

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

- Chapa LaVia: "They're for specifically for the cybersecurity because of what's been going on in the country. And to touch a little bit back here, if that's your last question, is that we're not impeding in any way the rulemaking. So, they can actually stick in definitions what they think cybersecurity, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera are. We're not messing with any of that."
- Wheeler, K.: "So, you're saying I'll see that when I'm in a JCAR meeting at some point down the future?"

Chapa LaVia: "Yeah."

Wheeler, K.: "I look forward to that. Thank you very much. I appreciate your efforts."

Chapa LaVia: "You're welcome. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Chapa LaVia to close."

Chapa LaVia: "I request an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady'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? Feigenholtz. Please take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Leader Turner in the Chair."
- Speaker Turner: "Senate Bill 2707, Representative Davidsmeyer.

 Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2707, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill for a third time."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2707, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Davidsmeyer."
- Davidsmeyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is an initiative of the Civil Service Commission, basically allows them to have a more reasonable timeframe to get things accomplished. They're still sticking with those 60 days, but if they... if they need to request more information from someone, it gives an additional time to request that information. I encourage an 'ave' vote."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2707 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 2707, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Feigenholtz, for what reason do you seek consideration?"
- Feigenholtz: "I had intended on voting 'yes' for Senate Bill 2651.

 My switch was malfunctioning."
- Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative. The Journal will reflect your request. Senate Bill 3052, Representative Arroyo. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3052, a Bill for an Act concerning business. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, Senate Bill 3052."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3052, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Arroyo."

Arroyo: "Speaker, I just want to move it to Third."

Speaker Turner: "It's on Third."

Arroyo: "All right. Give me a minute."

Speaker Turner: "Do you want to take it out of the record right now or do you want to call it?"

Arroyo: "No. No. No. No."

Speaker Turner: "Okay. Then it's on Third and you're ready to go,
Representative."

Arroyo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 3052 caps the amount that a contractor may withhold from the contractor's until the contractor or the subcontractor completes his work, commonly referred to a retainage amount. Under Senate Bill 3052, the... the owner may only withhold the retainage amount of only more than 10 percent payment until the contractor completes less than 50 percent the total project and more than 5 percent subsequent payment. Therefore, I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Breen is recognized."

Breen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What's our debate rule for this one?"

Speaker Turner: "Representative, this Bill is on the Order of Short Debate."

Breen: "As they all are. Let's... let's move to Standard Debate,
Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "This Bill will be moved to the Order of Standard Debate. You may proceed, Representative."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

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

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

Breen: "Representative, I... I'm looking at your Bill, in which, obviously, we continue to... I think each General Assembly we've considered this Bill. And I have a list of opponents: the Community Bankers, the Illinois Association of Realtors, the Illinois Bankers Association, the Illinois Credit Union League, the Illinois Municipal League, the Illinois Land Title Association. Are those still opponents to your Bill?"

Arroyo: "I believe so."

Breen: "Okay. Representative, where did you come up with the 10 percent number and then the 5 percent number?"

Arroyo: "Well, this Bill was brought to me by the contractors and small businesses and they feel that this is good for the small business. And to hold more than 10 percent for a small contractor, it won't... it would not help them to stay in business. They can't complete the jobs. So, they brought this to us to be able to help the small business. I consider this to be a jobs Bill and to help minorities to keep working."

Breen: "All right. And then... but this is a relationship. This is a contract issue not between... not between a homeowner and a contractor but between two businesses, whether it's a contractor and subcontractor, but it's a business to business relationship..."

Arroyo: "Right."

Breen: "...right?"

Arroyo: "Yes. Absolutely."

Breen: "Okay. What is a developer supposed to do if a contractor fails mid-project and it costs more than 10 percent... they

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

lose more than 10 percent? How are they supposed to retain or... or to..."

Arroyo: "Well, that's a change order."

Breen: "...get that back?"

Arroyo: "That's a change order. If there's something different to the contract, they've got to put a change order in there to be able to complete the job. But the contractor also... if they're not satisfied, they've got to tell the contractor that they have to complete it. That doesn't have anything to do withholding 5 or 10 percent."

Breen: "Right. But if you have a contractor that starts a job, they get up... up to speed on the job. They do all the... the preparation work and they start working, you've paid them an amount of money. And then all of a sudden they drop off. Then you've got a lot more than 10 percent or 5 percent loss. You've got... could be as high as a 50 percent loss, trying to find a new contractor, get them up to speed, possibly on short notice, having to work extra hours."

Arroyo: "Representative, this doesn't have much to do with that.

This does not address that. This only addresses the... the retainage you can hold back."

Breen: "I'm... I'm talking about... but this is a... in commercial. Now I... now I... I do have a... I mean, I have a family member that hired an unscrupulous contractor, they had the guy go halfway through the job, they were paying him and then they had to bring in somebody new and it was double or triple the cost. It was a terrible, terrible thing. And of course, the Attorney General couldn't do anything 'cause the original guy was off the face of the earth and what have you. So, I mean that's

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

the... that's the residential side. So, obviously, this 5 or 10 percent could not work there. But on the commercial side, it's the same issue. Somebody can just drop off, you know, drop off the project for whatever reason and they're..."

Arroyo: "I think..."

Breen: "...in terrible shape. The whole project is... is ruined."

Arroyo: "Well, Representative, I think he just made a wrong decision and picked the wrong contractor. That's happened to me myself. I'm building a house now in Florida and I've been through three contractors. But Florida is a right to work..."

Breen: "Wait... wait. You're building a house in Florida?"

Arroyo: "I think so."

Breen: "Are you going to keep paying our newly heightened income taxes while you're down there? Or I... I don't think they have an income tax and I think they're property tax is about a third ours."

Arroyo: "That's why I won't vote for the right to work."

Breen: "All right. All right. Here we go."

Arroyo: "'Cause Florida is a right to work state."

Breen: "It is a right to work state, yes. To... to the Bill, Mr. Speaker. Look, the folks who are some of the... the best supporters of business and building, the realtors, all the bankers, and the Credit Union League and the Municipal League are all vehemently opposed to this Bill. And look, we know full well that 5 or 10 percent retainage is not enough, if a contractor goes south on you. And so, would vigorously urge a 'no' vote. And I would like to yield the balance of my time to Representative Wheeler. Keith Wheeler. To Representative..."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Speaker Turner: "Representative Breen would like to yield the rest of his time to Representative Reick. Forty seconds."

Reick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I speak from personal experience here. To the Bill. I used to own a title company. And one thing that I found is that contractors, if they know they don't have a lot sitting there waiting for their final takeout, they're going to go move on to the next contract where they're going to get a big first payout... takeout. And they're going to leave that take... that residual sitting at the title company because it's not enough to justify them going and finishing the finishing... to finish the job. I've seen this happen. And I think that lowering the retainage at this point will... will do a lot of harm in especially the smaller..."

Speaker Turner: "Close your remarks, Representative."

Reick: "Thank you, Sir. I believe that reducing the retainage only encourages small contractors who have got another project on the horizon and are looking at a big first takeout... who are going to... who are... who think that the issue is one of let's... let's leave that sit there and move on to bigger and better things. They play the float, so to speak, on these things. I real... I understand what you're trying to do here. I understand that small contractors are squeezed on these things. But I also see the... the point on the other side where you have contractors who think that their best interest is at... lies in going on to the next job. I'm sorry. I just cannot support this Bill from the standpoint of personal experience. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Keith Wheeler."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

- Wheeler, K.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor indicates that he will yield."
- Wheeler, K.: "Thank you. Representative, I've gone back and forth on this a couple of times. And... and I'm looking to support this Bill at a level where you can help me understand if this retainage of 10 percent and 5 percent are limits. They're not mandated numbers. So, there's still the ability of a developer and a contractor to negotiate what they want the retainage to be?"
- Arroyo: "Yes. The contractor could still negotiate, the banker could."
- Wheeler, K.: "So, as long as it doesn't exceed that 10 percent level for the first 50 percent of the project or 5 percent on the last half of the project?"

Arroyo: "Right."

Wheeler, K.: "And to clarify a couple things for our discussion.

How we determine if a project is 50 percent completed, would

a... would you use the AIA billing approach so that people..."

Arroyo: "I... I didn't hear that?"

Wheeler, K.: "So, it was brought up earlier that how do we know, you know, 50 percent of a project is... is kind of an arbitrary number in some people's minds, but if progress billing is being used on a project, it actually already is in place to know when you are at 50 percent of that process and when you can kick that down to the 5 percent level. Would that be accurate?"

Arroyo: "Yes."

Wheeler, K.: "Thank you. I'm going to go to the Bill then. Ladies and Gentlemen, I come from a contracting background. And I

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

can tell you that retainage can be a real issue for... for those of us who are trying to make a living. When the profit margin's 2, or 3, or maybe a good project's 5 percent and you're withholding 10 percent for a long period of time, you are carrying the float for a long ways. Your project... your profit for an entire year can be tied up in retainage. Moving forward it's difficult to get financing and secure other loans just even for cash flow purposes. So, while this not... may not be the perfect vehicle, I think it may help some contractors. And... especially the smaller contractors, the ones I am generally looking out for. So, in that case, I'll be voting 'aye'. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Phillips."

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

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

Phillips: "State Representative Arroyo, I've got a question for you. Have you ever been in negotiations on any of these kind of contracts?"

Arroyo: "No."

Phillips: "So, you have no clue exactly what takes place on some of these contracts? Have you ever..."

Arroyo: "You... you asked me a question, I said no. But I... I know what this is about."

Phillips: "Have you ever seen one of these contracts?"

Arroyo: "So, you... don't put no words in my mouth, please."

Phillips: "Have you ever seen one of these contracts and what it takes to put one of these together?"

Arroyo: "Yes, I have."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Phillips: "Do you... on those contracts you've seen, are they all the same?"

Arroyo: "They're all different."

Phillips: "So, each person negotiates with each contractor differently? Have you ever..."

Arroyo: "Each contract is different, yes."

Phillips: "So you've seen some of these contractors where they put up mobilization costs and you have to pay the mobilization costs up front?"

Arroyo: "Yes."

Phillips: "That's where the subcontractor moves on to the job site, he mobilizes that site and you pay him up front for that?"

Arroyo: "Yes."

Phillips: "Do you think these percentages that are for payouts, you know, some of these contracts are paid out monthly, some are paid out quarterly, everything's a little bit different 'cause it's fluid and everybody's making these contracts?"

Arroyo: "They're usually paid out in stages according to how you finish the work."

Phillips: "Have you... have you actually seen where one of these payouts are an exact science?"

Arroyo: "No."

Phillips: "Now, see they're very difficult to figure out, you know, at what's 20 percent and what's 30 percent. So, you negotiate these things out front. And most of these contractors, we... we all agree, there's never been a problem that I've ever seen or heard of from anybody about, you know, withholding the 10 percent because..."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Arroyo: "Well, you... you want me to explain to you what the problem... some of the problems could be and some of the problems that we're going through now?"

Phillips: "Well, I... I'd rather tell you some of the problems on the other side of that. You know, when contractors..."

Arroyo: "Okay. When you..."

Phillips: "...walk away and then you're left trying..."

Arroyo: "Right. And when you finish with that..."

Phillips: "...to finish the project."

Arroyo: "...I'll tell you some of the problems on this side of the aisle."

Phillips: "Well, Sir, I... this is something that I think we need to just stay out of. Every time we get involved in these contracts for these builders all we do is chase them out of the state. And this particular thing it's worked for years, and years, and years. We negotiate these fronts up. I've got three contracts now with the union groups. We negotiate them over a few days. They agree to it, we agree to it and then we sign it. Why do you need to be involved in it? That's what I don't understand."

Arroyo: "Representative, can I answer your question from the first time you asked, if you don't mind? I'll tell you what happens to the small contractor when a bank or a big contractor doesn't pay them. They go out of business because they hold... right now, there's contractors that hold their money for a year and two years and never get paid."

Phillips: "Oh, whoa, whoa, whoa, whoa."

Arroyo: "They want to take you out of business."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Phillips: "Where do you see they hold them for a year? The contracts are specific. After a certain... once they finish the work you..."

Arroyo: "I'll bring you some documents over there when I get through with this Bill."

Phillips: "Well, I'd really like to see those documents says I don't have to pay a contractor..."

Arroyo: "I... I will."

Phillips: "...for a year. There is no such animal in the State of Illinois. Nobody would sign a contract. I wouldn't sign it.

Nobody signs a contract to say you can pay me a year after you've completed the work."

Arroyo: "Wake... wake-up."

Phillips: "Sir, I'm actually involved in this. Have you ever hired anybody?"

Arroyo: "I've never hired a big contractor like that..."

Phillips: "Well, that's the problem, Sir. If you would have..."

Arroyo: "...but today there's people that haven't been..."

Phillips: "...you would know that this is a crazy Bill."

Arroyo: "...paid for a year and they get taken out of business.

That's what this is about."

Phillips: "To the Bill, Sir."

Arroyo: "Thank you."

Phillips: "And here's another situation where the State of Illinois is getting involved in things they shouldn't be getting involved in. And all you're doing is putting nails in the coffin for anybody that wants to build in the State of Illinois. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Yingling."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Yingling: "Thank... thank you, Speaker. Just to the Bill. I meant...

I have a conflict of interest on this and will be voting
'present'."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Andersson."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Ladies and Andersson: Gentlemen, let's be clear about what this Bill does and doesn't do. This is not about government contracts. In fact, government contracts are exempt from this provision. This is about large scale multi-family unit developments, industrial and commercial. All private. Private... private businesses, private contractors, private subcontractors. And now we have decided, as the State of Illinois, that we are going to interfere with their ability to contract. So, fundamentally to me this is... this violates a basic premise, which is that parties to a contract get to negotiate their own deals. Number two, the practical limitations of this are virtually impossible to deal with. Understand, there's not one contractor and one subcontractor. There's going to be 1 contractor and 20 subs. And a lot of times those subs have to coordinate with each other during the time of the year whether they can do the work or not, exactly how that all gets done. And sometimes we won't know if there's a problem with construction until long after that 50 percent mark. So, you are asking to put developers and contractors at risk with those subs because there will no longer be accountability for how that gets done. But fundamentally to me, quite honestly, this is just an area we don't need to get into. I have not heard complaints. I have not had difficulties and I've negotiated many of these deals on behalf of my clients. The

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

architectural contracts that we use, the AIA contracts, fully address this. The architects have the ability to determine substantial compliance and when it occurs. This isn't needed and doing it interferes with the private rights of individuals. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Batinick is recognized."

Batinick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Due to a conflict of interest I'll be voting 'present'."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Arroyo to close."

Arroyo: "I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 3052 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Members, please record yourself. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 63 voting in 'favor', 48 voting 'against', and 4 voting 'present', Senate Bill 3052, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 40... on page 14 of the Calendar, under Consideration Postponed, we have House Bill 4873 offered by Leader Lang. Mr. Clerk... Leader Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I think when this Bill failed previously it was because of a lack of understanding of what the Bill does. So, when... when we passed Pay Day Loan Reform we allowed a fee to be charged by people called verifiers. These verifiers come in and make sure that the consumer is the right consumer for the right loan. These people protect the consumers. Some people thought this was an expansion of a fee for consumers, but in fact, it was an expansion of a fee so that consumers could be protected to

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

keep them out of bad loans, to make sure they are not put into bad loans, to make sure they don't continue in a cycle of debt. This simply increases the fee. This fee is paid by the lender and it can be passed on to the consumer but, we're talking about a very, very small fee. And this is to make sure that an unspecting person who wants to get one of these loans isn't put in the wrong loan, the wrong installment or to violate his rights as a consumer. This is actually a consumer protection issue. Please vote 'aye'."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Davidsmeyer is recognized."

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

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

Davidsmeyer: "So... so, this is something that allows them to have proper background checks to ensure that they can make the payments and things of that sort?"

Lang: "That's correct, Sir. And... and one thing I didn't mention, this does not go into effect until July of 2020. So, it affects nobody with a current loan at all. And this would all be disclosed to any borrowers after this goes into effect."

Davidsmeyer: "And... and I just... I just want to make sure. I think a lot of times when people see the word fees up there they get concerned. But this is... this is a consumer protection, this is something that's required by law that they do these verify... verifications, correct?"

Lang: "That is correct, Sir."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. This just ensures that they can... basically send that money over to the verifiers?"

Lang: "Since we passed the original Pay Day Loan Bill, most pay day loans at that time were very short-term loans. And now,

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

most of them are extended loans over months. And so, if they don't charge an appropriate fee, they can't do the appropriate verification."

Davidsmeyer: "Yeah. I want to thank you for bringing this forward.

I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Ammons."

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

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

Ammons: "Thank you. Representative, I just wanted to clarify when this was on the board before there was a discussion that ensued that kind of didn't give light to the situation. And I want to just clarify that the fee being assessed here is (a) to ensure that consumers are not receiving predatory loans?"

Lang: "That is absolutely true."

Ammons: "And (b) then the circumstance of this assessed fee would be to cover the people who are doing the selection of the appropriate loan, making sure that they are able to pay that loan back within the term and the time that is designated on that loan?"

Lang: "That is also true. That's why I referred to this as... as consumer protection. Representative, when I passed the Pay Day Loan Reform some years ago after two or three years of working on it, I got into it because I was requested by the consumer groups to enter those discussions to protect consumers. I certainly am not going to stop doing that now."

Ammons: "I appreciate your clarification on this Bill. To the Bill. This is one of those Bills that certainly raises the

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

eyebrows of a person like me who's very concerned with the protections, especially in industries where people don't have access to traditional capital and traditional loans. And so, although this is an industry that is allegedly needed at this time, I prefer traditional loans for our community, it does have a function that we have to work within that context. And I will be supporting you in this legislation today because the clarification is to prevent people from entering into loans that are predatory and to ensure that whatever the terms are that the person can actually meet those terms of the loan and don't lose their real or personal property in repaying of any such loans. And so, with that I... I appreciate the Leader's work on this for clarification. And I appreciate his consistent ear for those who may have concerns about legislation like this. Thank you so much. And I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Lang to close."

Lang: "Please vote for this."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 4873 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 72 voting in 'favor', 43 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present', House Bill 4873, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5344, Representative Lilly. Take your time, Representative."

Lilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. SB (sic-House Bill) 5344 allows the Department of Veterans' Affairs

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

to establish a field office in each Legislative District... Senate District that is. There's no opponents. Whew... I'm breathing hard. And the Department of Veterans' Affairs is in favor of this piece of legislation."

Speaker Turner: "This Bill's on the Order of Short Debate.

Representative Breen is recognized."

Breen: "Let's move it to Standard Debate in case someone else wants to talk."

Speaker Turner: "Bill will be moved to Standard Debate. You may proceed, Sir."

"All right. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We saw this Bill the other day and so I will go directly to the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, this would enact a mandate starting January 1 of ... of 2019, so just a year before our remap year, and we would have to establish Veterans' Affairs offices gerrymandered Senate Districts that we currently have right now. So, it doesn't matter whether they need a Veterans' Affairs Office in a particular location. Doesn't matter how close or far away they'd be because of the placement of these snakelike Legislative Districts drawn by the Democrats 10 years ago. There is no relation between the placement. In fact, you'd be removing the requirement that the field offices be located so as to be necessary to enable it to perform its duties, the Veterans' Affairs Department. So, you'd actually remove the mandate that the Veterans' Affairs offices enable the department to do its work, instead throwing one in each Legislative District whether or not... no matter how large or small those Legislative Districts are. And then, you've got to move them every 10 years. This is insane. There is no

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

reason to be doing this at all. I have no idea how this Bill... I understand the Sponsor saying there are no opponents. I have no idea how that's true. If you wanted to have a mandate that the offices be evenly geographically distributed or say one office for every 10 thousand veterans or 1 thousand veterans or you choose a number in terms of a geographic distribution, that would make some sense. But the veterans of the state are not necessarily scattered around in the way the Democrats draw the maps every 10 years. And so Ladies and Gentlemen, why in the world would we take the mandate out that the department locate its offices to do its duties and then why would we in... tie the location to something that's going to change every 10 years and is drawn in a spectacularly bad and corrupt process? Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Lilly to close."

Lilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. The concerns that have been addressed at the previous meeting and discussion, particularly to one that was shared by the great Representative, there's no suggestions to the Amendment was proposed to us or proposed to me. And I was open and willing to receive those. So with that, I am running the Bill to make sure that we are addressing the needs of our veterans who are very much in need of services that makes their life... the quiet life they deserve as people who have protected us in our great military. With that, I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 5344 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting
is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record.

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

On a count of 63 voting in 'favor', 46 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present', House Bill 5344, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2562, Representative D'Amico. You may proceed, Sir."

D'Amico: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a..."

- Speaker Turner: "Excuse me. Excuse me. Mr. Clerk, please move this Bill back to the Order of Second Reading. And read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2562, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative D'Amico."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative D'Amico."
- D'Amico: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to adopt Floor Amendment 1 and debate it on Third."
- Speaker Turner: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 2562, all in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments have been approved for consideration. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, Senate Bill 2562."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2562, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. The Bill was read for a third time previously." Speaker Turner: "Representative D'Amico."
- D'Amico: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Last week we had a very spirited debate on this Bill. I learned a lot from our debate that we had, you guys had a lot of suggestions for us on what we could to make this Bill better. We took this Bill back, did some work on it. We increased the number from 100 people to 1500.

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

And we also took out facial and biometric recognition. And I hope that made the Bill a lot better for everybody. It seems as we were talking to people they liked it a lot better. Appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "This Bill is on the Order of Standard Debate.

Representative Williams is recognized."

Williams: "Hi. I would like to request Extended Debate."

Speaker Turner: "Standard is Extended."

Williams: "Oh. Unlimited Debate?"

Speaker Turner: "Excuse me, Representative."

Williams: "There's something more than Standard."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Williams, Extended Debate."

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

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

Williams: "Just a couple of questions. You mentioned the facial recognition technology was removed. Can you elaborate on what you mean by that? I mean..."

D'Amico: "We are prohibiting it even in the future. I mean, even though that doesn't exist today, we are prohibiting it in the future."

Williams: "Okay. I think we need to make a distinction though between having facial recognition technology actually on the physical drone and using a recording or utilizing the pictures to compare it to software, say, at the office of OAMC or CPD offices. Certainly you can use facial recognition technology with the images that were captured. Isn't that correct?"

D'Amico: "The... the drones that the CPD will be flying do not have facial recognition. These drones typically weigh 55 pounds.

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

- They do not have that capability at all. And if... even if they did, we are prohibiting it."
- Williams: "But I don't think you're prohibiting utilizing the images captured via the drone from being utilized... from utilizing facial recognition technology. It just says, shall not equip the drone with facial recognition technology. So, I think it... isn't that correct? Does that make sense?"
- D'Amico: "Well, it... the... the way I understand it, these drones cannot even be equipped with what you're talking about. And we took it a step further and prohibited it."
- Williams: "Okay. I... okay. Second question, there's been some confusion on the floor today about whether public... whether citizens can capture or can figure out what information... excuse me, whether any information as to the usage of drones can be available to the public. Is this... why does this Bill not provide for citizens to know how and when drones are being used to monitor them without a warrant?"
- D'Amico: "Well, I'm glad you asked that question. So, the public...
 you... you can FOIA the use of the drones, you know, where
 they're going to be flying them. You will know... you'll be
 able to determine what neighborhoods they've been flown in,
 how often they've been flown, how many permits they've been
 pulled. As far as getting what the drones have been... been
 capturing, you know, that... that could hinder an investigation
 and they don't want to do that."
- Williams: "Okay. Often when you have issues like this that implicate FOIA there is language in the Bill that would say something like, nothing in this Act shall preclude the release of information regarding the deployment of drones, the date

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

of deployment, location of deployment under FOIA, if it does not interfere with investigation. That language is not in here leaving what I fear is a gray area in terms of public information on FOIA. Plus we all know FOIA has a discretionary component. Would you consider working with me in the future to ensure that the public can information to the date of the deployment, location of the deployment and how drones are used?"

D'Amico: "I'm always willing to work with you and make a Bill better."

Williams: "Okay. Thank you. To the Bill. I am concerned, and while I have the upmost respect for the Sponsor, I am concerned about not including some of this language in the Bill about the topics we just discussed. Just to be clear, the only substantive change to this Bill was that the number of people which constitutes a large gathering is increased to 1500. But let's be clear, this Bill still allows police, without a warrant, to fly over any gathering, including First Amendment protests and marches, for no reason at all as long as they're looking for possible criminal activity. There's possible criminal activity anywhere. I think we all know that. Possibly here. But that's way too vaque and for the kind of intense surveillance we're talking about with no limitations on how sensitive the cameras are, how close the cameras can zoom in, it is excessive. Much too vague. Secondly, the facial recognition piece. That is a red herring. The drones and the language reads that the drones shall not be equipped with facial recognition technology. I agree with what the Representative said, they're too heavy. You can't put a facial

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

recognition tool on the actual drone, but the images captured on the drone, whether still or video, can be taken back to CPD or headquarters and run using facial recognition software quite easily and that's what will happen. You can look at your phone, take a picture and on Facebook they recognize you and they want to tag you. It's easy to do. And that's so... so the images captured by the drones can still be run through facial recognition technology. So, I would not rely on that exemption and feel better about that piece. Finally, and I think almost most significantly, this Bill will increase the ability of law enforcement to monitor and record its citizens in mass on a scale we have never seen before. It is a vast expansion of government monitoring and surveillances. And in light of this dramatic policy change, which has major civil liberties implications, at a minimum the public should know when law enforcement employs..."

Speaker Turner: "Please make your final comment, Representative."
Williams: "...when law enforcement employs a drone without a
warrant, how often, when and where. Again, the interest of
public safety must be balanced with our civil liberties. This
is particularly critical where the First Amendment is
involved. This Bill does not strike the balance,
unfortunately, which is why I'll be voting 'no'. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative DeLuca."

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

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

DeLuca: "Thank you. Representative D'Amico, where did the original number come from? It was at 100?"

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

D'Amico: "The orig... the original number was part of a negotiation the city had with the ACLU."

DeLuca: "And where did the 1500 number come from?"

D'Amico: "The 1500 number came from a collaboration of a lot of people, a lot of Legislators here suggested it. The city suggested it, that we raise it to 1500. It seemed to be a number that everybody seemed to be comfortable with and something that could be acceptable throughout the state."

DeLuca: "It doesn't have anything to do with the permits that are required depending on the size of a gathering in Chicago? I mean, where did 1500 come from?"

D'Amico: "Well, they did... they came up with 1500 because we felt by the debate that we had here on the floor we'd be infringing on First Amendment rights on some of the small gatherings."

DeLuca: "Okay. If... if there's a gathering of 400 people..."

D'Amico: "Yes."

DeLuca: "...under this Amendment, is law enforcement prohibited from flying a drone?"

D'Amico: "Flying a drone, yes."

DeLuca: "What if they believe that there is potential criminal activity there or they know that there are... there's known gang members there or other individuals that they would identify as known criminals?"

D'Amico: "They would probably be manning it manually with their horses."

DeLuca: "They what? I couldn't hear you."

D'Amico: "What's that?"

DeLuca: "I couldn't hear you. They would what?"

D'Amico: "They would probably be manning it manually."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

DeLuca: "They would be doing what manually?"

D'Amico: "They would be there... the police officers would be there themselves as opposed to flying drones."

DeLuca: "Well, I would think there's a lot of folks in this chamber would be more upset about that than flying a drone. So, they're prohibited if there's 400 people?"

D'Amico: "Yes."

DeLuca: "They're completely prohibited? Even if they know that there is known gang members there and they believe that there's criminal activity that's about to take place? They can't monitor it with a drone? They have to go in there..."

D'Amico: "Well, they could also fly a helicopter as well. They're allowed to, right now, fly a helicopter actually that's armed with whatever they feel like."

DeLuca: "Okav."

D'Amico: "But a drone would be prohibited under this legislation.

But like I said, most likely..."

DeLuca: "Okay. So, the folks that..."

D'Amico: "...they would put more cops on the... on the street."

DeLuca: "...the folks that urged you to increase the number, they would prefer the cops to go in uniform, on the ground and take a look at how things are going at this gathering? They'd rather have that happen?"

D'Amico: "That's the way I understand it."

DeLuca: "All right. Well, I wish you wouldn't have amended the Bill. I'm going to support it either way. We have to give our police officers the tools that they need to keep us safe and use technology to do that. Vote 'yes'."

D'Amico: "Thank you."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative McAuliffe."

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

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

McAuliffe: "Representative, what would... what is there to prevent law enforcement from flying over every large event everywhere?"

D'Amico: "Well, it... they... they wouldn't do that. They're going to use... they're going to use their discretion to fly when they think it's necessary."

McAuliffe: "Okay. That's sounds pretty reasonable. Are there any restrictions on how... how long the police can keep this data?"

D'Amico: "Yes, 30 days."

McAuliffe: "So, after 30 days they have to destroy it or... or do whatever they have to?"

D'Amico: "Correct."

McAuliffe: "Okay. To the Bill. I think the Sponsor has done a reasonable job. There were a lot of arguments about it being in too small of a place, now he's raised it to 1500. I think this is a tool that not only the Chicago Police but police throughout the whole state can use to keep our community safe. And I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Andersson."

Andersson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll speak to the Bill. First,

I do want to congratulate Representative D'Amico for trying
to address some of the concerns. Raising it to 1500 people
from the threshold of 100 was certainly one of my major
objections. So, thank you for doing that. Notwithstanding
that, I still have to oppose the Bill. I heard a previous
Representative talk about, you know, that the police have to

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

keep us safe. Well, yeah, safety is important, but liberty is more important. If safety were the only test, we would put arresters on our cars so that we can't go more than 55 miles an hour. We would have cameras in all our homes so nothing bad could be done without it being reported immediately, but nobody wants those things. We want our liberty too. And that's what this Bill is about. And while I agree that he has improved the Bill and made it better, my concerns remain. And what ... and what they're focused on is this liberty interest. If you look at the detail of the Bill, one of the important parts is the record retention period for the videos. It's 30 days, 30 days. Now, look at a situation... let's... let's talk about what's going to happen, right? So, they launch these drones, they go over ... they go over an event and they videotape whatever they're going to videotape. Now, if the purpose of that is for public safety to ensure that nothing bad happens or they're ready to react quickly to that, okay, but let's say nothing bad did happen, there wasn't anything to react to. Shouldn't they delete the tape? They should. And in fact, the ACLU had... had developed an Amendment that was acceptable to them. Representative Ann Williams proposed it, it was rejected. That would have said for First Amendment activities they would delete the tape unless there's actually a criminal investigation within 24 hours. And for non-First Amendment stuff, 7 days. Because why do you need to keep the tape? They resisted that. They said, nope we need to keep it for 30 days. To me, that immediately raises my red flag, my suspicion. Why do they need to keep the tape? Well, maybe because they're going to run it through that facial recognition software that

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

isn't on the drone but is on the computer back at the office and use it for the things that we're afraid of or that I'm afraid of. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is about liberty. This is about privacy. We already have too little of both, this will just exacerbate it. So, while I respect the intentions of the Bill and the desire to keep us safe, I have to balance the liberty interest. And in this case, without Representative Williams' Amendment, it just doesn't do that. So, I respectfully urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Spain."

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

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

Spain: "Representative D'Amico, does your Bill only apply to the City of Chicago?"

D'Amico: "No, it does not. It applies to the whole state."

Spain: "The whole state. And could you describe your thinking...
you mentioned how in the original Bill which had a threshold
of 100 people, what the origin of that number was based on
current... current permitting activities for public events?
Could you describe how you landed on 1500 people as this
compromise?"

D'Amico: "We came... we came up with the number of 1500 based on what some of our colleagues here have suggested. And talking to some members of other communities throughout the state that have a lot of events going on that might be 1500 to 2 thousand people. If we made it too large, it would pertain to the City of Chicago only. And we want to protect all citizens across this state, not just the people in the City of Chicago."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

"Thank you, Representative. To the Bill. The point just Spain: being made is very important and as... as we all know, we have great communities throughout the entire State of Illinois. I'm proud to be from Peoria. And as an area that is the next largest metropolitan area outside of the Chicagoland area in our state, we routinely have events that are large public gatherings in our downtown, on our riverfront. They could be sporting event; they could be major runs and races. They could be music and concerts and so many different things, but 10 thousand would set that bar so high, that I agree with the Sponsor, that this Bill then would become effectively only applicable to the City of Chicago. And I think what we're saying here is that we're interested in protecting public safety throughout the state. That there are many communities that could have an interest in using this tool as an important way to enhance public safety. So, Representative, I think the compromise that you've struck here with this Bill appropriate. I think it lands at exactly the right spot. With 1500 people, that would still allow for the protection of large events in other communities outside of Chicago but not so large that the Bill would really be inapplicable. I would urge an 'aye' vote and thank you for your work."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Mah."

Mah: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I voted 'no' on the previous iteration of this Bill and I continue to be opposed. I remain troubled by the inadequate First Amendment protections in the Bill and the unaddressed possibility for immigrants to be targeted for deportation. I represent areas with large immigrant populations. Large gatherings take place

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

in my district on a regular basis. Street festivals like Moyo De Mayo, which we just had this past weekend or Fiesta Del Soul, the Mexican Independence Day Parade or Chinese New Year Parades. These events draw large crowds from all over the state. In addition, immigrant rights marches in which many from my district participate have had attendance in the thousands, 700 thousand in 2006. Despite the Amendment that's been added, there are simply inadequate assurances that immigrants, documented or undocumented, mix status families or those who wish to express their opposition to current immigration policies can feel certain that images captured by drone surveillance will not be used to punish, target, detain or deport them. The lack of safeguards to preserve constitutional protections is a grave concern to me. And I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Wallace." Wallace: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Wallace: "So, I missed the last debate. I was gone. My question is, what was the impetus of this particular piece of legislation?"

D'Amico: "Basic... basically to just promote... promote safety across the State of Illinois. We've had some issues where whether it's a terrorist, a lone shooter, whatever it may be at some of these events. This would be able to help law enforcement, hopefully, prevent it or maybe even identify people that have been wounded in these large crowds. So, our emergency vehicles, our responders could get to them immediately."

Wallace: "So, this has happened here in the State of Illinois?"

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

D'Amico: "No, fortunate..."

Wallace: "What you just described?"

D'Amico: "...fortunately it has not. We're trying to be proactive."

Wallace: "And so, this is an initiative of the City of Chicago.

Are there recent events of large gatherings that might have prompted such a piece of legislation?"

D'Amico: "Yeah. Well, not in... not in Chicago. But like the one in Las Vegas, yes."

Wallace: "No, I'm talking specifically in Chicago? I can think of some protests that have..."

D'Amico: "Well, I... what I... what I can tell you is that the... the shooter that was in Las Vegas did have a room over Lollapalooza. So, that could have... that could have happened here."

Wallace: "So, something like Lollapalooza but... okay. Other questions have been raised about the destruction of data. Is there a reason why we've not amended this Bill to make sure that that data does not live on in perpetuity?"

D'Amico: "It... it lasts for 30 days and that's current law right now today."

Wallace: "It lasts for 30 days?"

D'Amico: "Yes."

Wallace: "Not 24 hours or maybe a week, if there's nothing happened at the event?"

D'Amico: "Thirty... 30 days."

Wallace: "And what is... what is described as potential criminal activity? What... how would you define that? Is there a definition in the statute that you're proposing 'cause I can't find it in the Bill."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

D'Amico: "That's at the discretion of the police departments."

Wallace: "At the discretion of the police department?"

D'Amico: "Yes."

"All right. To the Bill. This... we've had a lot of Wallace: discussion here already so I won't belabor the point of civil liberties, the point of privacy, the point of the fact that this is an initiative of the City of Chicago. I understand why perhaps given the things that have happened across the country with large events and violence that have occurred. But what I was really getting at with the questions about what events have happened in the City of Chicago that might make someone want to fly a drone over it, would have been quite a few protests by communities of color about injustices and about police abuse of power. So, I find it very interesting that we would then propose that we provide more tools for intrusion into individuals' privacy. The vagueness of what potential criminal activity is another concern of mine. Potential criminal activity could be happening right here on the floor right now. Someone could be stealing someone's orange or apple or candy off of their desk. That's potential criminal activity. So, I will say, as I've stated publically before, that I cannot support this piece of legislation. Especially given the fact that there is no protection over whether or not once a recording has occurred... whether or not software that is not installed on the drone but installed in the mainframes of law enforcement, they can use that software to recognize faces. I'm concerned about, again, the impetus of this particular Bill. And I would like

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

to protect my own privacy and my own civil liberties. So, I encourage others to consider that and vote 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Skillicorn."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Skillicorn: "So, thank you for listening to some of the criticism and being open minded and filing an Amendment. I will be fairly brief. So, right now under current law there's already rules and guidelines about when drones can be used and then when, you know, civil liberties are protected. Is that correct?"

D'Amico: "I'm sorry, I didn't hear you. Could you repeat that?"

Skillicorn: "No problem. So right now under current law, there's already a compromise that was passed a few years ago by this Legislature that regulates when drones can be used and when they cannot, correct?"

D'Amico: "Yes."

Skillicorn: "And then, this particular Bill... so, not the current law but this particular Bill... does it limit the number of drones that could be deployed?"

D'Amico: "No, not that I know of."

Skillicorn: "Okay. Thank you very much. So, to the Bill. I'm going to oppose this Bill. And I'm going to tell you why. It's first, the… the Constitution already lays out specific criteria of when we can conduct searches and specifically unreasonable searches. So, think of it this way. There's no limit on drones. The City of Chicago could go out and buy thousands of drones and fly thousands of drones over events. Now, I would look at that as unreasonable. And that would be

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

expressly denied by the Fourth Amendment of our Constitution. Now, there is a remedy for that. And that is that courts give an opportunity to give a warrant. So, I ask, why doesn't this ... the City of Chicago, why doesn't the police department just get a warrant? If they need... if they have probable cause... if they have a probable cause of a crime they could get a warrant from a judge and it will protect their civil liberties but also give them the opportunity to collect evidence and prevent possible crimes. So, I would ask that. And furthermore, let's talk about the current legislation that's on the books. This was a compromise between the interests of police and civil liberties. I talked to one of the people that were involved in that discussion, Senate... Senator from Skokie was just in the chamber just a few moments ago, and he... he mentioned that he worked with both the police and people that were concerned about civil rights. And they struck a compromise. He also said that they were also willing to continue that discussion instead of having this forced upon us in such a broad manner. So, I think it's fair to have this discussion. And I know that the Sponsor, and he has been open minded about this and he'd be willing to listen to these concerns. If there are specific concerns, then maybe the Legislature should work on those specific concerns. But a broad based, no limits type of domestic spying is not what I want, it's not what the people of Illinois want. And I think... I think we can agree. I think we can agree in a majority that that's not what we want. So, let's agree to work on a compromise. But this just isn't this. Because this is broad, this has many concerns a few other people brought up here. I don't want to repeat that. So, I

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

urge a 'no' vote and I urge that we continue to work on this. The idea that we have to get this done in the next, you know, 36 hours seems like it's rushed. The idea that we have the Superintendent of Police calling people and asking them to do that, it... it doesn't sit well with me because we have to weigh the needs of the police with what our Constitution says and also with civil rights of the people we serve. Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "We've heard from five opponents and four people in support of this measure. Representative Zalewski, do you rise in support? You may proceed. You'll be the final speaker."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. The Sponsor was asked last time to consider some Amendments to make the Bill more narrower, he did that. He increased the limit to 1500. He added language specifically prohibiting facial recognition technology language... technology that doesn't exist by the way, but we're going above and beyond and adding into the statute any way to make sure it can never be used. And he did... he ... he did exactly what he was asked to do within the confines of this discussion. We've had a very healthy debate on First Amendment activity and what the technology here could lead to with respect to infringing upon people's rights. But ultimately this comes down to whether you think there's a public safety reason to use this technology to protect large crowds or whether you think an individual's... or whether you think the concerns outweigh that benefit. And I think for the majority of the Body it makes sense that if the technology exists to present... to prevent bad things from happening to

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

large crowds of people you should vote 'aye'. The Gentleman has narrowed the Bill, I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative D'Amico to close."

D'Amico: "Thank you for the spirited debate. I just want to say you know as... as technology... technology changes every day the way we live. When things go wrong, the first ones we want to call is our police to come and help. And they're here asking us for our help today. They want to use this tool that is available to help them make things safer for us. So, I think now is the time to stand up. Stand up and stand with our police officers. This is no time to turn our back on them. I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2562 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 74 voting in 'favor', 35 voting 'opposed', and 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 2562, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2332, Representative Lilly."

Lilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. We fully debated this Bill on the floor yesterday, so I'll be short. I want to remind everyone here today that a vote of 'yes' is a vote to protect our youth for a long life from deadly disease to tobacco and associated chronic diseases and also premature death. A vote 'no' is a vote to protect the tobacco industry profits against the interests of the next generation. To be clear, this Bill does not contain penalties for possession by minors. Penalties for possession are the

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

tobacco industry's tactic designed to focus on the tobacco retailer. There is no evidence that penalties for possession reduce tobacco use rates. Possession... possession laws unfavorably punish and stigmatize children who are targeted and this is a tactic that is jeopardizing the lives of our future. Tobacco is not a choice. It is an addiction that kills more than 18 thousand injured... Illinoisans each year. We should do everything in our power to stop this devastating habit. I'm asking you to vote in favor or vote with organizations you would trust with your health, your children's health, your parent's health. The hospitals, the health association, the public health department, the health care professionals all support this Bill. These are the same trusted organizations you turn to again and again in time of need. I respectfully ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "This Bill is on the Order of Short Debate. And Representative Butler is recognized."

Butler: "I rise in support, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "You may proceed."

Butler: "To the Bill. This... this has been a very difficult Bill for me. My seatmate from Quincy, I understand his concerns. He lives in a border area and I think those are real concerns by the business interests. And when I look at the opponents of this Bill, there's a lot of people that I support usually for their view on this Bill, I really do. But you know, a lot of times we have to make decisions here based on what we know as people and what our own personal beliefs are. I've spent the majority of my volunteer life here in Springfield working with an organization, the Springfield Road Runners Club,

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

organizing two of the largest road races in central Illinois and undertaking training groups that have taken people from smokers, from people who have sat on their couch for decades and gotten them to run a 10k or run a half marathon. People who have given up smoking after decades of smoking. And that's why I rise in support of this Bill. This Bill is not perfect. I wish the Sponsor would change it. I really do. I think there's some areas in here that need changed, but I only get to vote on what's on the board. And that's why I'm going to vote in favor of this 'cause I think it's the right thing to do. You know, a few weeks ago, just two Saturdays ago, we had the Race for the Cure here in Springfield right outside the doors of this chamber on 2nd Street. Smoking is the leading cause of breast cancer, especially in younger women. We know that smoking leads to cancer. My parents died of cancer. If we can take steps to make a healthier Illinois, I think we should do it."

Speaker Turner: "Final remarks, Representative."

Butler: "You know, when I was a high school kid, my senior year, I really liked Miami Vice. I thought it was a great show. Don Johnson was one of the coolest cats around. Don Johnson smoked filterless Lucky Strikes. I spent about two weeks of my senior year smoking filterless Lucky Strikes. And I'm damn glad I didn't keep smoking them 'cause I might not be here today. I understand the opponents of this Bill and I sympathize with them. But this is a vote that I'm making on my own personal beliefs that I think that this could help to be a healthier Illinois. That's why I'm voting 'yes'."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Keith Wheeler is recognized."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

- Wheeler, K.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. We discussed this recently and we went through the different components of this Bill that... that do have some negative impacts. Primarily, the fact on one level that removes all the penalties for those who actually... with possession of tobacco products under 18. If our true intent of this Bill is to reduce smoking, we'd want to keep that intact; however, we did not. The second component that we brought up had to do with the border communities who are naturally concerned about the fact that ... that sales would just move across the border and those merchants who have made investments in Illinois would no longer have the opportunity to ... to recoup their investment and move forward as they should. So, they're... they're... the opponents have real concerns here. And I wish we could address those things separately. I know that in my discussions with the nurses who came to me in support of this measure, I explained to them very clearly that if this were a regional or national effort to move to 21 I could consider it much more easily than I can right now. But putting Illinois on an island does not help us in the ways we need to do our business moving forward. Mr. Speaker, should this Bill receive the requisite number of votes, I do request a verification. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "Members, a verification has been requested.

 Representative Evans will be the final speaker on this Bill.

 Representative Evans."
- Evans: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and the great Members of this Assembly. To the Bill. I think we all know kind of my own personal story dealing with cancer. But I think more important

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

is, you know, I was in the barber shop this weekend and I was looking through an old magazine from the '70s. And I was looking at all of the different advertisement and how we used to advertise individuals. And it had the company with the Kools and the various cigarette companies running around and say how cool this is and they're on the beach. But we've changed that. You know, we've been educated. We know that tobacco causes x number of diseases. We know these things. And... and what I believe always is this is America, that you can choose to do what you... what you want to do. But I think we should give young people the opportunity to grow to learn. So at the age of 21, if you want to smoke tobacco and we've got decades of studies that say that tobacco causes cancer, we can't debate that. That is just the ... the truth. You can go to University of Illinois, any university. But I think to put it at 21 gives our young folks the opportunity to say if you want to make this bad decision, which you have the right to do, then you will be informed. You'll be equipped with the information needed to make this bad decision. And hopefully they won't. You know, I'm a border district as well. And it is my hope that the businesses there, they have individuals from 21 all the way up to 100 to sell cigarettes to. We want to make sure our young people are healthy. We want to try to avoid health issues. Again, we are already educated and we know what the realities are that tobacco causes cancer. Thank you, Representative Lilly, for your hard work and effort in this issue. It shouldn't be a tough issue. It is an issue that we've been informed about; it's an issue that we know about. Let's do what's right. Let's send a message to... to

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Illinois that 'yes' you have a right to do what you want to do. You have a right to live your life; we want you to live the healthiest life. So, thank you, Representative Lilly. And I humbly request for you all to support this issue. And let's move forward."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Lilly to close."

Lilly: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. Again, this piece... this piece of legislation... this measure allows for us to care for our future, our next generation. Tobacco use is not a choice. It's an addiction that kills more than 18 thousand Illinoisans each year. We should all want to do something to stop this deadly habit. The bordering states... or the bordering counties that have all taken up this measure have not had a problem with T21, Tobacco 21. It has allowed their teens to make better choices for their lives. And it's very critical that we recognize that our young people are standing up for their lives as well. I had the opportunity to talk to a group of young people that Representative Wallace brought down and they had opportunity to talk with Senator Jones who gave them a real compassionate speech around why he believes Tobacco 21 is a measure that we need to take up now. Those young people response was, I think we shouldn't start smoking or purchasing tobacco until we're 90. And these were young people, 12, 14, 15, who agree that this is a habit that they are picking up because \$291 million are being put in the marketing of tobacco. They want to live; they want better choices. It is so important that we collectively listen to one another so that we can make sure we are addressing what our young people are telling us. Tobacco 21, again, supported by organizations

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

that you trust: hospitals, Mercy Hospital, Northwestern, McNeill, North Shore, Rush. We have a good number of supporters. And I ask that you dig deep in your hearts and in your minds to vote 'yes' for Tobacco 21, affectionately known T21. I ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Members, a verification has been requested by Representative Wheeler. Please be at your seat to vote your switch. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2332 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 61 voting 'yes', 49 voting 'no', and 1 voting 'present'... Representative Wheeler, would you like to persist with your verification? Mr. Clerk, please read the votes in the affirmative."

Clerk Hollman: "A poll of those voting in the affirmative: Representative Ammons; Representative Andersson; Representative Andrade; Representative Arroyo; Representative Batinick; Representative Bristow; Representative Butler; Representative Carroll; Representative Cassidy; Representative Connor; Representative Conroy; Representative Conyears-Ervin; Representative Costello; Representative Representative D'Amico; Representative Davis; Representative Drury; Representative Evans; Representative Representative Finnie; Representative Flowers; Representative Ford; Representative Gabel; Representative Gordon-Booth; Representative Greenwood; Representative

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

- Guzzardi; Representative Harper; Representative Harris, G.; Representative Hernandez; Representative Hoffman..."
- Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, he no longer wishes to proceed with the… with the verification. On a count of 61 voting in 'favor', 49 voting 'opposed' and 1 voting 'present', Senate Bill 2332, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Feigenholtz, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to be recorded as a 'yes' vote on this since I'm a Sponsor. And this is the second time today my switch wasn't working."
- Speaker Turner: "The Journal will reflect your request.

 Representative Jesiel, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Jesiel: "Thank... thank you, Mr. Speaker. You called the roll very quickly before I had chance to vote 'yes'. So, please record me as a 'yes'. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "The Journal will reflect your request, Representative. Senate Bill 3109, Representative Guzzardi.

 Mr. Clerk, can you please move this Bill back to the Order of Second Reading and read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3109, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. This Bill was read a second time a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Guzzardi, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Guzzardi on Floor Amendment #1."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

- Guzzardi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment removes the Attorney Practice Act from the Bill per the discussion that we had on the floor."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Andersson, would you like to speak on the Floor Amendment? Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 3109. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read Senate Bill 3109."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3109, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Guzzardi."
- Guzzardi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We debated this Bill extensively and I was very grateful for the comments of my colleagues, particularly Representative Andersson and Representative Breen who brought up questions around the Attorney Practice Act and this Bill's interaction with that Act. The Amendment that we just adopted removed any reference to the Attorney Practice Act. I appreciate my colleagues' thoughtful commentary, I believe we've made this a better Bill. And I look forward to its passage."
- Speaker Turner: "This Bill is on the Order of Standard Debate.

 Representative Breen is recognized."
- Breen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, we debated this thoroughly the other day. I... we raised the point of the attorneys because we have to raise our right hands and swear to uphold the Constitution and the laws of

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

the United States of America and of this state. However, I don't know if the other practitioners who are currently licensed to by IDFPR and the School Code have to do that or if in any way that have to certify that they are law-abiding Illinoisans. The problem is just because you don't have to raise your right hand and swear allegiance to the Constitution and the laws, doesn't mean it's okay to violate those same items. It doesn't make the Bill... it may make the Bill slightly less objectionable, but it's no... it's no better than it was when it first came before this Body and failed. It should fail again today. With that, I would yield my time to Representative Andersson."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Andersson is recognized."

Andersson: "Thank... thanks, Peter. But I'm in favor of it. So... all right. Well, anyway. To the Bill. I want to thank the Sponsor for addressing my concerns and removing the Attorney Act. As I noted when we debated it a day or two ago, that attorneys occupy a unique position that the other professionals did not. And so, I really... I ... I want to say thank you for listening to that. And with that, I... I disagree with the Floor Leader even though he yielded me his time, thank you. Is that now we have a Bill that is in proper order, addresses a legitimate concern and we are trying... trying to encourage people to get licenses where they can. So, at this point, you know, this isn't about undocumented workers. This is about people like the DACAs, the dreamers, getting... getting the license that... that they can get without... without any limitation in that. So, all I want to do is say, thank you for putting me on the Bill, thank you for correcting it. And I urge an 'aye' vote."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Speaker Turner: "Representative Guzzardi to close."

Guzzardi: "Thank you, Members. Again, this just brings us in accordance with Federal Law and codifies current practice at IDFPR and other licensing agencies not to check people's status before they issue licenses. This is a matter of public safety and it's a matter of good practice. We need to be in accord with Federal Law. I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 3109 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 61 voting in 'favor', 49 voting 'opposed', and 1 voting 'present', Senate Bill 3109, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 3276, Representative Cassidy. Please proceed, Representative."

Cassidy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There was some confusion in the debate over this Bill. And I think that... that some clarity is helpful. In all cases, a defendant is able to withdraw a plea within 30 days. This Bill corrects a drafting error that was created when the advisement was put in place to make sure that before someone takes a plea that... or makes a... enters a plea that they understand that it could impact their immigration status. This gives the standard two years that go along with other such advisements. It brings it in line with all the other... all other such advisements in... in the Code. And I ask for your support."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Breen is recognized."

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

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

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

Breen: "Representative, I... a question's arisen on our side. Is this a retroactive provision, so that folks who have already pled guilty will now be given two years to withdraw? Or is it only for pleas that are entered on the effective date or after?"

Cassidy: "It is only moving forward."

Breen: "So, only for pleas that are entered after the effective date of the Bill."

Cassidy: "Yes."

Breen: "Okay. And then the idea is that there is not a... the current law is that a motion for withdraw of a guilty plea has to be filed within 30 days..."

Cassidy: "Which would exist for any... whether you had any sort of advisement or not. So, that's stand... that's sort of your baseline regardless of whether you were supposed to be informed of anything."

Breen: "Right. Now, I guess I... I should ask you a question. Can we even impose a time limit at all when, as I understand it, it is ineffective assistance of counsel for an attorney not to properly advise the client or for... to not properly advise their client of the immigration impact of a plea?"

Cassidy: "I kind of think this is apples and oranges. This is... this is specific to when there are other advisements. There's a... there is a different timeline when other advisements have to be put in place. This is really just putting an enforcement mechanism just as we have with other sorts of advisements. This brings this in line with every other place. This is not about effective assistance of counsel because it's not the

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

counsel that is supposed to do this. This is the... this is a judicial instruction at the time of plea."

Breen: "And so... so even... just so that I'm clear..."

Cassidy: "Like if I pled quilty, I'd have 30 days..."

Breen: "Right."

Cassidy: "...to anything. You... if you pled guilty, you'd have 30 days."

Breen: "Right. But if the... so if the court did not give the advisement, regardless of what their attorney told them or anybody else, as long as... if the court did not give the advisement they've got 2 years to..."

Cassidy: "Right."

Breen: "...withdraw the plea?"

Cassidy: "Right."

Breen: "Okay. Now, the... the Federal Constitutional Law is merely that an attorney must provide advi..."

Speaker Turner: "Final remarks, Representative."

Breen: "Okay. Again, Ladies and Gentlemen, we've got a 30-day time limit being extended to 2 years solely for the court. But it... that's regardless of whether the attorney has told the person whether they're going to have negative deportation issues. So, this is a new benefit for someone who is facing a situation like this where the court might not advise, but their attorney did, so they may have entered the plea knowingly. And that's something to be considered in terms of how to... how to vote on the Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Cassidy to close."

Cassidy: "I... I actually completely dispute your characterization of this. This... just as with any other advisements that are

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

required, there is a... there is a time period that goes along with that. This is not an extension at all. This is a... a repairing of a scrivener's error; this... this piece that exists in every other advisement was left out in this case. This is not an extension. This is not a special benefit. This is not anything unusual. This is, as I said, repairing a scrivener's error. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 3276 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record.

On a count of 51 voting in 'favor', 64 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present', this Bill, having failed to reach the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared failed. Mr. Clerk. Senate Bill 3489, Representative Guzzardi."

Guzzardi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I've spoken with a number of you individually about this Bill since we voted on it yesterday. I think there was a little bit of misunderstanding during the floor debate. But just to reiterate, this is language that was drafted by the States Attorneys Association. The States Attorneys proposed and approve of this language. All it does is allow people who believe to be on this registry in error to initiate an appeals process. So, it allows them to appeal their status on this registry. Again, all parties are in agreement on it. It's the States Attorneys language. And I ask for your support. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "This Bill is on the Order of Standard Debate.

Representative Breen is recognized."

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

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

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

Breen: "And... and Representative, I... I know we've heard it many times reported with something like the no fly list on the federal level that folks are being put on there and they were unjustly put on there and they had no way to get themselves taken off. And so here we've got something that is a much, much more even serious item which is the register of Violent Offenders Against Youth, you know, murderers or Violent Offenders Against Youth. And so, if one is improperly put on that registry, your Bill gives them a mechanism to challenge that designation so that they have a means to get themselves off of the registry if they are not actually a murderer or a violence against youth perpetrator?"

Guzzardi: "That's exactly right, Representative. You called this a good Bill yesterday and I agree with you wholeheartedly."

Breen: "All right. Thank you much."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Skillicorn."

Skillicorn: "I rise in support of this Bill. Specifically to this Bill. I... even the title... it isn't about violent youth; it's about people that are mistakenly put on a list. And I'd like to make that crystal clear. It's about people that are not experiencing justice because they're unduly put on the reg... a list. They're just allowed to get off that list. So, this is a good Bill. I urge the passage."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Guzzardi to close."

Guzzardi: "Thank you, Members. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 3489 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 73 voting 'yes', 42 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 3489, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 12 of the Calendar, we have Senate Bill 3115 offered by Representative Flowers. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3115, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Flowers."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Flowers on Floor Amendment #1."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #1 increase the temporary assistance for needy families to 30 percent of the federal poverty level. And it removes the second and third year increases to the TANF grant that was in the original Bill. This Bill will assist families living in extreme poverty and it would have them to get assistance in getting the basic necessity for life. And I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Lady moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 3115. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

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

Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, Senate Bill 3115."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3115, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to take this opportunity to thank Representative Harris and his working group and Representative Demmer for the bipartisan support

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

that we got in committee. And I would appreciate an 'aye' vote. This Bill would help all people that's living in extreme poverty that happen to be on TANF. It would help a lot of them live a better quality of life and I would appreciate an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "This Bill is on the Order of Short Debate.

Representative Breen is recognized for two minutes."

Breen: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

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

Breen: "And Representative, as... as I understand it this item is going to be included or is included in the... the budget Bill that has just been dropped, at least for the upcoming year. So, is that your understanding as well? It's going to be in the budget Bill, so it's part of the broader agreement between the parties?"

Flowers: "Yes, Sir."

Breen: "Okay. And so, the... has the fiscal impact... so the fiscal impact has been accounted for at least in the... in the budget agreement that is going to be brought before the House soon enough?"

Flowers: "Yes."

Breen: "Okay. But why not go with the budget agreement instead of running a separate Bill?"

Flowers: "I'm sorry. I didn't hear the last statement?"

Breen: "So, why... why not just wait for the budget agreement instead of running a separate Bill?"

Flowers: "Well... well, Representative... Hello. Did you ask a question?"

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Breen: "Sure. I was wondering why we were doing a separate Bill but I'm being..."

Flowers: "I was about to answer you."

Breen: "Well, I think I'm... I'm being told by my colleagues that they don't mind doing a separate Bill. And so, that... we... we apparently have no problem with this. So..."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Flowers to close."

Breen: "No one mentioned it to me until I got up on the mic. So..."

Flowers: "I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Breen: "...thank you."

Flowers: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 3115 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 85 voting in 'favor', 30 'opposed', and 1 voting 'present', Senate Bill 3115, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Members, an announcement. Committees will take place and be posted for 6:45 this evening. And we will wrap up a few measures here on the floor until then. Thank you. On page 28 of the Calendar, we have Senate Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #4 offered by Leader Lang. Leader Lang. Representative Lang, are you... is your mic working yet?"

Lang: "It is now, Sir. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Everyone knows what this is about. There's been a lot of talk about this, not only recently but over a long period of time all over this country. Let me start by saying what I said at the committee some time ago. And

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

that is, it is never too late to give women the rights they ought to be due under the Constitution of the United States of America. For a very long time this country has struggled with discrimination and intolerance. Discrimination and tolerance against people of color, against people different religions, against people based on their sexual orientation and of course because they are women. When our founding fathers, and there were no founding mothers, founded this country, different types of people were not treated as full citizens. African Americans were not treated as full citizens. Women were not treated as full citizens. It wasn't until many, many years later when we finally put an Amendment into the United States Constitution that gave women the right to vote that women are even mentioned in the Constitution. Today, despite the fact that we've made efforts in this state and in other states with legislation on equal pay, on equal treatment, the United States Constitution as written today would allow us to repeal any of those laws without regard to discrimination against women. And here in the State of Illinois the 1970 Constitution protects women. And all of the things that the opponents to this Resolution are going to talk about in the next 10 or 20 or 30 minutes, all of those horror stories that are about to come forth have not happened in the State of Illinois under our State Constitution. Supreme Court Justices as far apart politically as Ruth Bader Ginsburg, arguably the most liberal member of the United States Supreme Court, and the late Antonin Scalia, they both agreed that women are not protected by the most important document in our country. Some of the people who will argue

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

against this today continually talk about the importance of the United States Constitution as a core document in our country and yet are not prepared to add women, 161 million American citizens, to the United States Constitution. Justice Scalia said, 'certainly the Constitution does not require discrimination on the basis of sex, the only issue is whether it prohibits it. It doesn't'. Ladies and Gentlemen, there are only seven countries in the world... seven countries in the world that have not ratified the International Women's Treaty; Iran, Somalia, Sudan, South Sudan, Palau, Tonga and the United States of America. If you don't think there's something wrong with that, I don't think you're thinking too clearly. Ladies and Gentlemen, you will hear on the floor today discussions about the Congressional deadline. Well, the Congressional deadline is a deadline that can be changed. They changed it once, they can change it again. As they did with the Madison Amendment, which was ratified 203 years after its actual deadline. The deadline can be changed by Congress. You're going to hear about abortion, about same sex bathrooms. You're going to hear about co-ed military dormitories. You're going to hear about co-ed prisons and you're going to hear about boys and girls losing their sports scholarships. Silliness. The ... the Equal Rights Amendment has nothing to do, Ladies and Gentlemen, with any of those things. Now, I've noted in the debate, that has been going on for some time, that most of the debate seems to center around abortion. In fact, almost all of the testimony in committee that opposed this Resolution was about abortion. Ladies and Gentlemen, there have been no issues in the State of Illinois with our

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

equal rights language in our Constitution about the issue of abortion. And you know when Alice Paul wrote this in 1923, this very same language that we will vote to ratify today, we did not have legal abortion in America. Alice Paul was not talking about abortion. Alice Paul was talking about giving half of the population access to the full freedoms that the American Constitution should afford to them. Ladies and Gentlemen, there are many things that can be talked about. For now, let me just say... and I'll say more in my closing ... for now, let me just say this is a historic moment. How often will you get a chance, as a Member of the Illinois General Assembly, to cast a vote that can impact the entire United States of America, the Constitution of the United States of America? We have an opportunity today to be the 37th state to ratify the Consti... the Equal Rights Amendment for the Constitution. And then there will be one more state necessary. And yes, there will be court battles over it. There will be court battles over the deadline. There will be court battles over a few states that have tried to rescind their ratification. All those things will happen. But the question for us today and the only question that needs to be asked is, is the Illinois House of Representatives for or against adding million American citizens to the United Constitution where they absolutely belong? A 'no' vote, for whatever reason you have, is a vote against the rights of women in the United States of America. You can come up with any reason. You can cloak it in any clothing you wish, but in the end a 'no' vote is a vote against the women of America. Nothing nasty has happened in the State of Illinois with very

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

similar language in our Constitution. So, please spare us the hair on fire routine about what it's going to do. We know what it's going to do. It's going to do nothing to hurt the fabric of America because all it says is give women the same rights men have in the United States of America. If you're prepared to vote against that, I don't know why you're here defending and protecting the people that you represent. I urge you... those of you who have grabbed on to some issue that is not a... not the right issue. Some of you have grabbed on to some of the rhetoric you've been hearing from some people. Move away from that rhetoric and just think about our responsibilities here. And if you do that, you will join me in voting for this Resolution. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

- Speaker Turner: "This Bill is on the Order of Standard Debate.

 Representative Breen is recognized."
- Breen: "Mr. Speaker, I'd move for unlimited debate. Unlimited debate, I would move for."
- Speaker Turner: "We have Extended Debate."
- Breen: "I would move for unlimited debate. I'd ask for a Roll Call vote. I think there's so many lights on right now, we're going to need it."
- Speaker Turner: "It's not... and you will get a standard... an Extended Debate if you like, Representative. You will receive a Roll Call vote on this measure."
- Breen: "I'd like a Roll Call vote on unlimited debate on the measure. Or assurance from the... from the Speaker that we will be just allowed to say our peace on a Constitutional Amendment?"

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Speaker Turner: "On the Extended Debate, we will hear from five proponents for five minutes and five opponents for five minutes. Will that suffice, Representative?"

Breen: "Not for our side. And I'd imagine looking at the number of lights on, it won't work for your side either."

Speaker Turner: "I haven't seen the lights. There's not even 10 lights on."

Breen: "Well, there are going to be more lights on our side I'd imagine. But then... in fact, if there's only 10 lights then unlimited won't be any harm to the chamber."

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Representative."

Breen: "Well, I'd like my unlimited debate... I would move formally for unlimited debate then. I'd like a Roll Call vote on it. I think we should unlimited debate this. This is a... the Leader just said that this is going to be the most historic thing we do."

Speaker Turner: "One moment, Representative."

Breen: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Breen, any Member who wishes to speak on this Bill will receive five minutes of time."

Breen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "You're recognized for five minutes."

Breen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And to the Resolution. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I want to start by sharing with you the opinion of what the ERA is about as it was stated by the great statesman and former Congressman, the late Henry Hyde, former Majority Leader of this chamber. His statement was and I quote, 'The ERA is'... and I quote, 'will be used to sweep away the minimal protection of unborn children that the courts

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

currently allow and also to mandate tax funding of abortions.' And Ladies and Gentlemen, I would also point out it's interesting when we had talked to the proponents of ERA they keep saying there are all these terrible things happening. And you ask them, well, what exactly do you want to change in the law with ERA? Because the only alleged benefit I can see and that I've heard about or seen argued in court is that it will expand taxpayer funding of abortions, very well might rollback our parental notice law and have other negative impacts on various abortion regulations. They have no other thing they want to do. And yet, they'll say ... they'll note claims, oh, it's silliness to talk about that. It's silliness except for the fact that we've seen lawsuit, after lawsuit, after lawsuit. If you want to read about some of them, you can read it in HJR138, which was recently filed. There's a little litany of all the various lawsuits, including the ones that held, that used a state version of the ERA to mandate taxpayer funding of abortions. But that's not all. Maybe ... maybe that's not your issue. When the ERA came out of the United States Congress in 1972, there was a seven-year deadline. It was clear that they meant their seven-year deadline. And when the Congress tried to extend the deadline, a lawsuit was brought. And what the Sponsor of this measure won't talk about is he won't talk about what the court held in the lawsuit where they directly addressed the issue. It was called Idaho v. Freeman. The lawsuit held that the alleged extension was invalid, unconstitutional, void, illegal. And in fact, it is something that the proponent of this measure mentions the last Alice Paul. In fact, it's shameful because

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Alice Paul was pro-life. And the Sponsor and his allies on this have twisted her language into a mechanism for abortion, something that Ms. Paul never would have stood for. And as well, that's the main reason why the ERA was never ratified. That is the primary reason. Because it has been twisted against what Alice Paul wanted. In 1983, they tried to reintroduce the ERA, a simple Amendment was added. This will have no impact on abortion rights, yea or nay. And the Congress... the proponents refused to allow that to the floor. And so, the Congress killed that measure. That was the only thing standing between this country having the ERA or not, it was that abortion clause. Now there are other reasons to oppose the ERA, so be it. And I know others have that. But Ladies and Gentlemen, to ... to say today we ignore the text of the Amendment, seven years didn't matter, the court decision that said it didn't matter, the Supreme Court actually then dismissed the measure because they said it's moot. The time limit's done. They dismissed it as moot. For us to adopt this today would be to adopt a falsehood. It would to ... to adopt an illegal Act. It would be a violation of our very oaths of office. Not merely a violation of our commitment to our taxpayers and their good funds and their sincere beliefs on the right to life, but a violation of our oaths of office. A violation of our responsibility to our neighboring states that we will not take up an alleged Constitutional Amendment that long ago was wiped off the books. It was moot according to the United States Supreme Court. And so, Ladies and Gentlemen, I would respectfully urge that we vote 'no'. As

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

this Body has voted 'no' over and over and over again over the past 45 years. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Andersson." Andersson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I'll speak to the Bill.

You know it's rare that I'm nervous speaking here but today is one of those days. So, I hope that I can do this justice because in my time here I don't think that I will have debated a more important Bill than this Bill. This is about who we are as a people. This is about who we believe the State of Illinois is and should be going forward. But it's more than just the State of Illinois; it's about the United States of America, and quite frankly, I believe it's about the planet. I believe it's about how we treat women and men, not just women. There's a very famous quote from Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. that says, 'the arc of the moral universe is long but it bends towards justice'. I believe that. And I've believed that my whole life. And I've always had a world view that is one that we are always improving, we're always moving forward on our laws, on our society. We're making it better. You know, I would think if I could time travel where would I want to time travel? Well, it wouldn't be backwards; it would be forwards. I want to see what we can accomplish, what we can do together. And this is one of those opportunities. This is our chance to make a huge impact in our world. When I hear the opponents say this won't do anything, I can't disagree more. The ERA would provide that strong legal defense against rollbacks, against allowing that arc to bend towards injustice. So that the things that we've all fought for, for women's rights which are human rights, which also are men's

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

rights, won't be repealed. That the ... the work that we've done in our world will be reflected in our values. In fact, it's interesting the American Political Science Review, respected journal, did research on the question of what has the most impact against gender-based violence. And guess what? It wasn't the wealth of the country, it wasn't how progressive the politicians were, it wasn't even how many women held political power. It was laws like the ERA. That's made the difference. That's was created those protections. And we need to be a part of that. We need to have this. This is a world-level issue. And it's also about recognizing the status of women today in 2018. The opponents I hear talk in terms of, well, we need to protect women, we need to honor them, we need to put them on a pedestal. Well, I don't want to do that. I want to empower them because the better they are, the better we are as a people. And they are fully up to the challenge. They don't need my help or my protection. They can do that for themselves. They can handle our world. And quite frankly, a lot of times I think they make far better decisions than I do. Now when we hear some of the critics talk about abortion and talk about the elimination of all distinctions based on gender, I can tell you with absolute certainty both allegations are false. Yes, there have been cases out there. One in Connecticut and one in New Mexico, in particular. But those cases were decided on the term 'medical necessity'. Because those states had changed the definition of medical necessity, narrowed it to the point where it was no longer medical, it was political. That's what was changed in those Bills. Or in those ... in those states. So,

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

those are not illustrative. They don't explain anything about the abortion issue related to this. And while I'd love to spend an hour explaining to you why it's not possible for the ERA to generate late term abortions, et cetera, et cetera, I just have... I can't spend that much time. So, I just tell you it's not true. And the distinctions based on gender will continue to exist, they just are subject to a strict scrutiny review. This isn't about women. This isn't about men. When we equalize ourselves we're all better as a result. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is probably the most important Bill I think we're going to ever do, certainly in my time. I ask you to vote 'yes'. I ask you to recognize this isn't about those distractions. This is about the rights of all people. Please vote 'yes'."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative David Harris."

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, you'll hear lots of arguments here today, legal arguments and perhaps medical arguments. I want to tune my comments to the State of Illinois and where the State of Illinois stands on some of these. And I'm holding in my hand a map of the United States. And it's color coded by those states that have ratified the ERA and those states that have not ratified the ERA. Now, the states that have not ratified the ERA are states like Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, South Carolina, Florida, North Carolina and Virginia. You know I never knew that Illinois was part of the Old Confederacy. And I realize that there's an issue here perhaps of liberal versus conservative. And some might say if you vote for this it's more liberal and... and you shouldn't

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

vote for it. So, if this were to pass, this would put us in the category of conservative states like... or excuse me, liberal states like Texas or Wyoming or of course our neighbor to the east, that paragon of stately perfection, Indiana, which passed the ERA I don't know how many years ago. But let me reference if I may in this debate Senate Bill 63. And to frame some history on that, I'd like to talk about the women's issues generally. Back in the early 20th Century women were pushing for the right to vote. Because of that push the 19th Amendment to the United States Constitution was passed in 1920. Yet seven years earlier action had already been taken in the State of Illinois to give women the right to vote. I referenced Senate Bill 63. Yes, Senate Bill 63 from the 48th General Assembly because Senate Bill 63 of the 48th General Assembly gave women the right to vote in Illinois. And this is what was said about that vote. With the stroke of a pen he, the Governor, added as many as one million six hundred thousand new voters. This triumph, the first in a major state east of the Mississippi River, changed everything. As one contemporary explained to quote, 'the effect of the victory upon the nation was astounding'. Suffrage sentiment doubled overnight. Now, I realize that this is not suffrage but certainly it has an... an impact that could be just as great. And I reference that suffrage vote and I reference where we stand in relation to other states because I don't believe that Illinois should be a laggard on an issue like this. I think Illinois should be where they were when they passed Senate Bill 63 in the 48th General Assembly, at the head of

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

- the pack, leading the nation. And this Bill... this Amendment deserves a 'yes' vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes... Representative Severin.

 The Chair recognizes Representative Skillicorn."
- Skillicorn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a moment?"
- Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor indicates that he will yield."
- Skillicorn: "Just a very brief question. If Hyde Amendment... Hyde
 Amendment language was ever adopted to this... you know, would
 that be something that you would be open to or would you be
 open to Hyde Amendment language in Illinois Law?"
- Lang: "Sir, we cannot change the language that's in front of us.

 This was the language that Congress sent to the states many years ago. The same language that was voted on in the 36 states that have already adopted it, including Nevada very recently. And it is the only language we can vote on relative to this measure for the United States Constitution."
- Skillicorn: "Hypothetically, would you be acceptable to Hyde Amendment language?"
- Lang: "I'm not here to talk about hypotheticals, I'm here to talk about SJRCA4."
- Skillicorn: "Okay. I... I'll take that as a 'no'."
- Lang: "You should take as, I'm here to talk about SJRCA4."
- Skillicorn: "Okay. Well, to the Bill. If Hyde Amendment language were included in something like this, I would be supportive. And since it's not, I will rise in opposition to this. And I think we have to add to this debate the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. Now, many civil rights victories have used the equal protection clause of the

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Fourteenth Amendment. I think of ... of Brown v. the Board of Education, which helped... helped dismantle the evils of segregation. As I read the equal protection clause, as it currently exists, I do not see an exception that allows different treatment of the sexes in... absent of some compelling state interest. I just don't read it anywhere. I don't see any exception for sex in the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. So, when I think about the ERA, this is something that long since expired before I was even born. So, I will urge this chamber to get... to vote 'no'. This is a state... we are in deep financial crisis. We have a situation where we have millennials fleeing our state; we have property owners that can't afford their property tax payments and are losing their homes. Yet, we are going to debate something that is older than some of the Members of this chamber. So, I would urge a 'no' vote. Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Williams." Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Amendment. I'm Ann Williams and I'm grateful that my husband allowed me to be here today. Actually... actually, I don't have a husband and if I did, I don't think I'd need his permission to be here. But that's how anti-ERA activists, conservative icon and self-proclaimed housewife, Phyllis Schlafly, started her many public appearances. Interesting, huh? She did this she said to annoy the feminists. Well, in 1992 this eager bright-eyed young feminist and law student stood in the rain all day on Election Day in Des Moines, Iowa, fighting for the ERA. I wore a sandwich board and a button much like this one and urged Iowans to vote for it. I was energized, inspired and

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

hopeful, but I was very naïve. Why wouldn't everyone support equal rights for women, I wondered? Well, I learned that evening. Most of the State of Iowa voted 'no' on the ERA, but there was a strange strong showing of support for the ERA Amendment in southwest Iowa, a very, very conservative part of the state. So, what happened? Those in southwest Iowa got their TV from Omaha, Nebraska. No ads were run in Omaha TV. Instead, the rest of the people in Iowa watched TV commercials throughout the campaign for the ERA. A bizarre pr campaign and hundreds of thousands of commercials which misrepresented the impacts of passing the ERA and making mean-spirited and bizarre claims about what the ERA was really about. Such as, this gem from Pat Robertson on the ERA and the feminist agenda. 'Feminism is a socialist, anti-family political movement that encourages women to leave their husbands, kill their children, practice witchcraft, destroy capitalism and become lesbians.' Phyllis Schlafly's Eagle Forum ran crazy TV ads, which I remember watching, which played into people's deepest fears. It featured a hedonistic like scheme... scheme featuring men in women's clothing wearing boas, cavorting around wildly, apparently depicting what life would be like if the ERA was passed. And of course, a not so subtle attack on the LGBT community. The scary thing was, those ads worked. The misrepresentation, the hateful and bizarre rhetoric, it worked. Except it didn't work in southwest Iowa where people voted on the very simple issue at the heart of the ERA, should men and women be treated equally under the law? Simple question, simple answer. Yes. So today, 26 years later, I'm so excited to vote 'yes'. I'm grateful for the activists who

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

have been working to bring this to a vote today and I know many of them are listening in. I appreciate the exciting work of the young women that are working and becoming involved in this issue. They've embraced feminism with a new energy. But today, I'm thinking most about the women who've been fighting this fight for decades, the women who have come before us. They're the reason we're here. And while we have a long way to go, they're the reason we've come so far. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Kifowit."

Kifowit: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. The definition of

insanity is doing the same thing again and again and again. Listening to the false truths, to urge a cycle of no to continue is just not reality. And it's just not the world that we live in today. And we live in a State of Illinois that needs to recognize that all women are equal. We need to stop legitimizing these arguments that continue to keep females down, whether it's insinuating that women are too stupid to know what to do with their bodies or insinuating that women can't think for themselves and need somebody else to do it for them. We need to break that cycle. Equality is about embracing all individuals that are equal and realizing the important role that women have which is to be equal and recognize as being equal. I served in the military in 1990. When I joined, I was told that women could not serve on the front lines. And I knew many women, radio operators, individuals that served on the front lines who were denied accommodation medals and ribbons because they weren't supposed to be there even though they were. fundamentally wrong. From the beginning, we had women in the

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

military who dressed as men so they can serve. We had World War II women who were told you can only get to the rank of Lieutenant Colonel because the rank of Colonel and above was only for men. All this thankfully through the years women have persevered in order to get up the ranks in the military and in order to now finally be able to serve in the capacity in which they are very competent in serving. I am appalled and embarrassed that the State of Illinois has not done this earlier. I am proud to be on the side of history and I am proud to support not only all the women that this will help, that this will send a message to, but I'm also here to be a role model for my daughter. Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Ives is recognized."

Ives: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd just like to start by reading a few things into the record. Women are already quaranteed full equality in the workplace through Title VII in the Federal Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972, which prohibits any sex discrimination in the workplace in regards hiring, pay, promotion and establishes the Employment Opportunity Commission to enforce the law. Under the EEOC, women have won multimillion-dollar settlements against the largest companies in the country. Title VII also provides protection and recourse against sexual harassment. This legislation applies to all employers, unions and government entities. Just going back a little bit in history, in 1973 the EEOC and the Department of Labor and the Department of Justice and the nation's largest private employer signed a landmark consent decree to eliminate discriminatory recruiting, hiring and promotion practices

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

against women and minorities. Under that decree, they distributed millions of dollars to thousands of women and even minority men. In 1974, the EEC... EEOC, Department of Labor and Department of Justice filed suit against the nation's nine largest steel producers for discriminatory hiring, promotion, assignment and wage policies directed against men and women. These nine companies employed a total of 350 thousand workers. And the government suit named the steel workers union, the United Steel Workers of America, as a defendant. They agreed to ... that \$31 million in back pay were to be distributed to 40 thousand minority women. In 1980, the issued interim quidelines on sexual harassment, declaring that sex-related intimidation on the creating a sexually charged, hostile work environment is unlawful under Title VII. Notwithstanding the controversy surrounding the issue, the Commission voted to adopt the quidelines. In 1986, a.m. the Supreme Court for the first time recognized that sexual harassment is a violation of Title VII. In 1987, the year that I graduated from West Point, following the EEOC's decision in the federal sector in a... in a case against the Department of the Navy, the Secretary of the Navy announced the change in policy providing that female civilian employees will be allowed to participate in sea trials on the same basis as males. In 1998, the EEOC resolved two sexual harassment suits resolving large classes of female victims. And in 1999, the EEOC resolved another class action sexual harassment lawsuit against one of the country's largest lettuce growers. So, what you see here is we've made a lot of progress in this area. And we have a number of laws

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

on the bed... on the books already to protect women. The fact of the matter is, is that women will not be protected until men decide to protect them and decide to stop the sexual harassment, decide to stop the domestic abuse, decide to stop the sex trafficking, decide in the workplaces when they are in charge that they're going to protect the women under their charge. We have the rules on the books. What we need is great men to stand up and protect women. And this Body knows it. Having just gone through numerous instances of sexual harassment being filed and having already people being fired over the issue by some of the most politically influential folks in the state. We know how to solve this problem of equal rights for women. And men need to be the folks to stand up and solve it 'cause the rules are on the books. I will reiterate again, I was raised by strong parents, a strong mother, a strong father. I was not denied the opportunities. I was allowed to go to West Point, I was allowed to serve in the military in the capacity that I wanted to. And if General's in the past never realized that women are in combat, then they just did not realize it. But women have been in combat... combat since the Revolutionary War. And so, men I call upon you to solve this problem. We don't need a defunct law that's been, you know, been dead for decades to solve the problems of women's issues. We need men to be the strong men and support women as their equals. Otherwise, you're just putting another law on the book and it won't mean anything." Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Flowers."

10000141.docx

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, I want to preface my

remarks by saying, I respect myself and I am a woman. And

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

I've never in the 60-some odd years that I've been here on this earth, I have never, ever had my rights given to me. I've always had to fight for what is mine. Despite the fact, as someone stated earlier, when the Constitution was written it was written by all men. I was not included, black men wasn't included, white women wasn't included. It was written by all men. And later on when there was the movement eventually black men was added. But prior to that, there was the Women's Suffrage Movement. And it was Ms. Paul and Stanton and ... and others who was fighting for the women's rights. When they finally... when the women finally got their right to vote, despite the fact black women were supposed to have gotten their rights as well, we did not get our rights. Despite the fact in the Fifteenth Amendment black men was given the right to vote. That, too, was taken away with the Jim Crow. So the fact of the matter is, there was some laws on the books, but they did not apply to me until 1965. I had to wait almost 100 years before I really got my right to vote. Before I really got my civil rights. And you want to tell me that something that was written back in 1923 is going to apply to me today? It's going to make me equal? It's going to protect me? No, that's not true, Representative. Because the language in this Resolution is talking about sex. It does not say... you yourself said it at the hearing that we had. When I asked you, what does this Bill do for me? You said, this Bill doesn't apply to me. Thank you for telling the truth. You told the truth, Representative. And so, you tell me the reason why I would vote for something that will cause me harm? Because right now there are laws on the books. I can sue now. I do have rights

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

because of the Civil Rights Movement and because of the Voting Rights Act. But the fact of the matter is, for you to stand up on this floor and say any of us that don't support this ... well, I do know what Susan B. Anthony said in regards to before she sees a... a negro get the right to vote before she does, she'll cut off her right arm. I do remember that Alice Paul, she was a very proud racist woman. So, what is it that she's written that I would like to have my daughter to live ... live up to? Now, I understand... I do understand that this is something that's been going on for a long time in a lot of people's lives. But in the midst of 1923, here we are in 2018, let me tell you a few things that has happened. There was a movie out not too long ago and the title of the movie was called Hidden Figures. And that movie was made in the early '60s when we was trying to send a spaceship to the moon. It was some African-American women who at that time, Sir, had no rights because the Civil Rights Bill had not passed. It was at that time when they could not vote because we had not gotten our Voting Rights Act despite the fact the nineteenth Amendment had passed. But the fact of the matter is, despite all of that, they were not able to legally be able to read and write. In order to help send that spaceship to the moon, they had to sneak and lie and cheat to get a book out of the library. In order to help to send a man to the moon, they had to go to another building because they couldn't use the same bathroom. And there was other things that the humiliation that they had to go through and no one ever spoke up to them. But you know what, they had a made up mind. They had made up their mind that they was going to do what's right for this

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

United States of America despite the fact that Constitution wasn't written for them, despite the fact the United States of America wasn't doing right by them. But they were a women of..."

Speaker Turner: "Please make your final remarks, Representative." "I just want to say about another group of women that I recently read about. These women were a bunch of white women from Penn State. And, you know, they grew up in a very precarious time, again in the early '60s. They were able to go to Penn State and they got scholarships from all kinds of people. And, you know, no one ever told them what they couldn't do. No one ever told them they couldn't become CEOs, they couldn't become airplane pilots. No one ever told them that they couldn't be doctors, lawyers, banker men, whatever it is that they wanted to be. No one ever told them that. And you know what, they went on to be successful because they didn't know anything about the feminists' movement. They didn't know anything about the ERA. But more importantly, let me just tell about what it is... if you pass this Resolution, you are going to put wealthy women against poor working women. Because, see, the wealthy women they don't have to worry about lifting heavy bags and heavy boxes. They don't have to worry about having babysitters. They don't have to worry about their rights being violated. But then the ... the poor women that have to go to work every day and... and to say, you want to make me equal. Face it, Sir... and we all need to acknowledge this. We can talk about being equal all we want, but I will never be equal to you and you will never be equal to me because I am

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

a woman and you are a man. And whatever it is... I don't care what you..."

Speaker Turner: "Excuse me, Representative DeLuca would like to yield his time to Representative Flowers. Representative Flowers you may continue."

Flowers: "Thank you, Representative. I am, with all respect, Sir, it... it was not my intention to get myself upset. But when you made your opening remarks, I thought you were very disrespectful. And I just want to say to those of us in this House, and those of you that may be listening, I'm not going to raise my daughter to go up to no man and say, may I please have my rights. And none of us got here begging and pleading anybody to give us anything. We are strong. We are ... we are wise. We were able to go to work, have babies, still be a Legislator and do all of that without any permissions. And so the fact of the matter is, for you to talk about this ERA as if we're living back in 1923, shame on you, Sir. Because why don't you tell the truth. That things have changed. As a matter of fact... as a matter of fact, I just wanted to say to you that Justice Ginsburg she also talked about how when this ... there will come a time when this hap... when this Bill does happen, it will probably be too late because all the things that they were trying to get back in those days would have already happened. Will you admit, Sir, that we've come a long ways, baby? Would you admit that things have gotten better since 1923? Can you admit that Mrs. Paul and Anthony and Stanton they would be very proud of the things that they did despite the fact that each and every last one of these women that pushed this beyond the Nineteenth Amendment, they

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

purposely said this is really not for the negros. They really did not want us to be a part of it by no means. And they basically said that this is to make the white women superior. Well, you know what, I tell you, Sir, I've been a lot of people come and go on this earth and none of us lived any longer because of the color of our skin. And what we need to be discussing today while we're talking about this Bill... the equal rights would be that people will have equal rights to jobs, opportunity, education. People who are dying today because they don't have equal rights to be able to afford prescription drugs. They don't have opportunity to have equal rights to have a decent housing, or decent health care or a place for their children to sleep at night. Those would be equal rights. Those should be the type of rights, Sir, that we should be taking up our time on this floor today to be discussing. And furthermore, one thing I love about the laws that we have today... the laws that we have today I could have it in civil... in the State Courts as well as the Federal Courts. But the laws that you... this... this Resolution that you're talking about, currently, if my memory serves me, it would only be for the government. If someone were to do me some harm, I could take my case to the Federal Court, I could take my case to the State Court. But for instance like Ford Motor Company, that's a private company, if your Bill were to become ratified... if this Resolution were to become ratified, it would not apply to private companies. So, do you see you're setting us back? Do you see that... that the strict scrutiny that will be place for various reason will become ... we would have to go through Section, by Section,

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

by Section? The... the Bills that we could be working on to move things forward we would have to be going back... going back to redo some of the things that have to be done because of this ERA that says that I'm supposed to be equal to you. And then a judge would have to look at you and I both and judge us on the... whatever the... the scrutiny may be. There's three levels of scrutiny and I can't remember them now. But I do know the one strict scrutiny because that depends... that... that's where my race come into place. My race is something that I cannot change. There's nothing that I can do about it. So, without any... and thank you very much again, Representative, for yielding your time. But Representative, with all due respect, I would appreciate that we would send a message to the women today that we are wise..."

Speaker Turner: "Representative, you're on a timer. That's why the mic keeps cutting off. So, respectfully, can you make your final comment? You've been yielded time and you've had extra time. Thank you very much."

Flowers: "Sir, I appreciate you."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Fine."

Fine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Lang, I can't thank you enough for bringing this Resolution forward. All I have to say is, it's about time. There are men, women, boys, girls who have fought for this for years and years and years. And now, it's time for us to bring this over the finish line. The U.S. Constitution is a living document and it can be amended to reflect the changes in society. We have seen many changes since this was first introduced. So, it is well past time for women to have the Constitutional backbone to protect our

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

rights. The Equal Rights Amendment would ensure that all people benefit from our Democratic principles. So, not just all men are created equal, but we are all created equal and we have equal justice under the law. For more than two centuries, women have fighting to win the rights that they have been quaranteed to others. We need the ERA to prevent a rollback of women's rights and to promote laws and court decisions that fairly take into account women's as well as men's experiences. Unless we put into the Constitution the bedrock principle that equality of rights cannot be denied or abridged on a count of sex and political and judicial victories that women have achieved for the past two centuries can be reversed at any time. And we are already seeing that under this current administration. Congress has the power to make laws that replace the existing laws and do so by a simple Majority; therefore, many of the current legal protections against sex discrimination can be removed by the margin of a single vote. We cannot let that happen. And this is our time to protect the progress that we've made and the progress that we can see in the future. This is a very exciting day for me because not only did we bring this forward, but I have my husband and son on the floor with me to see what Illinois can do to move the state ahead. In our household I have taught my children about equality. And I am equal in our house. Well, maybe sometimes I'm the boss in our house, but I tell them that we're equal. What's important to me is that my family knows that not only am I equal in our home, and not only am I teaching them equality, but the Constitution of the United States sees me as their equal. And the law protects me as an

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

equal under our Constitution. It is about time we get this done. Thirty-seven is a great number. Let's be the 37th state to ratify the ERA. Thank you again, Leader Lang."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Winger."

Winger: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am pro-life. Again, I am pro-life. I'm a mother of a two-year old daughter. I am for her and others to know that the State of Illinois believes she should have the same opportunities as men. Vote 'yes'."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Morrison."

Morrison: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Amendment. So, I am a proud graduate of Hillsdale College in Hillsdale, Michigan, founded in 1844. The first college in the United States to prohibit in its charter any discrimination based on race, religion or sex. It was the second college in the entire United States to grant four-year degrees to women. And so, I rise in opposition to this Amendment, but I do so for a variety of reasons, some of have been stated by other speakers. Yes, I do have concerns regarding the ... the abortion concerns and I think those are valid points. But I have other concerns I'd like to bring up as well. First of all, Leader Lang, I... I was in that four-hour... we went for about three or four hours in that subject matter hearing in Chicago. And you stated several times on... in that testimony, and then here as well on the floor, we need to add women to the Constitution. This Amendment doesn't. It does not add the word women. It does not add women to the Constitution. Take a look at the language. It just says, equality of rights. This... the ... the comment has been made that we've had an ERA provision in our Illinois State Constitution and there have been none of these

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

consequences that... that some of our side have raised or some on your side have raised, but the language is different. Now, I'm not a lawyer, but I know that words matter. And the language in the Amendment you have here, equality of rights, is different than what we have in our State Constitution that quarantees equal protection under the law. Now, I try to do my homework, listen to what proponents have said. I'm looking at a flyer here from a group called Equal Means Equal. And I think this is what Representative Flowers was... was alluding to. That we ... we are different. We are objectively different. That means... that doesn't mean that we should have different rights, it just means that the law recognizes the differences and women. And those men are reasonable, understandable, commonsense differences. And we see that reflected in our Federal and State Laws. But according to this flyer it says, the ERA provides a fundamental legal remedy against sex discrimination for both women and men. The problem is, as we have seen in... in the last several years, that there will be men who will claim discrimination for not being able to participate on certain women's sports teams or receive certain scholarships that have been set aside for actual women. And if you have the... the hammer of the ERA, those protections would... would go away, protections for women. Furthermore, according to this flyer, the ERA would require the courts to judge sex discrimination with the highest Constitutional protection of strict scrutiny now used for religion and race. So, we had a Bill not long ago, now a law, now being challenged in the courts on the health care right of conscience. There are doctors and nurses,

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

medical professionals, both men and women who for reasons of ... of a conscience, do not want to be involved in the decision of abortion. Well, the law doesn't require them to do that. But with an ERA it could be argued in court that those individuals are discriminating against a procedure that only women would be seeking. And so, imagine the situation, you know, just like we... we would find it abhorrent that someone would not provide medical care for someone of a certain race or a certain religion. Will a doctor or a nurse who has prolife convictions be charged with discrimination and lose their license because they're discriminating against women for not wanting to do that procedure? I'm going to wrap up here. Just reading into the record some of the information from the Stop ERA group, and by the way, it's almost all women who are in this group. Women and men are biologically different, we must retain the ability to legally provide for these differences. We have a women and minority-owned business enterprise provision. Those would go away because that is a set-aside for women. In the 18 states that passed an Equal Rights Amendment, there have not been benefits for women. Instead, the courts have taken away those protections. In Maryland, the court held that the State ERA a husband could no longer be required to support his dependent wife. In Pennsylvania, a father was exempted from providing support for his minor children and a husband's legal responsibility for his wife's hospital and medical bills was nullified. And finally, think about insurance rates. They're set based upon the differences in... in sex. For health, life but also things like automobile insurance. Women are typically better

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

drivers. They would not be able to get preferred rates because we will have equal rights. No..."

Speaker Turner: "Please make your final comment, Representative."

Morrison: "...no differences based on sex. I need another minute

and a half, if someone would yield their time to me?"

Speaker Turner: "Representative Barb Wheeler would like yield her time to Representative Morrison."

Morrison: "Thank you. The last couple things I want to say is, you know, one of ... one of my colleagues cited the number of states that passed ERA. And he... he cited conservative states, you know. But keep in mind when equal... when the ERA was first introduced in 1972 there were quickly about 20 states that ratified it. In 1973, there were another a dozen, maybe 15 states that quickly ratified it. Well, what else happened in 1973? The Supreme Court handed down Roe v Wade. And that's why the... the movement on ERA dramatically slowed down. And it stopped and actually there are five states that have tried to rescind their ratification of ERA. That should tell us something. The timing of this, 1972, 1973 should tell us something. That our concerns about this being an expansion of... of abortion are valid. A constriction of reasonable commonsense regulations about abortion are valid. The last I'll say is, you know, there have been very strong capable intelligent women and men who oppose this for very valid reasons. And that's why I would urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Wallace."

Wallace: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise honestly quite emotional, with my heart racing. These are my last weeks and months in this chamber. I'm the daughter of a man who was born on a

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

plantation. I'm the granddaughter of a woman who left the south to come to Chicago for opportunity but never found it because of her race and her gender. A woman who raised her children in Ida B. Wells housing project, who had children with a man who was a janitor at Evanston High School, who was the daughter of a woman who died after childbirth. I stand here a single mother who has survived damn near anything you can think of. And I mean that quite literally. And while I just sat here and wrote all these eloquent things that I thought I was going to say and things that I thought might change some ideas or notions, I just want to put some facts on the record because it, again, is probably some of the last times I'll be able to speak here. When I got to this chamber, it was just 90 days or so after... well, I had only be in office about 90 days and it was just after we elected our current Governor. And it was right as we went to a point of upheaval within our budget and some of us have functioned over the last few years as if none of that has happened. But because of the walk and the journey that I've had in my life, I know the real impact of the things that go on this in room, the things that people take for granted here, the things that people speak over each other about, the things that people forget is everyday life or death for people. Whether or not they can eat, whether or not their kids have access to child care. I go so hard on the child care issue because my grandmother worked on the north side of Chicago to take care of white women's children and had to leave her own children at home to raise themselves. And I go so hard about child care because when my mother found herself single, she worked

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

the graveyard shift at the post office and I stayed home alone with my little sister and had DCFS found out we would have been taken. I go hard for all the things that I go hard for. And for those of you who don't understand that term, I might not be that young, but I'm still a little hip hop, that means you throw everything you have into something. But I go hard for those things because if I don't it's been my own lived experience that this chamber won't. And so, I feel conflicted today. Because I stand here black and a woman. And every single day of that existence in some way or another I am asked whether it's explicitly or implicitly to choose between those two realities and that's impossible. So, for my white sisters in the chamber, please stop asking black women to choose just their gender and their sex. To my black brothers in the chamber, please stop asking black women to choose their race and not their sex. To the white men in the chamber, I ask that you do deep reflection over the privileges that are exalted to you within this society because you were born with less melanin than I and with genitalia that I don't possess. I know I'm coming down on my time and I do ask that someone yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Representative Andrade would like to yield the rest of his time to Representative Wallace."

Wallace: "Thank you. Thank you, Representative. So, while we stand and we debate an issue that we've had a lot of historic questions and discussion about, I just continue to be disappointed at the fact that we parse out everything. And we refuse to recognize intersectionality, not just in this debate but in damn near every debate that occurs in this Body,

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

whether it's a committee or here on the floor. Some people don't have the ability to choose between their race, their gender, their class, whether they live downstate or upstate. Yet, we make decisions about those things in a very singular way. Today is extremely important and extremely historic. But as I stated about a week ago, women who present to the world like me have been asking for centuries, ain't I a woman? And we continue to hear a resounding 'no' to that question almost every day. The protections that Representative Ives spoke of are protections that women of color almost never receive. Whether it's from our government, our community, the lack of economic equity, the fact that people don't find us worthy of the same types of gentleness and protection and peace that we afford people who don't look like us. None of that that I just shared is taken lightly as I make my decision here today. And I quite honestly am worried about my son as we make this decision here today because there are no constitutionally engrained protections for a black man in America. There simply aren't. And so, it'd be very selfish for me to not acknowledge that. And it would be very selfish for everyone in this chamber to ask any woman of color in here to ignore that. And it would be very selfish of anyone in this chamber to ask any mother of a child of color to ignore that. And so, while I appreciate the Leader and I appreciate all that he's done for years around this issue, I had to put all of that on the record and make it plain as brother Malcolm used to say. Because if we don't make these things plain, these discussions won't continue and that's one of my fears moving forward. It's actually the only thing I fear about leaving this place.

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

I'm not saying that I'm the person that brings all of that, there are many people who do in their own way, but I hope that the type of urgency that we're experiencing right now around this issue is the same type of urgency that we will experience around other issues of equality and equity. And so, I can't tell you how to vote here today but I just had to state some simple truths for the record. And I ask that you continue to think about these things in the manner that I asked and do some serious soul searching about the types of privilege that comes along with us being here and how our own privileges often allow us to ignore the realities of people in our state, particularly the things that were outlined by Leader Flowers and the things that have been outlined by other Members who are either for or against this particular measure. Don't take this vote lightly 'cause I surely will not. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Scherer."

Scherer: "Well, that's a tough act to follow. I just simply wanted to make a very brief statement about this. It's weighed heavy on all our minds for a long time. I know for me it's been ever since the day I walked in the door, but it goes back further than that. It goes back to when I was in college and people were all talking about the ERA. Since that time, I'm now a mother of three daughters; I'm a grandma of four granddaughters. I listened to many of my Catholic pro-life friends and family, several... several of them are very dignified attorneys and every time I asked I got the same answer. They said it's time to quit using pro-life as an excuse to suppress women. I dream of a day when all people

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

are treated equally. And I hope that today is that day. And I intend to vote 'yes'. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Bryant."

Bryant: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If the Sponsor will yield, I'm

just going to address the Amend... the proposed Amendment?"

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

Bryant: "Thank you. This is am this is an issue that gets people very jacked up. And as a previous speaker, my heart's racing a little bit because I'm not really sure what I'm going to say, but there's a couple things that come to mind. First, because a previous speaker said something about, you know, not being married or whatever. I just... I've been married for 37 years. And I will tell you that in that 37 years my husband doesn't tell me what to do. I don't think he would dare try to tell what to do. Not because he's afraid of me or because I'm afraid of him but because we have mutual respect, one for another, as should we all have one for another. I have one daughter and I have one son, two granddaughters and two grandsons. And I'll tell you that my daughter has been raised to... to know you don't let anybody push you around not man or woman. Stand up for your rights, you stand up for who you are and you don't let somebody push you around. But I will tell you about my son, that once we were walking across the church parking lot and his great aunt was at the door in front of him... or... as he went to the door to open it for her she got there and was going to hold the door for him and he said, Aunt Jewel, my mom's coming across that parking lot and if I go in this door before you do, she's going to beat me, right? So, I want my daughter to know she can stand up for her rights

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

and I want my son to know that he should be respectful for ... to the women that are around, just as he should be respectful to the men that around him. I just hope... and so that my daughter would be respectful of both male and female. And I would hope that my daughter is teaching my son... teaching her four children the same thing. I worked for 20 years, in the Department of Corrections. And in that 20 years I remember going in almost every day and being reminded that I was walking into a man's world. And that I had to approach things a little bit differently because for 8 or 16 hours a day I was walking into a man's world. And when new women came into the Department of Corrections, sometimes I'd take them off to the side and say, listen, men don't fight the same way women do. We're going to have an argument with the men, go toe to toe with them, take them out in the parking lot, have a fight with them out there if you want to, whatever. When it's over, it's over, right, because we deal with things a little bit differently, women do than men do. It's... it is... it is... some of it is the way we're wired. The way God created us to be. We're wired a little bit differently. That doesn't mean that we... that... that we're not equal because we do things differently when it comes to our rights. But I will tell you this, I had a shift commander one time who decided that he was going to come over and he was going to treat my department a little bit differently than everybody else's 'cause he was mad at me about something else. So, I waited until a day that I knew I could get him in the office by himself, except for his secretary. I asked the secretary to leave. And because I've already used the 'b' word last week, I'm not going to

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

use it today. So, when I get to that part I'm just going to leave it blank, okay? But I said to him, listen, I didn't ... I'm nobody's niece or... or daughter, I didn't get this job that way. I didn't sleep my way into my job. I didn't buy my job and I am not your ... you can fill in the blank. You know what it did? It made him respect me a little bit more because I stood up for my rights. I didn't need somebody else to come in and tell me that I had equal rights with him because I know I have equal rights with him. Now, I'm going to say something that's a little bit controversial and I... I'm sorry, I don't mean disrespect on this, but you know we have a... a Member of this chamber that just a few days ago made a complaint about being harassed. And as a response, she received a letter from the Speaker of this chamber and in that letter the last sentence or so, and that I read, I thought that she was threatened. You can read it however you want, but in that... I think the last couple sentences said, thankful for continued service in chairing a committee and as part of a budget negotiation team. If you want for people to have equal rights, if you want for people to be treated equally, then when things like that happen we should be standing up and saying, that's not right. Those threats can't be over, they can't be covert. We have ... we can stand up for our own rights, Ladies. The only thing that I'm going to say today is, my whole life I haven't needed the Equal Rights Amendment because by God nobody's going to take my rights away from me. I don't need an Equal Rights Amendment now, my daughter doesn't need an Equal Rights Amendment, granddaughters don't need it. So, I say to you Ladies in here,

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

stand up for your rights. We don't need something on a piece of paper that says it, whether or not it would stand up in court or not. We're at a place today, Ladies, when we are equal with our rights. Stand up for them. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Wheeler."

- Wheeler, K.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. At the request of some of my colleagues, should this Amendment receive the requisite number of votes I would request a verification, Sir."
- Speaker Turner: "A verification has been requested by Representative Wheeler. Chair recognizes Representative Welch."
- Welch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today in support of this very important Amendment. I rise today because we have an opportunity to make history here. We have an opportunity not just to make history in the State of Illinois but across this great country. And I've listened to the debate. And one of the things I wanted to point out was what one of our current Supreme Court Justices says about the Equal Rights Amendment. One of our Constitutional Scholars that sits on our U.S. Supreme Court says, and I quote, 'If I could choose an Amendment to add to the Constitution, it would be the Equal Rights Amendment'. This Supreme Court Justice goes on to say, 'I would like my granddaughters, when they pick up the Constitution, to see that women and men are... are persons of equal stature. I'd like them to see that it is a basic principle of our society'. That is a quote from the great Ruth Bader Ginsburg. She would encourage us to pass the Equal Rights Amendment. Students all across this state and across the nation that are in 7th grade are learning our

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Constitution. When they pick up that document, they should know that men and women are equal. Why are we still having this debate? The Constitution is a document that has rarely been changed. It is extremely difficult to change that document, but a statute can easily be changed. We have a President in the White House right now, if he could gut the Civil Rights Act of 1965 he would do it and he'd do it now. His Congress is doing their best to try to reverse it now. I would rather rely on the U.S. Constitution than a statute that can be changed by Donald Trump. A man that hates women. He has no respect for women. I would rather rely on our U.S. Constitution than Donald Trump. We have a leader in this country who relishes disrespecting women. There is no better time than now people to pass the ERA. Let's stand up. Let's stand up for women. Let's stand up for black women, white women, brown women, women of all kind and pass the ERA today. Let's vote 'yes' and pass the ERA now. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Ammons."

Ammons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. To the Resolution I should say. Initially I wasn't going to make comment here today, but I thought about this in relationship to a few things that were said by a few of our Members that really drove home the point of passing the ERA. And without me getting into too much historical reference here about the status and hierarchy... hierarchical structure of race in America, I decided that I would just make the Constitutional argument even though I'm not a lawyer but I simply play one every now and again. And in this case I thought that the reason why you need this Constitutional Amendment... you need

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

to pass the NRA because of what we experience with the Voting Rights Act. Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act was gutted. And the gutting of the Section 5, meaning Section 4 first, but it rendered Section 5 which protected us, meaning those who had gained their rights in the 1960s to vote, it protected us from voter suppression techniques that were happening across the south. This is a very important point. Without Constitutional protections, any Bill or law can be changed. It's very difficult to change the Constitution, which my great colleague just made that point. So, when we look at the Voting and voter suppression techniques consolidating vote, polling locations to requiring voter ID and all of the other shenanigans that are being run by the right, this really makes the point why we must pass the Equal Rights Amendment. We can argue how it is applied later, but the principle point here, just like the principle point of all Americans having the uninhibited right to vote, all women should have the uninhibited right to equal everything else in this society which doesn't currently exist. And we can pretend that other things cover other provisions but today we know that there is a need for equal pay still, even though we have so many free thinking men in this chamber we can't seem to get equal pay. So, this is an important provision that will take us further down the road on this exercise of democracy in America. We haven't gotten there, but we are traveling on a path towards what we say is equal under the Declaration of Independence. And to make the document true, we have to continue to push forward towards those noble words and noble truths. And so, just like with the Voting Rights Act, we'll

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

continue to strengthen access to voting for people in our state. We'll continue to push back on voter suppression techniques, no matter where they come from. And we'll continue to fight for equal rights for women, women of all colors. We will continue to fight for women regardless to where they come from or their geographic location in the State of Illinois. But more importantly, this country needs a moral check. Because every time it comes to the issue of equity and justice, it seems to get a little bit amnesia. And this Bill reminds us of the unfinished business of the Constitution of this great country that we all say we will uphold. And so, I urge... I actually do urge a vote affirmative for the ERA today. And I wasn't sure... I did a lot of research on this over the weekend. I looked at the federal language. I did all the things that people are saying. But what is very clear to me is if you don't codify the language, if you don't at least get us on the board, we don't have a whole lot of protection because it certainly don't come natural in this country. So, thank you and vote 'yes'."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Cassidy."

Cassidy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This has been a fascinating debate. Nothing more fascinating than the fact that it even is one. Fundamentally, this couldn't be more simple, but obviously we've heard a lot today that shows that it isn't. I was raised in a really, really traditional first generation Irish-Catholic family and I think that... I often think that my dad wondered what he did to deserve five daughters under those circumstances. And how he ended up marrying one of the first women admitted into the Coast Guard in World War II, who

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

raised her daughters to never blink, to never take no for an answer. And that is a gift that I will never take for granted. I'm raising my sons never to put themselves above anyone else. And I strive more than anything else to live that example for them. It's real easy for those of us who have the privilege of being in this chamber to talk about what we can and can't do and what we're made of because each of us, by virtue of the way we... we've come into these roles, comes at this with a certain amount of self-confidence and a more than healthy dose of privilege. Obviously, as one of the previous speakers noted, I've made pretty clear that I can stand up for myself. I am voting 'yes' today as opposed to that speaker who said that they intended to vote 'no' because they can stand up for themselves. I'm voting 'yes' today not because I'm going to ask some man to change the way he behaves and make a decision to make life better for me. I'm going to make life better for me. But I'm going to make life better for everyone behind me. That is our obligation. Our obligation is to acknowledge our privilege and vote 'yes' for those who don't have the gifts that we were given. The gift that brought us into this role, the gift that gave us this responsibility today. To make the world a better place for those who may not feel safe standing up, for those who may not feel that they were raised with the confidence to speak their minds. Please, it's simple. It's a handful of words. Vote 'yes'."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Mayfield."

Mayfield: "Thank you. I wasn't going to speak on this Bill but I am compelled after listening some of the testimony here today.

I'm appalled by some of the things that I have heard. I'm

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

appalled just as Representative Flowers was by the Sponsor's opening speech where he had the audacity to mention race. And this ... we all know that this Bill does not affect women that are black, brown or any other color. This Bill actually takes us four steps backwards. It does not in any way, shape or form benefit a woman of color. It does not. Individuals have stated that they read the language. Well, obviously, you didn't comprehend what it was that you read. Representative Morrison is right. The language matters. What is in this ... in this particular Bill, these few little words as it was just stated, they have a significant impact on what they are going to do to the individual. This Bill is a bad Bill. I'm sorry. It is wrong for Illinois. It is wrong for every single one of us in this chamber. We are pushing language that was written in 1923. We have come a long way since then. Racial relations have come a long way since then. If you look at this Constitutional Amendment, if you look at the language in our own Illinois Constitution, Illinois is backwards. Alaska has a more progressive Constitutional Amendment than Illinois ever will because they acknowledge race. They acknowledge ethnicity. You know we heard words like equity and equality. Well, this Bill doesn't give it to us. It actually takes it away. The language in this Bill, those few little words that everybody thinks are just so inconsequential, what do they really do? They supersede the Fourteenth Amendment. They take away that racial equality from us. This is what Representative Flowers was trying to explain. This is what was being ignored. When I brought this matter up to the Sponsor, he told me... he acknowledged that this Bill would take away my rights, but

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

told me to vote for it anyway. Why in the world would I vote for a Bill that would take away my rights? I am a mother. How can I stand on this floor and go home and tell my daughter that I voted for a Bill that would subject her to becoming a second class citizen? I absolutely cannot and I will not. And anyone that says anything differently did not read and comprehend what it was that this Bill will do. This is a horrible, horrible Act. It will not take us into the next century; it will take my people four steps back. I recommend a 'no' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Conyears-Ervin."

Conyears-Ervin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I... I waited to listen to the debate. I thought these questions will be answered. So, I... I do want to ask some questions for the record. So, will the Sponsor yield?"

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

Conyears-Ervin: "And I'm only asking these questions because these are some questions that some women presented to me. So, I just want it for the record. If this was to take place... if this was to pass, is it possible... can women be drafted into the service if there was a war?"

Lang: "Representative, women could be drafted into the service now if Congress wanted to do that."

Conyears-Ervin: "Okay. So, this does not change that at all?"

Lang: "This does not change that."

Conyears-Ervin: "Okay. I wonder what were the opponents speaking about. Do you have an idea? Maybe I'm not asking the question correctly."

Lang: "I... I didn't hear you, Representative?"

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

- Conyears-Ervin: "Do you know what the opponents were referencing?

 Maybe I'm not asking the question correctly."
- Lang: "The... the opponents often take some language and twist it into a form to try to convince people of one point of view or another. That's often what you hear down here in Springfield; that's often what you hear in government. Congress, if they chose, could draft women today."
- Conyears-Ervin: "Okay. So, same applies to being on the front line as women? Congress could do that today?"
- Lang: "Congress has the power to make war and Congress can do that today. However, without the Equal Rights Amendment if Congress did decide to draft women, they could put them in deplorable conditions. They could... they could not acknowledge the differences between women and men and... and they could force them, without the Equal Rights Amendment, into situations that none of us would want them to be in."
- Conyears-Ervin: "Okay. Thank you. And my next question is, one of the other questions that came up from a woman was, like currently I know a woman that worked in a factory, she was pregnant and because she was pregnant she wasn't able to work the entire shift. She had to take two or three additional breaks because of her pregnancy. Does this Amendment possibly take that right away where she will be considered equal..."

Lang: "No."

Conyears-Ervin: "...to a man? No?"

Lang: "Simple answer, no."

Conyears-Ervin: "Thank you. And then, that... so the same would apply to a nursing mom that have to take additional breaks. She would not be... that would not be denied because of the Equal

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Rights Amendment, that she would be considered equal to a man..."

Lang: "No."

Conyears-Ervin: "...in that aspect?"

Lang: "No."

Conyears-Ervin: "Okay. So, then when we hear Equal Rights Amendment then what exactly does that mean? You know, we hear the word equal. What... what does this mean?"

Lang: "The most important aspect of this is the way the courts look at laws that are passed by states, by the Federal Government. And so, under today's law because women are not included under the... in the United States Constitution, when a court looks at a law they can't give it what's known as strict scrutiny. And strict scrutiny would require that they look at... at women as a group the way they have to look at race under the Fourteenth Amendment, the way they have to look at religion or freedom of speech under the First Amendment. Without that, they... laws don't have to make any accommodations for women whatsoever, but under strict scrutiny a court can look at a law passed by us, any other state or the Federal Government and determine whether if it discriminates against women do... is there a good basis for doing so or not a good basis for doing so? In other words, if they require separate bathrooms for women under the law, is there are good basis for doing that? And of course there is. And so, that's what will happen. What will happen is that we will create a higher standard of review of laws that are passed by state and by the Federal Government and without that we have a lower level of scrutiny, a lower level of ... of

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

review by a court system looking to determine when somebody challenges a law if it discriminates against women or if it doesn't discriminate against women."

Conyears-Ervin: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Thapedi."

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

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

Thapedi: "Leader Lang, if you could just give me a little clarification? I think it's a little difficult two men asking this question about something that's so important to women and all of us, quite frankly. And I just want to make sure that I understand exactly what's going on so that I can make an informed decision. I was looking at the list of proponents and opponents and I don't see a couple of organizations that are highly relevant to my decision with respect to the district that I represent. Have you heard from the NAACP on this issue?"

Lang: "I have not, Sir."

Thapedi: "Have you heard from the Urban League on this issue?"

Lang: "I have not, Sir."

Thapedi: "Have you heard from the Cook County Bar Association on this issue?"

Lang: "I have not."

Thapedi: "Okay. There was a statement a little earlier that the current language was somewhat archaic or is somewhat archaic and could potentially erode the rights of black women. Is that true?"

Lang: "Well, I certainly don't see it that way. I see this as an opportunity to be more inclusive for all women. Yes, the

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

racial problems in this country are intense. And yes, African Americans have been left behind by this country. And African Americans have not been given their due. And particularly, African-American women have had grave difficulties capturing the American dream. But this Amendment is an Amendment that gives more people a chance to get more out of this country. Certainly gives them the opportunity to complain when government is mistreating them. This is about when government mistreats people."

Thapedi: "Understood. But my question is... is very specific. It's about black women and how this Amendment will affect or impact them? And in large part, the reason why I ask that question is I'm looking at the roster of chief cosponsors and I don't see any of the... the black women listed. So, that's why I'm a little bit at a loss for trying to understand why is there a difference in opinion with the ladies on this issue? And if you could help give me some direction it would be greatly appreciated."

Lang: "Well first, Sir, as to the cosponsors, the first four people that asked me are on the board. That's... that's it. I... I didn't plan who the cosponsors would be..."

Thapedi: "Understood."

Lang: "...to try to look demographically or racially balanced. I just took the first four..."

Thapedi: "Understood."

Lang: "...as I do with most pieces of legislation to come over from the Senate. My guess is you'd do the same thing. So, this gives all women the ability to have less discrimination

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

against them and that includes black women. To me, that's a simple premise."

Thapedi: "And... and let me switch gears a little bit because my district also has a significant Latino population. Can this or will this language in any way have a deleterious impact on Latino women?"

Lang: "Well, and in fact, Latino women are even farther down on the scale of... of women in this country who cannot achieve reasonable salary levels and reasonable health care levels. They are even below black women in... in those... in those areas. The point here is that this is not designed to give people more money, it's not designed to give them a job. It's designed to make sure that government doesn't pass laws to make it worse. To discriminate against people. We already have laws and we haven't reached the full... the full intensity of what those laws are supposed to be, but we've already... we already have laws to protect against discrimination for color, for race. We already have laws that say you can't discriminate against somebody because of their religion. But now, we need a law to protect against discriminating against someone because they're a woman."

Thapedi: "Understood. And while I only have 35 seconds left and I... I understand that you brought up the strict scrutiny analysis, or at least treatment versus intermediate or irrational basis, and I think that we both know that anytime a law is subject to strict scrutiny analysis it's going to fail. We pretty much know that. That's why it's designed that way. So, other than the strict scrutiny analysis that will be

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

applied to those laws that are designed apparently to protect women, what else will this Amendment do?"

Lang: "This Amendment will protect women from inappropriate..."

Speaker Turner: "Please complete your remarks, Representative."

Lang: "...from inappropriate and discriminatory statutory action by states and the Federal Government. That's what it's designed to do. And let me add before my microphone goes off, additional Sponsors on this legislation, Sir, who you don't see on the board are Representative Wallace, Harper, Lilly, Tabares and Stratton. And in the Senate, Senator Hutchinson and Van Pelt."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Christian Mitchell."

Mitchell, C.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll go straight to the Bill... or I'm sorry straight to the Constitutional Amendment. It's been positive here several times, some language that I think is pretty divisive that ends up pitting women against people of color. And I think that there's a real concerned intention that folks are hearing. For I think women in my district and around the state who happen to be women of color there are sort of more pressing quality of life issues, bread and butter issues, table issues that you hear frustration about in this debate because they are not often met. Because this Amendment, which is obviously important legally but also... but in some ways some would argue more as a symbol, seems like a bread crumb to those who are most affected. But that said, there has been a series of assertions from people on my side of the aisle, women of color, who I respect that somehow this would be a negative to black women. And that's

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

just nuts. There's no other way to put it other than that; it's just crazy. Someone said, for example, that the Thirteenth... or that the Fourteenth Amendment... or this Amendment, I should say, does not mention women, does not mention gender specifically. Well, the Thirteenth Amendment doesn't mention race specifically, but without it we could still have slavery. This is an incredibly important piece of legislation. And it's important because laws matter. The words on the books matter. Now, I was raised by a single mom who I'd put up against any of the women anyone has mentioned in debate or any woman who has ever lived on this planet, who has done absolutely everything to make me the man that I am and has... has... as a Unit Director raised an entire generation of nurses to do really, really great things. But my mother has me and has a modicum of wealth and ways to somewhat protect herself just from being middle class that poor women, both of color and not, do not have. But is also matters because the laws that are on the books, the Constitution, is a history of the conversation and dialogue we have had with ourselves as a nation. And the goal, because it's a living document, is for it to get better, to be more inclusive, to have a more evolved idea of what it means to be American than when only white land owning and sometimes slave owning males were considered to be human. That's why this is so incredibly important. And by the way, I just want to note because you know a quote was used by Susan B. Anthony and that quote was mischaracterized. What she actually said was in response to Frederick Douglass, who was pushing for suffrage for African Americans to be the first part of the movement, she said I

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

will cut off this right arm of mine before I will demand that the ballot... the ballot for the Negro and not for the woman. Because she understood, as Frederick eventually came to understand, that we're all bound up together. That division is always a false choice. And that making women more equal does not take anything away from people of color. And in fact, when women of all types are less equal, women who are African-American are going to find themselves at the lowest end of the stick. This is an important piece of legislation for making sure that America and Illinois is better and freer and more inclusive than it was yesterday. I'd encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Unes."

Unes: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to yield my time to Representative Mary Flowers."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Flowers, your name was also used in debate. You're recognized."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I'll try to be very brief.

To answer one of my earlier colleagues questions, Congress right now chooses not to include women in the draft. But that ability to choose not to be in the draft can be taken away with this ERA. ERA would take away the choice and mandate that women be included into the draft. In regards to strict scrutiny, it takes away the judges ability to rule favorably toward the benefits of a woman because it requires same treatment. ERA requires sameness, all equal. In regards to a question, Representative Lang, that was asked at the... or a statement that was made at the hearing that we had, and I think you made the same announcement in regards to what will

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

happen once this Resolution is ratified. And the answer that was given was nothing. Nothing's going to change. And we also know for those of us who heard the conversation from the Winston & Strawn who was on that... on the... on the hearing that they had by way of telephone. The question was... she made the statement... the attorney made this statement, 'don't look for anything to change, nothing is going to change. Life is not going to be better. Nothing is going to change'. So, if nothing is going to change and things are not going to be better, why are we pushing this ERA? And even you said, Representative Lang, that nothing was going to change. If nothing is going to change, why are we telling everyone about how great life is going to be once we have this ERA? And the equal protection clause, it simply says that the Fourteenth Amendment says that 'no state may deny any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the law'. Any person. Person is a male or a female. Any person. So, you could say that the word sex is not in the equal protection clause but any person. And in regards to the Title 7 is a Federal Law that prohibits employers from discriminating based on sex, race, color and national origin or religion. It protects all employees, everyone. So I just want to say, as plainly and simply as I can, that changes have been made to the Constitution with the Amendments and the different Sections. And the same people that made those changes was the Congress. And there's an affirmation after each Section that says Congress can make the determination and the changes. They're the only ones. So, the same people that ... if you didn't like what Congress did back in 1964, 1970 and whatever, the same

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Congress... if you didn't like what they did back then, well, we don't know what they're going to do moving forward. We know what we have now. We know what we are living with now. We know things have gotten better, much better since 1923. We don't know what it's going to be in 2023. So, once again, Ladies and Gentlemen, I'm going to politely and respectfully ask that we consider what it is that we are doing with this Resolution. 1923. When you think about where women were, that the times have changed. We didn't have the airplanes that we have now. We didn't have the types of protections for buildings and cars and other material things that we have. We didn't have the dishwashers that we have now. We didn't have none of the stuff that we have now. We're talking about something that happened back in 1923. And in regards to the racism, no one is trying to inject..."

Speaker Turner: "Representative, can you respectfully please bring your final comment to a close, please? Thank you."

Flowers: "Thank you, Sir. And I appreciate you. Race was already there. When Susan B. Anthony mentioned the woman, she made it plain and clear that she was not talking about the Negro woman. Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Brady."

Brady: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, straight to the Amendment. First off, I'd like to say to all my fellow Legislators here that I respect each and every one of you. And we differ on issues. But I respect the process that we have, the democracy that we have, that we can have difference of opinions. And we're... should always respect that. I am a pro-life Representative with a strong pro-life voting record.

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

And after this vote is done, I will continue to be a strong pro-life Representative with a strong pro-life voting record. I've been taught that all individuals are made in the image and likeness of God. We have dignity and rights endowed by our Creator. This includes both men and women. If you believe that, then I can find no reason any longer why our United States Constitution should not reflect the same. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Arroyo."

Arroyo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to talk to the Sponsor of the Bill. He mentioned something about Latino women and there was another Legislator that talked about that. I was kind of had my mind somewhere else. So Lou, could you explain to me what... how does this affect Latino women? I... I got a little bit kind of sidetracked and I don't know exactly what you were talking about when you were talking about it, but if it has to do with Latino women, it has to do with me. I'm married to a Latino woman. So, I want to know what it does."

Lang: "Representative, we were discussing the issue of racial inequality and how it particularly affects women of color. And I commented that, as bad as it is for African-American women across this country, it's even worse for Latino women. They are even lower on the totem pole, as you well know, in terms of socio economics. But it's... it's a distinction without a difference because both African-American women and Latino women are in a bad way in terms of our socio economics in this country. The Equal Rights Amendment... and you heard somebody say that some people at the hearing said nothing will change. Well, we didn't mean literally nothing will change. What we meant was that there isn't going to be any

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

clap of thunder, there isn't going to be any money falling from the sky and immediately fix everybody's problem in this country. What we meant was that the changes that have to be made in this country are sometimes unseen. They aren't a clap of thunder or a bolt of lightning. They aren't like running your car into a wall. They are steady and sure. But when our founding fathers left women out of the United States Constitution, they made a mistake. Now, I know every... we all love to talk about how our wonderful founding fathers were. And in many ways they were. Where would be if nobody created the Constitution? But they were not flawless. They left holes in that Constitution. But where they didn't leave holes, this country is better off. Freedom of Religion. Freedom of Speech. These are things we hold dear. And yet, we wouldn't take them out of the Constitution simply because we have passed laws in our state and in our country to further protect those things. And that's what ERA will do. It'll put women in the Constitution, affect all women in this country and yes, maybe women of color and minorities, not as well as others. And yes, maybe white women will continue to be more privileged than Latino women because this country hasn't figured out how to deal with that yet. But this provision in the Constitution sure can't hurt. And it's why every newspaper that I've read in this state that has written anything about this supports this Resolution."

Arroyo: "Thank you, Lou, for your explanation. You made it pretty clear. Thank you."

Lang: "Thank you."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Speaker Turner: "Representative Stratton will be our final speaker on this Resolution. Representative Stratton is recognized." "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Constitutional Stratton: Amendment. I proudly stand in support of ratifying the ERA in Illinois. The Equal Rights Amendment, once ratified, will help all people. It will ensure that women and men are entitled to the same rights under law. For women, who just a century ago did not even have the right to vote, this is a critical step forward. The ERA would give all women additional tools to fight against gender-based violence. It would help women who desperately need law enforcement to enforce orders of protection against abusive spouses. It would give Congress a Constitutional basis to enact legislation that targets gender violence and enhances the protections for victims. And it would increase protections for women in the custody of law enforcement. The ERA would stand in the way of discrimination in the military, ensuring that women are able to serve their nation to the best of their ability and to advance through the ranks alongside men. And this particularly important for African-American women who enlist in the military at significantly higher rates than white or Hispanic women. The ERA could have immediate practical consequences for teachers and the millions of women who work for the agencies of the state, federal and local government. Passage of the ERA should prompt all government employers to examine their pay and promotion practices to make sure that they are equal and to evaluate their protections for pregnant employees as well. At the same time, the ERA would not abolish all sex-based distinctions under the law. It would merely

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

subject them to greater scrutiny in court. If the distinction serves a compelling state interest and is narrowly tailored to serve that goal, it would be allowed to stand. And it's important to note that a number of race-conscious policies have been allowed to stand under strict scrutiny, including policies that take race into account in college admissions. As I make these comments, I do so standing on the shoulders of my mother, Velma Wiggins, my grandmother, Velma Slaughter, and my great grandmother, Anna Capshaw. None of whom lived to see this historical vote but left a legacy that I should value all people as equal and spend my days working for the same. And standing on my shoulders are Tyler, Cassidy, Ryan and McKenzie and my hope is that their rights are also protected under the United States Constitution as being equal to those of their male counterparts. For those strong women who have gone before us dreaming of a better tomorrow for their daughters, that tomorrow is now here. And for the girls who are the strong women of our future, the hope of their tomorrow begins right now. But also for all of the men and the boys who also stand for and are being raised to value justice and equality for all, we can and must act for them as well. As a woman, and as a black woman in particular, I... I have experienced discrimination. Not just from being a woman in America but also from being a woman of color. And we are certainly not where we need to be in this country but I have radical faith. And I have not given up hope as to where we can go from here. But I truly do believe that our Constitution, that living, breathing document that guides us and sets forth the ideals of this country, must reflect what

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

we hope to be and serve as our compass. We can make this courageous vote today and we can enshrine that basic notion of equality and justice for all. Thank you, Leader Lang, for bringing forth this Resolution. I strongly urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Lang to close."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, I appreciate the debate. It's been a good one; it's been for the most part fair and rational. But for me, I just can't find a way to understand a 'no' vote. This is the year 2018. Have not we... have we not evolved enough as a society to say 161 million women aren't counted in the Constitution of the United States? Some have said on the floor today that aren't we doing great. We've passed all these great statutes and we've made all these great changes and look how we are evolving. Well, we shouldn't be evolving on the issue of whether 161 million people deserve rights under our most precious Constitution of the United States of America. What's to evolve? This is not a slam dunk to some of you. Take a step back from your politics, people. Take a step back from this group that you're worried about and the next Primary that you're concerned about and... and who's coming after you from the left and who's coming after you from the right and... and the phone calls you get from angry people. We're better than that. We are better than that. One hundred and eighteen people in this chamber with hearts and minds and souls. And... and I don't want to get all that philosophical, you guys know me pretty well, but my goodness gracious, we're going to make up things to give us excuses to vote against putting women in the United States Constitution?

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

This is a historic moment. It's not a Bill. It's not a Bill about whether we're going to do this thing or that thing or the budget we're going to vote on and the next morning you wake up and you go, oh well, I was right; I was wrong. And then you go back home with all your clothes and you go back to your other jobs, if you have them, or you go back to your families. This is about the United States Constitution, people. And half the people in this country aren't in it. They aren't included in the United States Constitution. Isn't that enough for you to realize the historic moment and step back from predispositions you've had, and your heels dug in the ground on this issue or that issue or the other issue and say, now wait a minute, this is about half the population of America. Women aren't being paid enough. Women are being mistreated in courtrooms. Women can't sign car leases without a cosigner. Women can't get an apartment without a cosigner. Women can't find jobs because men say, well, you might quit to have a baby so you shouldn't be working here. This is 2018. Don't we have a heart? Don't we understand? I think we understand. Before I go on and before I forget, I want to thank Steve Andersson, my good friend, who's worked so very hard to try to convince people on both sides of the aisle, particularly his side of the aisle, about the Constitutional underpinnings of this and why this is so important to him personally. I think we have to make this important to all of us personally. This is personal. This is our friends, our neighbors, our wives, our cousins, our coworkers, the people we work with, the people we live with. Think about your daughters, think about your granddaughters.

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Think about that we don't know what America's going to look like in 5 years, or 10 years, or 20 years, or 30 years. Who our President will be, who our Congressmen will be, who will be here. We don't know. So, we would say to ourselves, well, we would never do those nasty things to people. Look at all the great laws we have passed. And yet, as my friend Mary Flowers points out, that hasn't worked all that well for the racial divide. We have a long way to go in the racial divide and no matter what we do on ERA today, we'll have a long way to go to give women the rights they ought to be due and the dignity they ought to be due in this country. You heard David Harris say that we have joined the Confederate states; he's not wrong. But states like Wyoming, and Texas, and Indiana have passed this because they understand the importance of giving dignity to women. You heard me read the seven countries in the world that have not yet signed on to a worldwide treaty, a worldwide commission to defend the rights of women. All kinds of countries none of us would ever move to or live in and the United States of America. Can't we do better than that? Don't we care about the people we live with? The people that live next door to us, don't we care? Don't we care that they're mistreated? Don't we care that states pass laws to hurt them? Don't we care that states pass laws that discriminate against them? And yes, racially motivated as well. We can do better than that. And so, I say to all of you, again, consider what this is all about. It's not a Bill. It's about the United States Constitution. Most of us will never be in Congress; I ain't going. We aren't going to be able to effectuate what goes on in Washington. We aren't going

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

to be able to change the world as we know it. All we can change is our little world for the most part, but on this, this Body, 118 people in this room today, have a chance to change the United States of America. And the question is, will we take the time to do it? We will search our hearts and our brains and put aside the things that separate us and get together and do the right thing for the people of the United States of America? We will never get this chance again. This is it. Eight o'clock p.m. on May 30, 2018 we have a chance to make the United States of America, all the country, a better place. Are we going to do it or are we not going to do it? And before I sit down, to those who said to me I'll be your 71st vote, I'll think it over, don't be the 71st vote. Be the first vote. Put your green vote up on the board. Do the right thing and watch the total grow because if everybody who told me they'd be the 71st vote votes for this we will pass this right now. Please vote 'aye'."

Speaker Turner: "Members, a verification has been requested by Representative Wheeler. Please be at your switch to vote your... to vote. The Gentleman moves that the House adopt SJRCA 4. All those in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Members, please record yourself. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the... On a count of 72 voting in 'favor', 45 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present', SJRCA 4 is adopted. Excuse me... excuse me... excuse me, verification was requested by Representative Wheeler. Representative Wheeler, do you wish to persist with your verification? Mr. Clerk, please read the votes in the affirmative."

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Clerk Hollman: "A poll of those voting in the affirmative: Representative Representative Ammons; Andersson; Representative Andrade; Representative Arroyo; Representative Brady; Representative Burke, D.; Burke, K.; Representative Representative Carroll; Representative Representative Cassidy; Chapa Representative Connor; Representative Conroy; Representative Conyears-Ervin; Representative Crespo; Representative Representative D'Amico; Representative Representative DeLuca; Representative Drury; Leader Durkin; Representative Evans; Representative Feigenholtz; Representative Fine; Representative Ford; Representative Gabel; Representative Gordon-Booth; Representative Greenwood; Representative Guzzardi; Representative Halpin; Representative Harper; Representative Harris, Harris, G.; Representative Representative Hernandez; Representative Representative Hoffman; Representative Hurley; Representative Jones; Representative Representative Lang; Representative Kifowit; Lilly; Representative Mah; Representative Manley; Representative Martwick; Representative Mitchell, C.; Representative Moeller; Representative Moylan; Representative Mussman; Representative Olsen; Representative Pritchard: Representative Riley; Representative Rita; Representative Scherer; Representative Sente; Representative Slaughter; Representative Smith; Representative Soto; Representative Stratton; Representative Katie Stuart; Representative Tabares; Representative Thapedi; Representative Representative Wallace; Representative Walsh,;

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

- Representative Wehrli; Representative Welch; Representative Welter; Representative Williams; Representative Willis; Representative Winger; Representative Yingling; Representative Zalewski, and Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Turner: "He withdraws his verification. With 72 voting in 'favor', 45 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present', SJRCA4, having received the Constitutional (sic-Majority), is adopted. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk Hollman: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 1151, offered by Representative Lang and House Resolution 1153, offered by Representative Hurley."
- Speaker Turner: "Leader Currie moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolutions are adopted. Mr. Clerk, committee announcements."
- Clerk Hollman: "The following committees will be meeting immediately after Session: Appropriations-Public Safety is meeting in C-1, the Executive Committee is meeting in Room 114, Veterans' Affairs is meeting in Room 122, Elementary & Secondary Education: School Curriculum & Policies is meeting in D-1, Labor & Commerce is meeting in Room 413, Revenue & Finance is meeting in Room 115, Human Services is meeting in Room 118. A note that the Judiciary-Criminal Committee for tomorrow morning has been canceled. Judiciary-Criminal which was meeting at 8 a.m. has been canceled."
- Speaker Turner: "And now, allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk,

 Leader Currie moves that the House adjourn until Thursday,

 May 31 at 9 a.m. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the House is adjourned."

Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Committee Reports. Representative Daniel Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on Executive reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2018: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 3254. Representative Crespo, Chairperson from the Committee on Elementary & Secondary Education: School Curriculum & Policies reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2018: recommends be adopted as amended is House Resolution 1098. Representative Sente, Chairperson from the Committee on Environment reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2018: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 3309; recommends be adopted is a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 3248, Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 4746, Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 3550. Representative Soto, Chairperson from the Committee on Health Care Licenses reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2018: recommends be adopted is a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1853, Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 4936. Representative Mussman, Chairperson from the Committee on Special Needs Services reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2018: recommends be adopted is a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 5463. Representative Chapa LaVia, Chairperson from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2018: recommends be adopted is a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Representative Fine, Chairperson from the Committee on Insurance: Health & Life reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2018: recommends be adopted is a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment 3 to House Bill 2624, Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 4146, and Floor Amendment 2 to House Bill 5769. Representative Kelly Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-Higher Education reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2018: recommends be adopted is a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 4467. Representative Welch, Chairperson from the Committee on Higher Education reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2018: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 2927. Representative Greg Harris, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-Human Services reports following committee action taken on May 30, 2018: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 1851. Representative Zalewski, Chairperson from the Committee on Revenue & Finance reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2018: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 585, Floor Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 2610. Representative Conroy, Chairperson from the Committee on Mental Health reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2018: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 1707. Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 1152, offered by Representative Christian Mitchell. House Resolution 1155, offered by Representative Jimenez. House Resolution 1156, offered by Representative Scherer. And House Joint Resolution 137, offered by

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Representative Davis. These are referred to the Rules Committee. Committee Reports. Representative Daniel Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on Executive reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2018: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 452; recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment 1 to House Bill 860, Floor Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 336, Floor Amendments 4 and 5 to Senate Bill 1531, Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2921, Floor Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 3531. Representative Chapa LaVia, Chairperson from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2018: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 3128. Representative Crespo, Chairperson from the Committee on Elementary & Secondary Education: School Curriculum & Policies reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2018: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment 4 to Senate Bill 454. Representative Hoffman, Chairperson from the Committee on Labor & Commerce reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2018: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1737. Representative Zalewski, Chairperson from the Committee on Revenue & Finance reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2018: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 482, Floor Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 3527. Representative Gabel, Chairperson from the Committee on Human Services reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2018: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2655. Second Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 452, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 3254, a Bill for an Act concerning

141st Legislative Day

5/30/2018

State government. Senate Bill 3309, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. First... correction... Second Reading of these Senate Bills. These will be held on the Order of Second Reading. Introduction and First Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 203, offered by Representative Moylan, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Senate Bill 2411, offered by Representative Ammons, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Senate Bill 3190, offered by Representative Manley, a Bill for an Act concerning education. First Reading of these Senate Bills. First Reading and Introduction of House Bills. House Bill 5911, offered by Representative Crespo, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 5912, offered by Representative Welch, a Bill for an Act concerning House Bill 5913, offered by Representative education. Willis, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. First Reading of these House Bills. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."