150th Legislative Day

- Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Committee Report. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on November 28, 2018: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4637; recommends be adopted, referred to the Order of Resolutions is House Resolution 1098."
- Speaker Currie: "The House will come to order. Members will be at their chairs. We shall be led in prayer today by Rabbi Meir Moscowitz, who is the Regional Director of Lubavitch Chabad of Illinois and Senior Rabbi of Chabad of Northbrook. Represent... I'm sorry. Rabbi Moscowitz is the guest of Representative Fine. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting your laptops, turn off your cell phones, and all of you please rise for the prayer and the Pledge of Allegiance. Rabbi Moscowitz."
- Rabbi Moscowitz: "I will begin this prayer with an act of Sadaqah, of charity, placing this dollar bill in the Pushka, in the charity box, as a symbolic act of doing kindness, Sadaqah. Almighty God, sovereign of the universe, as we approach the holiday of Hanukkah, the holiday that symbolize the triumph of freedom over oppression, spirit over matter, light over darkness, we pray that we always learn from its message, a little bit of light dispels a great deal of darkness. There is an additional dimension with the Hanukkah message. As the Lubaritcher Rebbe has often taught, that the menorah is placed on the outside in the public's fear, illuminating the darkness with the candle, with the light. Unfortunately, we have seen an uptake in acts of antisemitism, in the public's fear and

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

the Hanukkah menorah reminds us that the antidote to this darkness is the light. A little bit of light dispels a great deal of darkness. Let us all increase in adding that little flame, that little light. Almighty God, the Leaders and the... the honorable Members of this distinguished House, give them guidance so that they will always be conscious of Your presence and will strive to enact laws with honesty and integrity in accordance with Your will. May Illinois serve as a beacon of light for all people of all walks of life. May Illinois achieve the goal so powerfully stated in the Pledge of Allegiance that America's truly one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all. Let us say, Amen."

- Speaker Currie: "Thank you, Rabbi, for that very fine prayer. We shall be led in the Pledge of Allegiance today by Representative Andersson."
- Andersson 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 Currie: "Roll Call for Attendance. For excused absences on the Democratic side, Representative Feigenholtz."
- Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. There are no excused absences on the Democratic side of the aisle."
- Speaker Currie: "And for the other side of the aisle, Representative Keith Wheeler."
- Wheeler, K.: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Please let the record reflect that Representatives Jesiel, Reis, and Barbara Wheeler, along with Leader Durkin are excused today."

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

Speaker Currie: "The record will so reflect. Have all... have all recorded themselves? Clerk, please take the record. There are 111 present today. We have a quorum and we are ready to roll. Representative Kifowit, for what reason do you rise?"

Kifowit: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just wanted to make a statement and talk about yesterday. I want to... I did offer earlier and I want to offer my sincere apologies to Representative Breen, his family, and the House colleagues for a poor choice of words during a serious discussion on our veteran's health and welfare and safety. I... I would never wish any harm or mortality on anybody's family and that includes the Breen family and anybody else's. However, as a Marine Corp veteran, I do feel very passionate about what happened to our veterans in the Quincy Veterans Home. And it did result in 13 veterans and 1 spouse dying, in addition to 70 other individuals being ill. The truth is this did happen to our heroes and my attempt to illustrate empathy for the families that were affected by this loss of their loved ones was not conveyed properly, and I apologize for that. Lost in my comments yesterday was the obligation to work together on behalf of our veterans to ensure that the situation in Quincy never, ever happens again. As a Legislator, we are fallible people, we are with faults, but we are tasked with a tremendous responsibility of caring for those that need to be cared, in addition to our veterans, our youth, our seniors, and those that are the most frail among us, and we cannot let them down and we owe them that much. I do look forward to working with my colleagues going forward in helping, not only our veterans get access to health care and mental health, but

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

also to serve the people of the State of Illinois. And with that, again, I want to... being a flawed individual and definitely working hard for our veterans, I want to extend apology to Representative Breen and his family for the remarks made yesterday."

Speaker Currie: "Committee Reports."

"Committee Reports. Representative Zalewski, Clerk Hollman: Chairperson from the Committee on Revenue & Finance reports the following committee action taken on November 28, 2018: do pass as amended Short Debate is Senate Bill 2744, Senate Bill 3430, recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 156, Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4560. Representative Riley, Chairperson from the Committee on State Government Administration reports the following committee action taken on November 28, 2018: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 21; recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 1328, Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 2365. Representative Conroy, Chairperson from the Committee on Mental Health reports the following committee action taken on November 28, 2018: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 3102. Representative Daniel Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on the Executive reports the following committee action taken on November 28, 2018: do pass as amended Short Debate Senate Bill 514, Senate Bill 563, Senate Bill 2898, Senate Bill 3197, Senate Bill 3402; recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 3127. Representative Hoffman, Chairperson from the Committee on Labor & Commerce reports the following committee action on November 28, 2018:

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

do pass as amended Short Debate is Senate Bill 3174; recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur Senate with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 200, Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 3452, and Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 203. Representative Costello, Chairperson from Committee on Agriculture & Conservation reports the following committee action taken on November 28, 2018: do pass as amended Short Debate is Senate Bill 1364. Representative Thapedi, Chairperson from the Committee on Public Utilities reports the following committee action taken on November 28, 2018: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 849."

Speaker Currie: "Thank you. Representative Brady."

Brady: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. May I have a point of personal privilege?"

Speaker Currie: "You may. State your point."

Brady: "Thank you very much. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if I could have your attention for just a moment. Yesterday, Leader Durkin's wife, Celeste, and Leader Durkin and their family members lost their father, a husband, father-in-law, and grandfather. Mr. Bill Fisher died yesterday at the age of 79. Bill was married to Marilyn, and is survived by their 6 children, and 16 grandchildren. Bill was a successful business man from Elmhurst, where he reached the highest level in one of the world's largest insurance companies. His greatest pleasure was watching the sunset on his South Haven bluff with a glass of wine surrounded by all of his family. So we ask, may his soul and all the souls that faithfully parted through the mercy of God rest in peace. And, Mr.

150th Legislative Day

- Speaker, I would ask for a moment of silence in memory and to memorialize the life of Bill Fisher."
- Speaker Currie: "We will have a moment of silence. Thank you, Representative Brady. Thank you all. Representative Brady."
- Brady: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I also like to call for an immediate Republican Caucus."
- Speaker Currie: "And how long do you think that caucus will take?"
- Brady: "Around 15 to 20 minutes."
- Speaker Currie: "Okay, so the House will be at... until the call of the Chair and we expect you back 15 to 20 minutes. Thank you."
- Brady: "Thank you very much."
- Speaker Currie: "The House will again be in order. Clerk, for a Rules Report."
- Clerk Hollman: "Committee Report. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules Reports the following committee action taken on November 28, 2018: recommends to be adopted, referred to the floor is Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1469."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Halpin on House Resolution 1180."
- Halpin: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to recognize the Rock Island Lady Rocks softball team and their coach Chris Allison. They are in the Speaker's Gallery today. The Lady Rocks went on to a 2018 season with a record of thirty-two and five, and a conference record of nine and one, to win the very first state championship for Rock Island High School and their softball program. So, we're very proud of them. I am a Rock Island native. My daughter is in the Rock Island public school system and excited of these type of programs that are waiting her in high school. And like so many teams across the state

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

that we honor down here in Springfield, these young women are shining examples of cooperation, dedication, perseverance, and work ethic. And that'll serve each of them very well in the next journey of their lives. And so I would just ask... I would ask all of us here, my colleagues, to give them a warm Springfield welcome on their achievements. So, thank you all."

- Speaker Currie: "And now on page 11 of the Calendar on the Order of Resolutions. The first is House Joint Resolution 122, Representative Swanson. Out of the record. How about House Resolution 1225, Representative Martwick?"
- Martwick: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Resolution 1225 urges Congress to take action on the Butch Lewis Act, which would allow the U.S. Treasury Department to create a low interest loan program to help secure multiemployer private pension plans. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Currie: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all in favor of the Motion vote... say 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 1269, Representative Hernandez. Why don't we skip over that until she's back? Here she is.
- Hernandez: "Okay. Thank you, Speaker. So, House Resolution 1269 congratulates the dedication and the leadership of the Little Village Chamber of Commerce on receiving the United States Hispanic Chamber of Commerce Chamber of the Year Award during the 2018 National Convention Conference, which recognized their commitment to the Hispanic business community."

150th Legislative Day

- Speaker Currie: "Representative Hernandez moves adoption of House Resolution 1269. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. And the next Resolution on our list is House Resolution 1276, Representative Mah."
- Mah: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. House Resolution 1276 addresses a health disparity that affects the Asian American community. The Resolution urges support for the Screen At 23 Campaign, which recommends that Asian Americans be screened for diabetes at a lower body mass index because of generally lower fat and body weight averages in the population. Lowering the threshold for screening recommendations will help decrease the health disparity that... in which Asian Americans have a greater risk of developing diabetes, prediabetes, and heart disease at a lower body mass index than other groups. I urge everyone's support. Thank you."
- Speaker Currie: "On the Resolution, House Resolution 1276 all in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Resolution is adopted. Next is... on page 12 of the Calendar, Senate Joint Resolution 25, Representative Long. Out of the record at the request of the Sponsor. Senate Joint Resolution 65, Representative Bill Mitchell."
- Mitchell, B.: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have a Resolution honoring the Gaultney Brothers of Leroy, Illinois. I have been here 20 years and I have never had an experience where we have 2 brothers that were killed in action in World War II. So, this is a fitting Resolution. It was offered by Senator Rose and I would appreciate the House's approval."

150th Legislative Day

- Speaker Currie: "Is there any discussion? Would this be a vote...
 all in favor of the Resolution vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'.

 Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record.

 On this measure, there are 112 voting 'yes'; 0 voting 'no'.

 And the Resolution is adopted. Next is Senate Joint Resolution 70, Representative Mazzochi."
- Mazzochi: "This particular Bill is to celebrate... or to designate a month... a part of October as Dyslexia Awareness Month. I apologize, I apparently have it myself because I am not reading things correctly."
- Speaker Currie: "Seeing no discussion, all in favor of the Resolution say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Resolution is adopted. The House will be at ease for a few moments. Clerk for the Rules Report."
- Clerk Hollman: "Committee Report. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules Reports the following committee action taken on November 28, 2018: recommends to be adopted, referred to the floor is Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1993."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Kifowit on a Motion."
- Kifowit: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Prior to the start of Session, I had conversations with Counsel and I filed a Motion pursuant to House Rule 36 to expunge from the House record the comments that were personally directed to Representative Breen. In following up from my statement earlier, I believe the comments were in poor choice and that I did apologize to him personally. And I wanted to inform the Body of this action."

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

Speaker Currie: "You've heard the Lady's Motion. Is there any discussion on the Motion? Representative Wehrli."

Wehrli: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. On behalf of the Republican Caucus, I too filed a Motion under this same rule. And I would like to publically thank Representative Kifowit for taking the high road in correcting an egregious error. For too long and too often, civil discourse in our political arena has eroded and I hope that this is a first step for all of us to move towards, even in vehement disagreement, a higher and more professional discourse. I look forward to this Motion being on the board and I urge an 'aye' vote for everyone so we can put this situation behind us and move forward to do the work of the great State of Illinois."

Speaker Currie: "Thank you, Representative. Representative McDermed."

McDermed: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. There is one aspect of what happened yesterday that has not been discussed yet, and I would like to bring the attention of the Body, and that's Rule 51, dealing with personal attacks. And I feel that it's the role of the Chair to deal with personal attacks. This is not the first time that we've had a personal attack of a member of my Caucus on the floor of the House. It is not the first time that the Chair... and I want to make this really clear, the person occupying the Chair right now was not there yesterday. This is not the first time the person occupying the Chair has failed to deal with the lack of decorum and with the breech of legislative procedure that takes place here. I think that a vigilant Chair would have noticed that personal remarks involving a Member's family, followed by

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

clapping and echoing of other Members of this Body is something worthy of comment and gavel action by the Chair. As we move forward into the 101st, where I, and I think everyone else here in this Body, hoped that we would move to a better place. As we move to that place, I think that it's incumbent upon all of us to follow our rules and to take our discourse to a higher level. In the four years that I have been here, we have passed a number of anti-bullying matters and we have passed some anti-sexual harassment matters. I would call upon all of us to take those measures, which we have imposed on other people, and impose them on ourselves. We are better than this. We are better than bullying. We are better than harassment. We are better than personal attacks on Members' families. I call upon all of us, and I particularly call on our Chair, who is here to keep order and here to keep the rules, to keep this in mind in the future and not permit these matters to go unaddressed, ungaveled, and unsanctioned. Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Kifowit has moved to expunge certain of her remarks from the House record. On that Motion, all in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'no'. Voting is open. This requires 71 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this measure, there are 110 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the Motion is adopted. Representative Welter, for that reason do you rise?"

Welter: "For a point of personal privilege, Madam Speaker." Speaker Currie: "State your point."

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

Welter: "Thank you. Yesterday on the House floor comments were made that I think we all agree go beyond civil discourse. Inappropriate and insensitive remarks were made Representative Kifowit. I am glad to hear her apologize for her comments today as we started Session. However, we cannot allow this type of rhetoric in this chamber to go unchecked. Something as hurtful as what was said yesterday cannot be allowed to stand. It sends the wrong message. That's why I am pursuing House Rule 90. It states, any two Members have the right to dissent and protest, in respectful language, against any Act or Resolution that they think injurious to the public or any individual, and have the reason of their protest entered into the Journal. Our Caucus stands united against these statements. And I'm sure my friends on the other side of the aisle do as well. That's why I am asking all of you, in a bipartisan manner, to sign on to the descent and protest that I have here in my hand that I will be filing at the end of business today. Please, visit me to sign this document because it's the right thing to do. We cannot and shall not allow words like this to go unchecked in this Body. It is not a good message."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Breen."

Breen: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I acknowledge and accept Representative Kifowit's apology today. I am glad she decided to issue it. I'm also glad she decided to bring her Motion. This Body, this state is at a tipping point. We are faced with two paths. We can continue down our current path of worsening threats and even violence or we can make the difficult decision to take the path upward, to civility and

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

decency. On our current downward course, we are headed toward mob rule. The path upward is tougher. It will require more of each of us. But, in the long term, that upward path will lead this Body and this state to a better place. Earlier this year I received a death threat that prompted police protection for my home and family. And my family and I endured a vile, filthy election campaign with \$2.5 million spent to falsely connect me to rapists and child molesters. And yesterday we all listened as a Member of this House leveled a heinous death wish on my family. My wife and our two year old and two month old sons, who are the joy of our lives, and has been stated by others, are adopted. Now we know that if a Representative had made that statement in the parking lot outside, or left it on my office phone voicemail she would be in custody right now. But because she made her statement on the House floor, her remarks were met with applause instead of handcuffs. I will not be here next year. So, it is up to the Members of the 101st General Assembly to decide which path our state will follow going forward. Whether the high road or the low road. The people of Illinois are watching to see what your response will be. The conduct on this House Floor should set a high bar. Will the Members of this General Assembly take steps to ensure this type of behavior is not tolerated? Whether here on the House Floor or anywhere in the Land of Lincoln? There certainly needs to be accountability for the conduct we saw yesterday. Otherwise, this sort of despicable behavior will become the new standard of what we allow in this chamber and it will set a bar for acceptable conduct very, very low for the people of our state. In my four years

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

here I have watched this General Assembly avoid the tough decisions that were needed to divert our State Government from the path towards fiscal ruin. Now I wonder, will this General Assembly have the character to divert our state's politics from its current path of moral and ethical ruin? My two boys deserve better. Every child in this state deserves better. I hope and pray that the Members of the next General Assembly choose the right path. Thank you, Madam Speaker."

- Speaker Currie: "We will now return to the Calendar. On page 3 of the Calendar... on page 3 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 203, Representative Davis. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 203, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. This Bill was read a second time a previous day.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Davis, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Davis on Amendment 2."

- Davis: "Thank you... thank you very much, Madam Chair. Amendment number... just trying to get my notes together here. Okay, thank you. Sorry, Members of the Body. Amendment 2 keeps the underlying Bill, but adds provisions that basically sets the prevailing wage at whatever the collective bargained wage is for any particular locality. Be more than happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Davis moves adoption of Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 203. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Motion... the Amendment is adopted. Clerk, please read

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

Senate Bill 203 on Third Reading. Third Reading. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 203, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Davis."

Davis: "Thank you, Madam Chair. As I mentioned before, the Amendment added some clarifying language with regard to setting the prevailing wage rate at whatever the collectively bargained wage rate is, for that particular locality, but the underlying portion of the Bill creates mechanisms to allow for appropriate data collection, from... with the Department of Labor with regard to the diversity of individuals that are working on any particular job. Again, I'll be more than happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Davis moves adoption of Senate Bill 203. And on that, is there any discussion? Seeing none, all in favor of the Motion please vote 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this measure, there are 78 voting 'yes', 28 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. We then go on the same order to Senate Bill 407, Representative Costello. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 407, a Bill for an Act concerning government. This Bill was read a second time previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

150th Legislative Day

- Speaker Currie: "Representative Costello. Are there any Amendments? Are there any Motions?"
- Clerk Hollman: "No Amendments and no Motions are filed."
- Speaker Currie: "Third Reading. Clerk, please read the Bill on Third."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 407, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Costello."
- Costello: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Senate Bill 407 extends the sunset date for the Commission of Police Professionalism from December 31, 2018 to July 1, 2019. I ask for your 'yes' vote."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Costello has moved for passage of Senate Bill 407. Is there is any discussion? Seeing none, all in favor of this Bill on Third Reading please vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this measure, there are 109 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having achieved the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 580, Representative Welch. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 580, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Currie: "Third Reading. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 580, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Welch."

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

- Welch: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Thank you so much for being in the Chair for us today. House Bill or... Senate Bill 580 is a trailer Bill. In the spring the General Assembly passed a Bill that helps ensure that organizations who represent the interest of survivors of human trafficking can sue a trafficker on behalf of the survivor, in order to help them financially recover. At the end of Session, Senator Barickman requested a trailer Bill that specifically clarified that an organization can only take this action with the express consent of the survivor. This Bill makes that change and we do believe that it's a good change that protects the survivor's interest and we would ask for approval."
- Speaker Currie: "Thank you. Representative, has moved for passage of Senate Bill 580. And on that is there any discussion? Seeing none, all in favor on Third Reading of the Gentleman's Motion please vote 'aye'; opposed 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this measure, there are 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 849, Representative Zalewski. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 849, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day.

 Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Zalewski, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Zalewski on Amendment 2."

150th Legislative Day

- Zalewski: "Mr. Speaker, Amendment 2 becomes the Bill. It extends a preemption of taxes on electric generating facilities for two... preemption of locally imposed taxes on electric generating facilities for two more years."
- Speaker Currie: "On the Motion on the Amendment, Representative Williams? Or do you want to wait until the Bill is on the Third Reading to discuss?"
- Williams: "No, this is another manner."
- Speaker Currie: "Okay. Is there any discussion on the Amendment? Seeing none, all in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Third Reading. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 849, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Zalewski."
- Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Within statute there's a preemption on locally imposed taxes on electric generating facilities. This would extend that for two more years. I urge an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Zalewski has moved passage of House... of Senate Bill 849. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this measure, there are 91 voting 'aye', 13 voting 'no', 4 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having achieved the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Williams, for what reason do you rise?

150th Legislative Day

- Williams: "Thank you, Madam Chair. Pursuant to Rule 65 I would like to move that a vote on the Motion to reconsider pending on House Bill 5175 be taken up immediately."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Parkhurst, on the Motion."
- Parkhurst: "I would respectfully withdraw the Motion at this time."
- Speaker Currie: "Okay, the Motion is withdrawn. Okay, we now go to Senate Bill 1226, Representative Moylan. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1226, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government..."
- Speaker Currie: "Excuse me. At the request of the Sponsor, out of the record. Senate Bill 1469, Representative Greg Harris. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1469, a Bill for an Act concerning health. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day.

 No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Greg Harris, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Harris."
- Harris, G.: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. The Amendment becomes the Bill. I will describe briefly what it does. This has several items that make corrections to the Hospital Assessment Act and some changes in the Medicaid Program. I'd like to thank Leader Demmer and Representative Spain, along with my colleagues on the Democrat side of the aisle, for their work on this for the last several months. The items contained in this legislation is language that correct an error that HFS made that has resulted in underpayment of Medicaid funds to

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

rural critical access hospitals. It makes a correction for payment processing dates for the hospital assessment itself. It extends the rates for psychiatric hospitals for the payment of expenses of youth held in the hospital beyond medical necessity. It makes some changes to the SMHRF Act that caps the number of licenses. It extends and then sunsets the life of the Hospital Transformation Committee, which needs several more months of work to do its job beyond December 31. And lastly, and very importantly, to every hospital in this state this provides a five year extension of the sales tax exemption which is provided to nonprofit hospitals. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Harris moves adoption of Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1469. Any discussion? Representative Demmer. Or do you want to wait and discuss the Bill on Third?"

Demmer: "Whatever."

Speaker Currie: "Let's adopt the Amendment. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Clerk, are there any more Motions or Amendments filed?"

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

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

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1469, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Harris."

Harris, G.: "Please vote 'yes'."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Demmer for discussion on this effort to pass the Bill."

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

Demmer: "Madam Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Currie: "The Sponsor will yield."

Demmer: "Representative, I appreciate the work that we have been able to do in a bipartisan way on this Bill. This reflects the product of our negotiations between the two sides, members of the administration, both Republicans and Democrats in the Senate. And it corrects... as you mentioned, it corrects some of the aspects of the hospital assessment Bill that we all talked about and thoroughly discussed and debated here several months ago. Just for clarification purpose, we had discussed a few items this morning and I believe there is... there are a couple of things related to the expiration of the Hospital Transformation Committee that we may need to deal with in a trailer Bill next year. Is that your understanding as well?"

Harris, G.: "Well, absolutely, Representative. And I think we all hope that given the extra three months we've allowed ourselves the Transformation Committee will be able to do its work in the approved format. But we also recognize that should we hit that date of April 1, there will have to be several corrections to statutes made to reflect changes that occur should the sunset happen."

Demmer: "Thank you. Madam Speaker, to the Bill."

Speaker Currie: "To the Bill."

Demmer: "I encourage my colleagues to support this initiative.

Again, it's a cleanup measure that makes sure that we have in statute correlation between the plan that we talked about earlier this year and the way it is actually being carried out. And in addition to that, extends some key provisions

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

that help avoid significant tax increases on hospitals across the state. I encourage support for this Bill and encourage you to vote 'yes'. Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "On Senate Bill 1469 on Third Reading, all in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this measure, there are 107 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1987, Representative Kifowit. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1987, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. This Bill was read a second time previously. Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

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

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1987, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Kifowit."

Kifowit: "Thank you, Madam Chair. I believe there is an Amendment on this... that was adopted in committee?"

Speaker Currie: "Amendment 1... Clerk, could you give us the status of the Amendments to the Bill?"

Clerk Hollman: "Amendment 1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Kifowit."

Kifowit: "So, Amendment 1 to this Bill is a technical change requested from the Illinois State Police to correct an oversight with the Healthcare Violence Prevention Act...

Healthcare Worker Violence Prevention Act."

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

Speaker Currie: "Representative Kifowit moves passage of Senate Bill 1987. And on that, seeing no discussion... somebody just popped up. Mr. Wheeler."

Wheeler, K.: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Currie: "The Sponsor will yield."

Wheeler, K.: "Representative, I just wanted to clarify for the Body this is a Bill we had in committee yesterday that is fixing some things that we had wrap up from the Healthcare Violence Protection... that we passed earlier that was an unanimous Bill we got through, right?"

Kifowit: "Correct, this was just an oversight for the Illinois State Police."

Wheeler, K.: "Perfect. Thank you very much."

Speaker Currie: "Any further discussion? Seeing none, all in favor of passage of Senate Bill 1987 please vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this measure, there are 108 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having achieved the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Gabel, for what reason do you rise?"

Gabel: "A point of personal privilege."

Speaker Currie: "State your point."

Gabel: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Last night we had a lovely going away party for our esteemed Leader, Barbara Flynn Currie. And at that party she was given a photobook, a photobook of memories of her 40 years here. That book is now in the back in the Speaker's..."

Speaker Currie: "Conference room."

150th Legislative Day

- Gabel: "...Conference room. And I... we encourage everybody to go back and please sign the book for her, so she can... when she leaves us she still has a memory of all of us. There are some... there are like four pages at the backside of that book. And there is another book that her family gave her. So, please get a chance and go back there and sign the books. Thank you."
- Speaker Currie: "Back on the Calendar, on Second Readings. On page 3 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 1993. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1993, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day.

 No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2..."
- Speaker Currie: "Out of the record. Then on page 4 of the Calendar we have Senate Bill 2342 on Second Reading, Representative Guzzardi. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2342, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. This Bill was read a second time previously.

 Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Currie: "Third Reading. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2342, a Bill concerning an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill." Speaker Currie: "Representative Guzzardi."
- Guzzardi: "Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you, Members. This Bill represents small technical changes, our second round of small technical changes to the civil asset forfeiture overhaul that passed this Chamber almost unanimously a couple of years ago. Most of these are just grammatical changes. There's a couple of small changes in substance specifically pertaining to

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

notification of people who are currently incarcerated about the disposition of their property. I urge an 'aye' vote. Oh, by the way, it's negotiated with everyone, everyone's cool with it."

Speaker Currie: "And on the Motion, Representative Keith Wheeler." Wheeler, K.: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Currie: "The Sponsor will yield."

Wheeler, K.: "Thank you. Will, I think you just got to where my question was, pretty much right at the very trail end there. So, I want to just put on the record, for sure, this is an agreed Bill, everyone's on the same page and we're going to get this done."

Guzzardi: "Sorry, I snuck that in there. But yes, this was negotiated between the ACLU and the State's Attorneys who worked on the original Bill and there's no opposition to this measure."

Wheeler, K.: "Perfect. Thank you very much."

Guzzardi: "Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "On this measure, Senate Bill 2342, all in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this measure, there are 111 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having achieved the appropriate Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Same page of the Calendar, Senate Bill 3127, Representative Costello. Clerk, please read Bill.

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3127, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. This Bill was read a second time a previous day.

Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2,

150th Legislative Day

- offered by Representative Walsh, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Walsh, on Amendment 2."
- Walsh: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Amendment... Floor Amendment #2 is a gut and replace that would have become the Bill. What it does is extends the sunset for so a Capitol Development Board design-build authority from July 1 of 2019 to July 1 of 2022. And ends the current board member's terms establishing a new appointment cycle beginning January 31, 2019. I ask for its adoption."
- Speaker Currie: "All in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments or Motions on this Bill?"
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Currie: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3127, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Third Reading on this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Walsh... or is it going to be Costello? Representative Walsh on Senate Bill 3127."
- Walsh: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I pretty much explained the Bill on the Floor Amendment. I'd be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Currie: "Are there any discussions? Seeing none, all in favor of the Bill vote 'aye'; opposed 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this measure, there are 107 voting 'yes', 4 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority,

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

is hereby declared passed. On page 2 of the Calendar, Senate Bills-Third Reading. Senate Bill 1328, Representative Andersson. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1328, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Andersson. Sorry, Mr. Andersson requests that we return the Bill from Third Reading to Second Reading for purposes of an Amendment. Clerk, please return the Bill to Second."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1328, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. This Bill was read a second time previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 1 and 5 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Andersson."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Andersson on Amendment 1."

Andersson: "I actually only believe there was House Floor Amendment 5 that we acted on this morning."

Speaker Currie: "You wish to withdraw Amendment 1?"

Andersson: "Yes."

Speaker Currie: "And Clerk, are there further Amendments?"

Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #5 is offered by Representative Andersson and has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Andersson on Amendment 5."

Andersson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. And I certainly hope I didn't just make a mistake with that, but I believe it's correct. House Floor Amendment 5 is a gut and replace. However, what we are doing is we are doing some cleanup work on the Court and Traffic Assessment Bill, that this Body passed and was signed into law earlier in the spring. These

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

are all technical Amendments that were discovered by the Administrative Office of the Illinois Court. So, they are very much just cleanup items. The only substantive addition is a reporting requirement where we report the results of the impact of the various fee changes to the AOIC from the various clerks. With that, I'd ask for approval of the Amendment."

Speaker Currie: "Seeing no discussion, all in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Clerk, are there any further Amendments or Motions?"

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

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

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1328, a Bill for an Act concerning

criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill.

Speaker Currie: "Representative Andersson."

Andersson: "Thank you, Madam Chair. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Currie: "Seeing no discussion, all in favor of the Bill please vote 'aye'; opposed 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this measure, there are 108 voting 'yes'; 2 voting 'no'; 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the appropriate Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 3 of the Calendar on Third Reading Senate Bill 20... Senate Bill 3051, Representative Hoffman. Clerk, read the Bill. Oh, does this, too, we wish to return to Second Reading for purposes of an Amendment. So the Bill is now on Second Reading. And, Clerk, are there any Motions or Amendments filed?"

150th Legislative Day

- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3051, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. This Bill was read a second time previous day.

 Amendment 2 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Hoffman, has been approved consideration."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Hoffman."
- Hoffman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This Amendment would simply remove the immediate effective date if enacted into law. And would take the effective date to June 1, 2019."
- Speaker Currie: "Is there any discussion on the Amendment? Representative Breen."
- Breen: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Currie: "Sponsor will yield."
- Breen: "And... and Representative, you would just remind us. Is this the American Water Bill?"
- Hoffman: "This is a Bill to allow municipalities to sell their water systems, yes.
- Breen: "Okay. And just inquiry of the Chair, will we be allowed to debate this Bill on the Third Reading or will we move directly to a vote?"
- Speaker Currie: "Absolutely. We will debate this Bill on Third Reading."
- Breen: "Okay, then I would like to do that... do that. Thank you."
- Speaker Currie: "There any further discussion on the Amendment or would others like also to discuss the Bill on Third?

 Representative Parkhurst."
- Parkhurst: "I... I want to discuss the Bill, not the Amendment."
- Speaker Currie: "All right then on the Amendment, the Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment 3, to Senate Bill

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

3051. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments or Motions, Clerk?"

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

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

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3051, a Bill for an Act concerning

regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We debated this, I believe, a couple of weeks ago. And this simply indicates that it is the intent of the General Assembly when we passed in May the Bill... this Bill that... that it was designed to go into effect and there wouldn't be a lapse in time between the time that we passed it, which is the middle of May and the sunset, which is June 1, 2018. The Governor didn't get around to signing it until August. This clarifies it and I ask for a favorable Roll Call. And all this does... all this does, all this does is change an effective date."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Hoffman moves for passage of Senate Bill 3051. And it seems there will be discussion and debate upon the Bill. On the Bill, Representative Spain."

Spain: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Currie: "The Sponsor will... will yield. And I'm going to turn the timer on because we have a lot of people who wish to debate this measure."

Spain: "Madam Speaker, I won't take that personally. Thank you.

Leader Hoffman, this Bill has received a lot of attention.

And when it was discussed during the first week of Veto

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

Session, there was a lot of concern raised about the need for additional transparency and the ability for the public to weigh in. And in fact, a specific discussion about a requirement for a referendum. A requirement, not an option, that communities would impose upon themselves. What sort of consideration did you give that?"

Hoffman: "Well first of all, all this does is change the effective date of a Bill that we passed in May. Currently under that law which had been in effect for five years prior to that, but was expiring and was sun setting. Currently under that law our elected officials, people that we elect, make the determination as to whether or not they are in such a situation where they are going to be forced to sell their water system. I never have received any language on a referendum. And it didn't come up until committee two weeks ago. The Citizen's Utility Board, I believe, raised it initially. They did not raise it, to my knowledge, way back in the spring. And they have never given me language."

Spain: "Thank you, Leader. And to the Bill.

Speaker Currie: "To the Bill."

Spain: "I think the issue of a referendum is critically important. And one of the things that this Bill does it's... it's we're talking about changing the effective date now, but it doesn't change the affect of the Bill which was bad public policy to begin with. And originally... and the Leader is correct, this was a program in place for five years. And it was five years available to the acquisition of very small water systems for small communities. We're now looking at 10 years for this practice continue and is now eligible for all sorts of water

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

systems of various sizes. Look, I've been dealing with these issues for a long time because in my community in Peoria the issue of public versus private control of our water infrastructure is a perennial issue. And more than 100 years ago when Peoria made the ... made the decision to privatize its water system, we thought it would be important to preserve the role of public opinion and continued decision making. And so that community was given an option to repurchase and to have public control of the water system every five years. And it's a process that we still continue to undertake in Peoria every five years. When I served in local government I actually voted against the city purchasing the water system. I was an ally of the private water utility, but one of the things that has really caught my attention by serving in the Legislature is this particular issue. And what frustrates me is that you can have communities making decisions about privatizing one of their most important public resources and then using other communities to pay the bill. So as a customer of a private water utility in the community that I represent, I take it as an egregious public policy decision that we now allow other communities to sell their water systems to a private operator, and the existing rate payers are relied on to finance the cost of that acquisition. It's not the shareholders of the private water utility that are financing that acquisition. It is the existing rate payers. So to all of us, if you represent a community where you currently have in place a private water utility providing water to your citizens. I encourage you to be very careful about this issue. Much like we discussed in the spring you are passing along the cost of acquiring other

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

water systems to your constituents, your taxpayers, your rate payers in your community. This is a good deal for municipalities trying to sell their water system at the highest price. And the water company is able to endure that high price because they're not paying the bill to finance that acquisition. I strongly urge a 'no' vote. This is an item that did not receive 71 votes when we looked at it in the spring. And I understand the change that has been imposed now, to get this over the hurdle. But this is an incredibly bad policy decision on a particularly important issue that affects one of the life blood natural resources that we have in our communities. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Currie: "Because we've discussed this issue in the past, and because there are many, many people who wish to speak, the Chair will use her prerogative to limit speakers to two minutes rather than five. Representative Parkhurst."

Parkhurst: "Thank you, Madam Chair. To the Bill. I rise in support of this Bill. Communities in my district have benefitted, and will benefit from this legislation. I'd like this Body to remember it is only an option if communities want to use it. With or without this legislation communities still have the right to sell their water or sewer system. If communities want to sell, this legislation allows them to sell for appraisal value or fair market value as compared to current book value. This additional value can be reinvested back into the community. I'd also like this Body to remember the entire process must be approved by the ICC, which includes purchase price and rate increase. I encourage an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

150th Legislative Day

- Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Representative Connor. Two minutes."
- Connor: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Currie: "Sponsor will yield."
- Connor: "Representative, my question is, just to clarify the situation that we're addressing today. Basically, a mistake was made in the original legislation. So, we're here today to correct a mistake by Illinois American Water and Aqua. Is that right?
- Hoffman: "No. What happened in the original legislation is that the Bill was passed and it wasn't signed until after there was a sunset that was already in the previous law. And so this... this would just correct any action that may have taken... been taken in the interim. For instance in Representative Bristow's district, our colleague on our side of the aisle, the City of Alton just recently used the... used these provisions in order to sell their water system."
- Connor: "I'm sorry Representative. I mean there was a mistake in the enacting day or we wouldn't be addressing this issue today. Correct?"
- Hoffman: "It's a timing issue."
- Connor: "Right. So, we're here today to correct a mistake. Someone made a mistake. You're here today to ask the Body to correct it. Is that... is that a fair assessment?"
- Hoffman: "If that's the way you want to phrase it. I don't... I don't agree with it, but okay."
- Connor: "Okay, so I have 23 thousand residents of Bolingbrook that are on Illinois American Water. And for at least the last seven years, they have been involved in litigation to

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

attempt to get back out of their water system being owned by Illinois American Water, which is similar to what the Representative referenced in Peoria. If we're going to come here today and correct Aqua and Illinois American Water's mistake can those communities that are trying to get out of Aqua or Illinois American Water owning their systems... that being a mistake for them... are the companies that are being represented today going to offer that opportunity to those communities to get out of that mistake?"

Speaker Currie: "Please bring your remarks to a close. You're up against your two minute limit."

Connor: "This is bad public policy. I'd urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "A 'no' vote. Further discussion? Representative DeLuca."

DeLuca: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. So, he... he wanted a 'yes' vote.

Is that correct? He urged a 'yes' vote.

Speaker Currie: "I think he did not."

DeLuca: "To the Bill. Just three points I want to make. I urge a 'yes' vote on this legislation. And three simple points as to why. First, there's no mandate in this legislation. It doesn't require a municipality to do anything, if they choose not to. The other point is, I've heard a lot about referendums and public involvement. You can't operate a municipality by referendum. Referendums have their point and their value, but not on every single issue. And the last point is about quality. And the reason I bring this up is we had a full debate a few weeks ago. And we never talk about the quality, and that's an important aspect of this. How many of us in

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

this chamber might live in a community where the quality of the water is poor? And you need water systems in your house. You need filtration units, or reverse osmosis, or whatever kind of system you need to clean the water. This is an opportunity for the municipalities to improve the service, and provide better quality for the residents. It doesn't require them to do anything. It gives them that opportunity. This is an important option for municipalities to have. Please vote 'yes'. Thank you.

- Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Representative D'Amico."
- D'Amico: "Thank you, Miss... Miss Speaker. Representative Hoffman,

 I just have a couple of quick questions. Can you clarify
 something? Is it... is this Bill supported by labor?"
- Hoffman: "Yes, it's supported by the Operating Engineers, as well as the plumbers and pipefitters."
- D'Amico: "Very good. What about business? Does business support this Bill?"
- Hoffman: "Yes, business also supports the Bill."
- D'Amico: "Well it seems like a good Bill to me. I urge an 'aye' vote. Seems like it's a Bill that's actually going to put people to work, and work for the community. So, thank you."
- Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Representative Andersson.

 Two minutes."
- Andersson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll speak to the Bill. I will remind the Body again, as I did two weeks ago. Take a look at your vote on House Bill 4508, which is the underlying Bill. While the Sponsors correct in saying that this is just fixing the passage error, if you will, of this you need to look at what the underlying Bill was. And that's 4508 and see

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

about whether you agree with... with the underlying Bill. 'Cause if you don't this is the way to stop that Bill. I would remind you that not everybody likes this Bill. AARP opposed the Bill. CUB opposed the Bill. The Sierra Club opposed the Bill and the Attorney General's Office opposed the Bill. I personally oppose the Bill. Why? One, if you believe that it's a good idea to sell off public assets of a fundamental nature, our water supply, to private industry without referendum, without public involvement, then you should vote 'yes', but I don't agree with that. I think that it's a major asset sale. If you think it's a good idea to be able to sell off assets, like Chicago did with its parking meters and you think that's a good plan, you should vote 'yes'. I think that's a bad idea. should encourage municipalities out And if you desperation, because of other issues that have been caused that have nothing to do with their utility systems, to effectively sacrifice their utility systems because of other problems that they're having, you should vote 'aye'. I oppose that concept. We should not sacrifice assets that are one time only things that you can't get back, and water is one of those. I urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Representative Welter. Two minutes."

Welter: "Does the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Currie: "Sponsor will yield."

Welter: "Representative Hoffman, I was wondering is... just for clarification, was this the Bill that you pulled out of the record on our first week in Veto when we were down here?"

Hoffman: "Yes."

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

Welter: "Okay, and why was that at that time?"

Hoffman: "We had attendance issues."

Welter: "Okay. I know at that time I spoke on the floor and I think some of my colleagues... to the Bill... Spoke on the floor. I actually voted for the Bill, the underlying Bill, the first time. It was after the fact that I actually did a little more homework. And shame on me, I should have done more ahead of time. I found out how terrible this Bill really was for consumers. The protections that are lacking are not there for consumers of systems that will be bought in the future, is lacking the referendum part... portion. Which was stated on the floor, I think, by multiple Members that they wanted to see that included. Well, it was not included in this Amendment, not taken under consideration. Folks, we have an opportunity here to the consumers of Illinois, to fix this bad piece of legislation. We need to put safeguards in there for consumers. We can do that. Let's get the Bill right. Don't pass this. We have an opportunity to do it right and I urge an 'aye' vote ... a 'no' vote. I almost did what Connor did."

Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Representative McDermed. Two minutes."

McDermed: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. To the Bill. When we discussed this Bill last spring, it was... the emphasis was on the need of the villages, the municipalities to get top dollar for their assets. In other words, if you're... if you're back is up against the wall and you need to sell your assets you need to get top dollar, this is a really important part of doing that. This is something we need to enable our municipalities to do. And of course we all know why an

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

industry might want to buy the assets. What we need to understand is that by municipalities having the ability to sell at top dollar, and the buyers being willing to pay top dollar, this seems like this is a good idea. And that's why the Bill met with some success in the spring. What you need to do is look behind that and see what happens to the consumers of these water and sewers when they're sold at top dollar. Because that top dollar, while it is realized by the municipality, it's a one-time thing and those poor consumers, the poor rate payers, are paying off that top dollar forever. That becomes the number by which they have to reimburse the private companies. They're... the consumers, the buyers are not at the negotiating table when this is being sold for top dollar. So, it's not just about the municipalities being pushed up against the wall. It's our job to consider everyone that is involved in this equation. And the group that has the most to lose, the group that is not even at the bargaining table are our consumers, our voters, our... I'm going to call them helpless folks that are forced to pay these... these overcharges because..."

Speaker Currie: "Please... please bring your remarks to a close."

McDermed: "...forced to pay the overcharges because the negotiation

was at top dollar. Please vote 'no'. Please think about your

consumers."

Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Representative Bristow."

Bristow: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise in support of this Bill. There has been a lot of talk about what might happen if this Bill becomes law, a lot of fear mongering, but, as is usually the case, most of it is not true. This law has been

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

on the books for five years now and nothing the opponents claim will happen has happened. There is no reason to think the past will not be prolonged. Also this Bill affects me and my district probably more than anyone else in this chamber. Illinois American Water has served the City of Alton for more than 100 years as its water company. And recently Alton has decided to sell its waste water service to Illinois American Water as well. The issue was debated vigorously, locally, and the City Council received feedback from residents and voted to approve the deal. The deal means that Alton will allow experts, who have an excellent track record of environmental compliance to solve the city's combined sewer overflow issue. As EPA standards tighten, compliance becomes harder and more expensive and Alton has seen the benefits of having experts run their water system. I know the city will also benefit from this sale, but this sale cannot happen if we do not pass this Bill. After a healthy debate we passed this Bill last spring, but unfortunately we had a technical issue. The Bill before us does nothing except change the effective date of the Bill we passed earlier this year. A 'yes' vote supports local control and shows that we trust municipalities to know what is best for them. A 'no' vote is a vote to take \$100 million in investment from the City of Alton. I strongly urge a 'yes' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Representative Skillicorn for two minutes."

Skillicorn: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to share a quick story of why the Sponsor should pull this Bill from the record. So, this spring I had some residents that lived in

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

unincorporated Algonquin Township, right next to the Village of Lake in the Hills. Now, the story goes that over 40 years ago, Lake in the Hills laid down the water system and included this small subdivision of people. So, they were part of a water system of a village that they did not have a say in, they could not vote, they had no say at all in it. So, basically they actually paid a little bit higher rates than residents in Lake in the Hills, but they're included in the water system. Now these residents came to me because they found out that the village was going to sell their portion of the water system, to a private company for only one dollar. Now why does that make a big deal? It's because the Village of Lake in the Hills deferred maintenance on that water system for 40 years. And they needed two and half million dollars of repairance. This two and half million dollars of repairs was gonna be the obligation of those homeowners. They had no protection. They had no referendum. They had no say. So, I want to urge the Body to vote 'no', but actually what we should do, is pull this Bill from the record. We should amend it to add this referendum. Because here's a situation where a municipality can sell water system to a private company for profit. They don't have to maximize profits. They literally can... can sell something they deferred maintenance for years and years and years for just one dollar. And those people that do not live in the village, do not live in the city. They do not have a vote, they do not have a say, and they're stuck with a big bill. So, this is a bad Bill. And extending the sunset on a bad law is a bad idea. So, I urge the Sponsor

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

to pull this from the record. We'll get this right in January."

Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Representative Unes."

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

Speaker Currie: "The Sponsor will yield."

Unes: "Representative, there seems to be some confusion on this Bill. I understand what's before us right now is simply, only a technical change. However, many Members want to talk about the underlying Bill that has already passed the... the House. So along those lines, wasn't the underlying Bill just simply an extension of an existing law that had been in place?"

Hoffman: "Yes, the existing law had been in place for five years prior to the underlying Bill."

Unes: "So, this existing law allowed for municipalities to have local control. It allowed for municipalities to go through the proper practices of making sure if they choose on their own, with that local control if they made that decision, there are some protections in place to make sure that they get top dollar to protect the taxpayers. So, Representative, if the municipality made that decision, would the ICC still have to approve the sale?"

Hoffman: "Yes, Representative. And that's why I don't... I respect the thoughts of the previous speakers but they're simply incorrect. Number one, local municipality with elected officials after public hearings has to make the decision as to whether or not to sell. Number two, an 11 month process at the ICC has to approve it. And number three, the rates have to be approved in the future by the ICC."

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

Unes: "Thank you. So... so I'd just like to take in a little bit of a different perspective. So many people have talked about public opinion and public control, but how about this perspective. How about we are... we have municipalities right now that have chosen..."

Speaker Currie: "Representative, could you bring your remarks to a close? You're up against your limit."

Unes: "I sure will. We have municipalities that have chosen that local control and now they've made these decisions and this law has expired. And now their case that they've chosen on their own to make, is sitting at ICC and can't move. There is several communities... there are several communities that are doing this. One of which is in Peoria county, rural Peoria county in my district that's sitting at ICC because they, on their own choosing with local control, chose to do this decision. So, we are... if you wanna talk about local control, this Bill gives local control, and we need to continue to urge that. And so I ask the Body to please listen because I think there is some misunderstanding of this Bill. I strongly urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Currie: "Final discussions, Representative Ives for two minutes."

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

Speaker Currie: "Sponsor will yield."

Ives: "Representative Hoffman, if the purchase of this goes through, does American Water... Illinois American Water or whoever... or whoever purchases that system, do they own the system entirely from then on out? Do they own everything about that system? All control rests in them?"

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

- Hoffman: "Well, I wouldn't say all control rests in them because now under current rate if you own it by the municipality the ICC doesn't have to approve rates, that's number one. And then number two, if it is purchased then the ICC has the oversight of rates. So they don't control everything, but you can have it either way. You can sell all or part or you could have a reversion where it's a... you're looking at it five years' time as to whether or not you want to purchase it back."
- Ives: "Okay. But in the end who owns the purchase and operates that system is the private company? They own it, right? They're the deed holder."
- Hoffman: "It would be... you'll sell your water system from the public entity to a private one, yes."
- Ives: "Okay. Very quickly then, do you think that we should sell, since Illinois is broke... I mean there is no doubt about that.

 Do you think we should sell the entire Illinois tollway system to a private entity?"
- Hoffman: "No. I think we should sell the Thompson Center. It's ugly."
- Ives: "Yeah, but what... well you guys actually decided to sell it three for the past three years. Then decided we weren't going to make 300 million and then based the budget off of that, and that was all fault. Madam Speaker, to the Bill. So the point here is that this is a public asset. And it is an asset that you should not so willingly sell to a private entity. Now, I think it's perfectly fine for a private entity to operate a public system. I have no problem with that.

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

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

Ives: "But the underlying assets should be held by the public trust and invested in... I urge a 'no' vote because there are so many more protections we could put in place in a better Bill for the residents and the consumers that are the buyer of the last project. And lastly, I've had personal experiences where the ICC has not been responsive to the needs of individual consumers when they have brought up complaints against the private operators of water systems. So I urge a 'no' vote. This is not ready. Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Hoffman to close."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This is changing the effective date. That's what this is about. Now... now we have probably debated this for over two hours in two weeks and all we're doing is changing the effective date. Now we can re-litigate what we did in May. But that doesn't... this doesn't do that. We're changing the effective date. And we can talk about local control. We can talk about whether or not there is some or isn't. But at the end of the day the elected officials will make a determination. And this doesn't say that they can't do a referendum. They still could. They still could. It doesn't prohibit a referendum. Then once it is determined by the locals as to whether or not to sell the ICC oversees it and oversees the rates. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Hoffman has moved for passage of Senate Bill 3051. All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this measure, there are 60 voting 'aye', 45 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'. And this Bill,

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

having achieved the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Turner in the Chair."

- Speaker Turner: "Members, on page 7 of the Calendar we have Senate Bill 427 under Total Vetoes, Leader Currie. Mr. Clerk. Leader Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This is a measure that comes to us from the McCormick Place Board. And all it does it to expand by one term the amount of time that a person can be appointed either by the Governor or by the Mayor to serve on that... on that program. I think the Governor made a mistake when he vetoed it. And I hope you'll help me correct his mistake by voting 'yes' on the override of Senate Bill 427."
- Speaker Turner: "For further discussion, Representative Breen is recognized."
- Breen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Motion. Ladies and Gentlemen, this was the expansion of an additional term for the board members of the Metropolitan Pier & Expansion Authority. I don't see the reason why, with nearly 13 million people in Illinois, we have to add another term to a good term limit, eight years, which is plenty of time to serve on nearly any board. So, if you like term limits, then vote 'no'. If you don't like term limits, then vote 'yes'. It's as simple as that."
- Speaker Turner: "Leader Currie to close."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. I have full confidence in the Mayor and in the Governor, to see to it that the appointments are appropriate, sound, and solid. Please vote 'yes'.

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 427, pass the veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' The Motion requires 71 votes. All those in favor signify by voting '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 78 voting in 'favor', 33 voting 'opposed', and 0 voting present, Senate Bill 427, having received the required Three-fifths Majority, the Motion to override prevails and Senate Bill 427 is declared passed notwithstanding the Governor's Veto. On page 6 of the Calendar, under the Order of Concurrence, we have House Bill 531, Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. I urge that the Body approve a concurrence with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 531. Many people in this chamber and many of our constituents across the state do not know that nobody who is imprisoned in the State of Illinois has eligibility for parole. Thirty-five of our sister states give people the opportunity to go before a parole board, to say I've seen the error of my ways, I am now an improved, better person and it may be appropriate for me to be released. All this measure does is just say that people who committed crimes, while they were under the age of 21, will after 10 years, in some cases 20 years, in some cases never, have the opportunity to go to the Prisoner Review Board, to say I am a different person, and I do think that it would be appropriate for me to be released. In no way is this a get out of jail free card. I have no reason to think that the Prisoner Review Board would apply any but the most stringent standards, to a decision

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

whether to release somebody after 10 years or after 20. But I do think that our correctional system should be premised on the idea of rehabilitation, not just retribution. Rehabilitation so that when somebody has shown that they really are different they're really a changed person, we ought to take that seriously. We ought to take it into account. We ought to give them a second chance. Think of St. Paul on the road to Damascus. Think about what we know about what we know about brain research that says that young people, and the subject of this Bill is young people, do not always have good judgment. They haven't always understood the consequences of their actions. So I hope you will support me in approving the concurrence motion on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 531. This is a critical change in our criminal justice system. To recognize that young people should be given, if they deserve it, a second chance. Happy to answer your questions and I'd appreciate your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Members, there are numerous people seeking recognition on this measure. We will be moving to a two minute timer. Please try to keep your remarks as brief as possible.

Chair recognizes Representative Breen for further discussion."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Breen: "And, Representative, just for the… ensure the Body is correct about the affect of your Bill. You are impacting folks who are ages 18 to 21 or roughly 18 to 21, when they committed these very serious crimes. Is that correct?"

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

- Currie: "This would affect people who were under the age of 21, when they committed a crime that sent them to the correctional facility."
- Breen: "And a whole range of very, very serious crimes would be impacted and now be eligible for additional parole that were not previously?"
- Currie: "Because we don't have parole in the State of Illinois. So yes, you're right. There are people who will have committed crimes, will have served time in the state penitentiary and under this Bill the young people, those under the age of 21 when they committed the offense, would have the opportunity after 10 years, in some cases after 20 years... in the event of a particularly heinous act never... But for many there would be the opportunity to go to the Prisoner Review Board and ask for the opportunity of parole."
- Breen: "And... and as I understand it... just to make sure my analysis is correct. This is... so first degree murder would be covered under this after 20 years?"
- Currie: "After 20 years and if it's a murder of a first responder that person would never have a chance to seek support from the Prisoner Review Board."
- Breen: "And then aggravated criminal sexual assault would be allowed to apply for parole after 20 years. Is that right?"

Currie: "I believe that's right."

Breen: "Okay, Class X offenses would be 10 years."

Currie: "I believe that's correct."

Breen: "Okay. To the Motion. Ladies and Gentlemen, the DuPage States Attorney has contacted me and is just very much against this. We're letting folks out that have committed extremely

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

heinous crimes. They're adults and they should have to serve their sentence."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Parkhurst."

Parkhurst: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support. In Illinois you can't rent a car until you're 25 years old. Twenty-five is not a magic number. The insurance company research showed teenagers and young adults lack judgment and are not responsible so they are in a high risk category. Too high to be able to rent a car. Juvenile Justice has similar research showing the brain is not fully developed until age twentyfive. This research shows juvenile offenders lack maturity and are excessively influenced by peer pressure. Currently juvenile offenders tried as adults have no chance for parole. We lock them up and throw away the key. The United States Supreme Court held children are categorically less culpable than adults and more capable of change. The Supreme Court specifically stated, it is difficult even for expert psychologists to differentiate between the juvenile offender, whose crimes reflect unfortunate yet transient immaturity, juvenile offender whose crime and the rare irreparable corruption. I am proud to cosponsor this Bill designed to educate and rehabilitate our youth. And provide eventual relief from long term incarceration for certain crimes committed as children. This Bill provides opportunity for youthful offenders to rehabilitate, remediate, and reenter society. This Bill allows juvenile offenders eligibility for parole after a certain time, allowing for a rehabilitation path during incarceration for crimes committed in their youth. I urge an 'aye' vote. I truly

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

believe this is a good Bill designed to protect our youth and our society. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Bryant."

Bryant: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Question of the... for the Sponsor."

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Bryant: "Representative, again, I... I want to ask a question. I think Representative Breen asked it, too. But this is... this goes up to age 21 right?"

Currie: "If the crime was committed before the age of 21."

Bryant: "Okay, and could you say again why we're using age 21 instead of 18?"

Currie: "We're using that in part because our hand is being forced by the United States Supreme Court. You may remember that in the Miller case the court decided that imposing a sentence of life in prison without the possibility of parole against a age of young person, someone under the 18, unconstitutional. The court found it unconstitutional because of precisely the brain research that was previously discussed. Young minds do not exercise sound judgment. They may not understand the consequences of their actions. What the court said is to put these people in jail without ever the possibility of release is unconstitutional. And I believe that the young people that are the subject of this Bill, those who are under 21, are similarly lacking at least in some circumstances good judgment, and they are also people who do not think through the consequences of their actions."

Bryant: "So, my question..."

Currie: "They're impulsive."

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

Bryant: "...my question on this particular Bill, focuses on the age between 18 and 21. So at 18 an individual can get married?

Currie: "That's true."

Bryant: "At 18 they can enter into a contract?"

Currie: "They can, and many of them make bad contracts when they're eighteen."

Bryant: "And at 18 they can enlist in the military or be drafted?"

Currie: "True.

Bryant: "And at 18 they can vote?"

Currie: "They can, but they can't drink."

Bryant: "And they can...they can they actually they can vote if they're 17, if they turn 18 before the election right?"

Currie: "That's true."

Bryant: "Okay, so I am going to urge a 'no' vote on this. Specifically because of the age of 18 to 21 on this Bill. I wish that you would have reduced this to age 18. And I would have looked at this a little closer to support it. So, I'm going to be voting 'no' and urging a 'no' vote on this.

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Davidsmeyer.

Davidsmeyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Question of the Sponsor." Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Davidsmeyer: "Is this only going forward? So if somebody who has committed a crime prior to this becoming law, does... is not affected by this?"

Currie: "Absolutely, I'm glad you mentioned that. I meant to say so in my opening remarks. This Bill will not affect anybody who is currently serving time in the Illinois Correctional system. It is prospective only."

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

- Davidsmeyer: "So, you know... I know that one of my... one of the concerns of my local State's Attorneys was you know, making a promise to the victim's family that this person will never come back. Now they'll know going in that... that they may have an opportunity for parole in 10 years, or 20 years or whatever that date may be, correct?"
- Currie: "And that was the reason we made the change because of the concern for victim families."
- Davidsmeyer: "Okay. I will say... to the Bill. This is kind of a difficult thing because I think that people have to take responsibility for their actions. I think that, you know, at age 18 you are an adult, there's a lot of things that you can do. But I think that this... I hope that this will provide an opportunity for reform for young people who have committed crimes before their brains were fully developed. They have taken responsibility for that crime. They have served. But they will spend more time working on reforming their life and... and working towards a better life for their future. Instead of continuing to cause problems within the prison system, within the correctional system. So, I hope this will encourage reform instead of just punishment within our Department of Corrections. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Skillicorn for two minutes."
- Skillicorn: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"
- Speaker Turner: "Sponsor indicates that she will yield."
- Skillicorn: "Thank you, Sir. Barbara, just a quick couple questions here. Would you mind enlightening us about the age? So it's 18 to 21. What is the… the Supreme Court ruled on

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

something about the age of 21. What... What's the significance there?"

Currie: "That... that decision affected people under the age of 18.

This Bill goes a little further than what the Supreme Court required, by saying that people under the age of 21. So not 21 year olds. Eighteen, 19, and 20 year olds, who have committed a crime that sends them to the state penitentiary. Most of them would have an opportunity 10 years down the road or 20 years down the road, to come before the Prisoner Review Board and suggest that they should have the opportunity to go back into the civilized world."

Skillicorn: "Thank you."

Currie: "And we did that because, as I say, the Supreme Court did say, and all the brain research shows, that even people as old as 21 and 22 are often impulsive, often engage in risky behavior. There is no question that people under the age of 21 fit that description."

Skillicorn: "Thank you. And to the Bill. And a little bit about the Supreme Court ruling is that it also ruled that people under 21 could not be sentenced to life without parole. Illinois does not offer parole currently, because that has sun-setted years ago. So, today and yesterday there was quite a bit of partisanship. There's quite a bit of bitter tempers. And I admit that I was caught up in the moment many times also. But I am going to say let's put a rest to partisanship and let's extend parole again. I think this is a good idea. I support this. I would argue that we should extend parole in this case. We used to have it in Illinois. It has expired, let's re-extend it. And I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

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

Mayfield: "Thank you so much. I'm just going to speak to the Bill. I do want to just reiterate that this Bill is prospective, meaning those individuals who are not currently incarcerated. This gives the State's Attorneys opportunities, when they are doing their sentencing, to take in consideration, you know, the length of the sentence when they are giving them. Knowing that after 10 or 20 years that individual may be getting out. Now what you will see if you look on your analysis... I'm sure it should be on everyone's... is that the State's Attorneys are not listed as an opponent because some of them agree with the Bill, some of them disagree. So there is not consensus among them for this particular Bill. I know different individuals have stood up and talked about their individual State's Attorneys. However, this is a good Bill. And it does, you know, provide an opportunity for rehabilitation. That's one of the things that we're constantly talking about giving individuals a chance to rehabilitate themselves. Now, I do want to iterate, that just the fact that you're going before the parole board does not quarantee that you're getting out. There are several cases right now currently who are eligible for parole who will never see the light of day. Simply because their crimes were so heinous. This just basically says we're going to give you an opportunity to rehabilitate yourself and if you do that we may, may give you an opportunity to get out. Not that you will get out. We need to stress that. And Leader Currie has been working on this Bill for years. It has taken a lot to get it to this point to where we believe that

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

there is a good compromise on both sides of the aisle, with law enforcement. I'm recommending that everybody please open your hearts and vote 'aye' on this particular Bill. We are two of... two states within united... two states within the U.S. that do not have parole. Texas, one of the most conservative states in the Union, has a parole Bill. We do not. Think about that and vote 'yes'."

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

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor indicates she will yield."

Andrade: "Leader Currie, just for legislative intent nothing in this Bill redefines youth."

Currie: "No, there is no definitional change whatsoever."

Andrade: "So, at this point, a youth is still 18 and under?"

Currie: "Yes."

Andrade: "Okay. Thank you very much."

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

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

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

Gabel: "So, Representative Currie, I know that you have been working on this Bill for a while. Is this Bill a product of long negotiations? Long negotiations? Have you been negotiating this Bill?

Currie: "Several years of negotiation. And it is fair to say, as

Representative Mayfield reminded us, that the State's

Attorneys Association is neutral on the Bill. So are the
advocates for victims of crime, including the Coalition

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

Against Domestic Violence, the Coalition against Sexual Assault, and the Marcy's Law Illinois Organization."

Gabel: "And the Prisoner Review Board, where do they stand?"

Currie: "The Prisoner Review Board has been very helpful to the discussions and the negotiations."

Gabel: "And they are... they are in support of this Bill, correct? I think they are. Yes. Well, I appreciate all the negotiation that you've done about this. To the Bill. I think that this is a good Bill. It shows that we understand that humans can make mistakes and that humans can change. As we said it's a parole Bill. It allows people to go up for parole. It does not mean that it's a get out of jail free card. People have to show that they've changed, that they've made an effort, and that they will be good citizens, once they leave the prison. So, thank you for... for working so hard on this Bill, getting it to this point. It's possible that this may be one of your last Bills. And I encourage an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

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

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

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

Mazzochi: "Can you explain the reason why Illinois originally did get rid of parole?"

Currie: "It happened actually before I got here. So it was many, many, many moons ago. And I believe that the decision was the function of the creation of the determinate sentencing. So there was a craze in the early 70's to go to determinate sentencing if x then y. This is how much time you are going to serve. And the idea was that instead of having sentences

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

that may be all across the board you get uniformity of sentences and what you give back, what you give up for uniform sentences is the opportunity for people to go to a parole board and say, 'I am now a changed person and am I want to have an opportunity to leave prison earlier'.

- Mazzochi: "Right, but isn't this... isn't this approach ultimately going to lead to those differences in sentences? And doesn't that create its own do process problem, perhaps 20 years later?"
- Currie: "It doesn't create any dis-uniformity in sentencing. What it does say is that somebody who was under the age of 21 who committed a particular crime, just like somebody else under the age of 21, and both of them were sentenced to 15 years in prison after 10 years they can both go to the prisoner review board and perhaps the prisoner review board says, 'one of these people really has been rehabilitated'. And that person now can serve the time they've served and they do not have to finish the rest of the sentence. Perhaps the other one is not contrite. Perhaps the other is not someone who shows rehabilitation and that person may end up finishing the remainder of the sentence. But the sentencing itself is not affected by passage of this Bill."
- Mazzochi: "Well, but it leads to... it may not lead to differences in sentences on the front end, but it certainly leads to an effective difference in sentence on the other end. Just based on whether or not somebody manages to meet these very nebulas standards of rehabilitation. And I have very real concerns that what we're doing with that is were creating a... disparate system where only one type of person is going to benefit from

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

this and others will not. And when the prisoner review board, when those types of decisions are ultimately made in a way that is not according to a particularly objective standard is based on subjective creditability of what a person's degree of contriteness is. I have real concerns with that, when you're talking about people who are convicted of violent crimes such as murder and violent rape. And then additionally, I also have a question with regard to..."

Speaker Turner: "Representative. Representative Mazzochi."

Mazzochi: "What other, what other..."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Mazzochi."

Mazzochi: "Yes."

Speaker Turner: "Your two minutes have expired. Can you please make your final remarks? Thank you."

Mazzochi: "Yes, I'm very concerned that we are continuing to make very disparate judgements as to when somebody is or is not an adult. You can be a minor and you can make incredibly sophisticated medical decisions, but here if you are over the age of 21 and you engage in violent activity were going to give you a pass? I just don't see the logical consistency for this. And that's why I'm a 'no'."

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

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

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

Wallace: "I thank you, Leader Currie, for this important piece of legislation and I want to take a moment to thank you for all of the work you've done. I guess my only concern is, is there

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

a standardized risk assessment that the review board would then be utilizing to make their determination?"

Currie: "I believe the Prisoner Review Board has long experience with making assessments. In Illinois, today, we do not have risk assessment as part of the actual sentencing that goes on when someone has been found guilty. I think there's a lot to be said for doing that, but I am confident that our Prisoner Review Board is not going to be a get out of jail free card if they had this opportunity. Today, they do have responsibility for those people who were sentenced to prison before determinate sentencing came in and many of them are still languishing in their prison cells."

Wallace: "And to that point I hope that ...

Currie: "And they do... I'm reminded that they do. There are factors in the code creating the Prisoner Review Board that will help them make a legitimate assessment."

Wallace: "Thank you so much, Leader. To the Bill. I hope that those who will be here next assembly will maybe consider this was my rub in Restorative Justice. How do we maybe negotiate ways to make this retroactive? There are individuals who are in prison today who have been there since they were 18, 19 years old and will be there for the rest of their lives. But other than that, this is a good Bill and I would encourage an 'aye' vote."

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

McDermed: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Turner: "Sponsor indicates that she will yield."

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

McDermed: "Representative, did you work with Sentencing Policy
Advisory Commission at all in forming this Bill?"

Currie: "Yeah, they were involved in some of our discussions."

McDermed: "Good. I had the privilege of being appointed by my Leader to the Sentencing Policy Advisory Commission..."

Currie: "Excellent. Excellent."

"...where I have served. And I want to bring to the McDermed: attention of everyone in this room some of the things that we learn at Sentencing Policy Advisory Commissions, which is about fact based decision making. And one thing we know from fact based work that Sentencing Policy Advisory Commission does is that these long sentences don't do anything to detour crime or to reduce recidivism. Obviously these folks aren't going to get their recidivism reduced because they ain't out there. But, you know, we need to understand what the... what the facts on the ground are. Which is that these long terms without any way to get out don't actually make a difference in our crimes statistics or in the recidivism rates of these people. These long terms are not necessary. Yes, we need to be firm. Yes, we need to have people realize the consequences of the actions that they take. These long and determinate terms aren't doing it. This is good work here today, vote 'yes'."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Currie to close."

Currie: "Thank you. First, I would like to say that the Sentencing Policy Advisory Committee did give us help in figuring out how many people might be coming before the Prisoner Review Board were this Bill to become Law, affecting as it does, only future criminals, and the number is probably under 100

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

a year. A hundred a year. I would remind the Members that 34 other states have parole. Thirty-four for other state believe that it is possible for the correctional system to help rehabilitate offenders, that it is possible for the Criminal Justice System to work to help to see to it that recidivism is reduced. And I certainly agree with the previous Speaker that lengthy sentences, very costly to the taxpayer, do not make us safer in the streets. Those 34 states that have parole, they do not have mayhem, they do not have chaos, their rates of criminality are not very different from ours. I think it's time for us to go into the wave of the future, to recognize that Paul on the road to Damascus is very much what happens to people who were young when they committed crimes and I urge your 'aye' vote on the concurrence Motion."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 531?' 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 account of 67 voting in 'favor', 41 voting 'opposed', and 1 voting 'present', the House concurs with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 531. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 7 of the Calendar, under Total Vetoes, we have Senate Bill 34, Representative Hernandez."

Hernandez: "Thank you, Speaker. Okay. So, Motion to override SB34. So the Bill passed with a vote of 76 in 'favor', 38 in the House, and in the Senate 37 in 'favor' with 12 'no'. The Bill requires certifying agencies such as law enforcement,

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

- prosecutors, and other public authorities to complete Federal immigration certification forms that undocumented persons who are victims of domestic violence, rape, and other crimes. The certification only, I repeat, only allows for a victim to be able to apply for a U or T Visa application. I ask for your support on the override."
- Speaker Turner: "For further discussion, the Chair recognizes Representative Wheeler."
- Wheeler, K.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Turner: "Sponsor indicates that she will yield."
- Wheeler, K.: "Thank you. Representative, can you, for the purpose of clarity, explain to us what U and T Visa applications differences are?"
- Hernandez: "So U Visa is a Visa that is... you can apply if you are a victim of a crime. A T Visa is if you are a victim of trafficking."
- Wheeler, K.: "Thank you for that clarity. I appreciate that. Can you also then give me some indication of the level of unfunded mandates that are associated with this?"
- Hernandez: "We took care of... we ruled the fiscal notes there...
 they don't apply."
- Wheeler, K.: "But there still unfunded mandates in the Bill."
- Hernandez: "We did pass the Bill with the... that was clarified."
- Wheeler, K.: "I'm asking for the clarity right now, just for my own personal request."
- Hernandez: "Give me a second. So can you tell me what is your direct question about that?"

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

- Wheeler, K.: "This is mostly related to the timeline with which law enforcement has to respond to the... to the status of the individual?"
- Hernandez: "Okay, so are you asking the timeline or are you asking about the funding, the cost?"
- Wheeler, K.: "I'm sorry, Representative, I couldn't hear you?"
- Hernandez: "So what is the question? Is it on the funding, the fiscal piece, or is it the timeline?"
- Wheeler, K.: "Okay, so my understanding is that if we're placing a mandate on law enforcement to respond within a certain period of time that may require more staff on their behalf to accomplish those things. Hence, an unfunded mandate from the State of Illinois that they are going to have to pay for at the local level."
- Hernandez: "So my understanding is that officers are already doing this."
- Wheeler, K.: "Are there mandatory timelines in place right now?"

Hernandez: "Pardon me?"

Wheeler, K.: "Are there mandatory timelines in place right now?"

Hernandez: "It's a 90 day period."

Wheeler, K.: "So... but in certain situations were asking to change it to 21 days. Is that accurate?"

Hernandez: "Yes."

- Wheeler, K.: "Okay. That's my point, is there's going to be a change in the threshold which requires more staff in certain situations?"
- Hernandez: "It's certain, very rare situations."
- Wheeler, K.: "Thank you, Representative. I appreciate the answers to the questions. Thank you."

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

Speaker Currie: "Representative Currie in the Chair. Further discussion Representative Wallace for two minutes."

Wallace: "Thank you, Mrs... or Madam Speaker. I am going to go directly to the Bill because there seems to be so much misconception about the Bill here and in media. This is a Bill that is about allowing victims of crime to be able to feel empowered enough to use their voice and report the crimes that they have been victim of to local law enforcement. And should they cooperate with local law enforcement, and are trying to seek justice for themselves for the crimes committed, we're asking that a law enforcement agency sign the certification to send to the Federal Government which only allows for an application for a U Visa. This is not an automatic pathway to citizenship but what it is, is empowering individuals in our community who may be undocumented to come forth and talk about crimes that have happened. Which only moves or serves to make the rest of us, all of us, safer because we're able to address the crimes that these individuals are victim of. It is imperative that we pass this particular piece of legislation because what we see right now are law enforcement agencies throughout certain parts of our state willfully ignoring this process, and willfully putting individuals at risk and keeping individuals silent, and preventing them from coming forward. This is a great piece of legislation. Anyone who is truly concerned about public safety and truly concerned about all of the residents of their district, regardless of citizenship status, will vote 'aye' to override the Governor's Veto of Senate Bill 34."

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

- Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Representative Skillicorn for two minutes."
- Skillicorn: "Will the Sponsor yield for a moment?"
- Speaker Currie: "The Sponsor will yield."
- Skillicorn: "So a quick question came that up in debate here about T and U Visas. So if someone is a victim of a crime, they can now apply for the T or U Visa. Is that correct?"
- Hernandez: "The certification is just simply a form, an eligibility to even just apply for the U Visa. Then they have to go through whole process of the U Visa or the T Visa which could take anywhere from 3 to 4 years and at that point they could even be denied. So it's a very, very long process."
- Skillicorn: "Is there a requirement that there be a conviction or is it just the accusation of a crime?"
- Hernandez: "They have to be considered a victim of a crime and that is where the law enforcement is... that's where they come in. They are the ones who basically identify them as a victim of a crime."
- Skillicorn: "To the Bill. My concern is that someone could get special priority even though they just make an accusation. So I am empathetic to someone who is a victim of crime. I think we should crack down on people who do just do wrong things to other people. The idea of traffickers, I don't think we should... we should go after that with the zealous regard that go after people who break the law and hurt other people. But the idea that someone could make and accusation and get special visa treatment, I think that's a bridge too far."
- Speaker Currie: "Seeing no further discussion, Representative Hernandez to close."

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

Hernandez: "I ask for your support."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Hernandez moves... the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 34 pass the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding?" This motion requires 71 votes and it is final action. All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this measure... this Motion having received the required three-fifths Majority, the Motion to override prevails and Senate Bill 34 is declared passed notwithstanding the Veto of the Governor. The Chair recognizes Representative Phillips, for what reason do you rise?"

Phillips: "Point of personal privilege, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Currie: "State your point."

Phillips: "Thank you very much, I really appreciate it. I have a constituent, she's actually the Superintendent of schools of the Village of Hudsonville, Illinois, and I would like to recognize her. Her name is Julie Kramer. She took it upon herself to go to the part time police academy and she passed and was second in her class. And she did it so that she could... undertook the training because in the State of Illinois unless you're a licensed police officer you can't carry a weapon and in a small school district with a small police department she wouldn't be able to have this type of protection for her students. She took this upon herself, passed, and now she's an official part time police officer for the City of Hudsonville and for the school district. And I just wanted to recognize her on the floor. It's a great thing that she did.

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

And then the second thing I'd like to recognize, since this is my last term and I'll be exiting here pretty soon, I certainly have enjoyed being here, I've learned a lot, and hopefully I've been at least a positive effect on some of the things that we've done here. But the guy that got me involved in this... I have a love/hate for this... is Jim Runyon. Jim, would you stand up? I want to recognize the guy who helped me get elected both times. And he's the sucker that got me in this and I appreciate it all in the end. Thank you very much. Ladies and Gentlemen, it's been a pleasure to serve with everybody here and I look forward... I hope this isn't the end of being able to see everybody and when you're down in Florida come by and visit me. Thanks."

Speaker Currie: "Continuing on the Total Veto Calendar, page 7 of the Calendar, Senate Bill 2332, Representative Lilly for a Motion."

Lilly: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to request your vote in favor of my Motion to Override Governor Rauner's Total Veto of SB2332. This legislation we affectional refer to as Tobacco 21. This legislation has been debated in the general body at great lengths. And I really do not want to extend my comments. I just have a couple things to share. Tobacco 21 is an important piece of legislation in Illinois that would help prevent young people from beginning a lifetime tobacco addiction. Tobacco 21 protects children, reduces smoking rates, saves billions in health care costs, and saves lives. Many of you have discussed some of these main issues. We have some updates or some restatements. The military supports Tobacco 21. Department of Defense globally will go tobacco

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

free by 2020. This means in the next 13 months you will not be able to buy, sell, or use tobacco products on the U.S militaries or any bases worldwide. In a most recent article, in October, the Ultra Company says it will discontinue most of its flavored e-cigarettes and stop selling some of the brands entirely. The first time that tobacco giant companies are now supporting raising the age to 21. The purchase of all these products, and vaping products is causing major concerns in our schools and high schools throughout the country, where our current President administration is addressing it fiercely. It is time, again, to address this issue. We have debated and we have a lot at stake. It is time, now, that we override the Governor's Veto of Tobacco 21, SB2332. If there's any questions, I'll have them now. Otherwise, I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Currie: "Discussion on the Motion, Representative Breen for two minutes."

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

Speaker Currie: "She will."

Breen: "Representative, your Bill, just to remind the Body, removes the penalties for possession of tobacco by those under the age of 18, doesn't it?"

Lilly: "That is correct."

Breen: "Okay. So they can be procured tobacco by others and we no longer have a means to address that issue of underage possession of tobacco?"

Lilly: "If I'm understanding you, 'cause I really couldn't hear.

I'm sorry, Representative. What I do know, if I'm understanding your question, that currently across our state,

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

whatever penalties that are in place now they... the police forces across our state are not enforcing these."

Breen: "Except for the fact that my communities have the option today to raise the age to 21 in their community and those under 18 still have penalties. And you're stripping those penalties away, instead of increasing those so that folks under 21 can longer possess. So what you're doing is pretty much creating an incentive for folks under 21 to now take ... they can now possess tobacco under your Bill. Whereas today, they would not be able to. And so you're actually harming the ability of our local law enforcement and our schools and others to be able to enforce the current prohibition. I'll go to the Motion. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is... this was an ill-considered Bill, it needs more work. But again, we can't be allowing folks under the age of 18 to possess tobacco without penalty. You remove the penalties and you're going to see a spike in the illegal possession by those under age 18. You no longer can address those situations with the schools, the law enforcement, and others."

Speaker Currie: "Please bring your remarks to a close. You're pushing..."

Breen: "Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Representative Skillicorn."

Skillicorn: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm going to address a giant elephant in the room here. And it's smoking tobacco products, smoking cigarettes is dirty, disgusting, and unattractive. We all know that. I would rather these people that are under 21, make a good decision, than us remove the ability to make every decision from them. So these are people

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

that are above 18 years old that can enter in contracts, they can decide if they want to go to college, they can decide if they want to go thousands of dollars in debt for a college loan. They can go walk into a car dealership and sign a contract for a very large car loan. They can get credit cards, they can get very high rates of interest. They can get married, they can have children. Again, we're going to talk about the military, of course they can be drafted. Let's encourage them to make the right decision. Not take away all the decisions. I want Illinoisans to make smart decisions. Not smoking is a smart decision, but if we take away everyone's decision, we don't give them the opportunity to make the right decision. We don't get the opportunity to make the occasional mistake. I'm going to urge a 'no' vote. Please vote no to this. It's a dirty, disgusting habit. We don't want more people smoking, but just banning everything isn't the idea... isn't the best idea either."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Lilly to close."

Lilly: "Thank you, Madam Chairman. Thank you, for the debate, the brief debate. I appreciate that. But one comment. Our children are not the individuals who are responsible for these bad habits. The tobacco industry has been selling these products to our children. Causing them to create addictions beyond the lives of wellness and good community and civic thought. Please, understand this is a product of bad, I would say, opportunities. At this time, I ask for your 'aye' vote. Our children, our future deserve your consciousness today. 'Aye' vote. Thank you."

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

- Speaker Currie: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2332 pass the veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' This requires 71 votes and it will be final action. Clerk, please open the roll. Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this Motion 62 voting 'yes', 45 voting 'no', and the Motion fails. Still on page 7 of the Calendar, Senate Bill 65, the Order of Total Vetoes, Representative Williams."
- Williams: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd like to move for an override of Senate Bill 65. If you recall from the last time we discussed this Bill, this involves a codification of what is current practice in Cook County and the collars related to the provision of title insurance. There still is consumer choice allowed here. If the parties agree, they can use two different title companies otherwise this Bill provides that one title company can be used as a matter of consumer protection and streamlining the process. And I'll take any questions."
- Speaker Currie: "Is there any discussion on the Motion? Two minutes, Representative Batinick."
- Batinick: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Just a reminder to my caucus we vetted this Bill thoroughly in caucus and I would just ask everybody stand by what they said they would vote in caucus. Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Representative Fortner."

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

Speaker Currie: "She will."

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

- Fortner: "One of things that, as I was reading the Bill, as I understand it, it uses a population scanner to 500 thousand to determine which counties are exempt from the other provisions. Is that... am I reading that correctly?"
- Williams: "Absolutely, it applies to counties with population over half a million."
- Fortner: "So, I guess what puzzles me, is that when we speak of Cook and the Collar Counties we usually don't use population threshold because McHenry doesn't have a population of over 500 thousand. So, is there a reason why McHenry wasn't included among the Collar Counties?"
- Williams: "Well, we're generally operating with what we do as a current practice. So, Cook and the Collar Counties currently utilize the system of the provision of titles and closings that we have here. McHenry County, you can still do whatever you want to do in the other counties, but current practice is most likely what the Bill reflects."
- Fortner: "So, current practice does not apply to McHenry County, is what you're saying?"
- Williams: "We wanted to start with our consumer protection efforts in places that commonly and frequently use this method of title searching and we chose this to get a start in the consumer protection arena."
- Fortner: "I just find it a little strange since, I think, normally we use different language when we want to do Cook and the Collars and this isn't that language. So, it just struck me as very unusual."
- Williams: "I thought I've seen other items with the population standards. So, I was comfortable with that piece."

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

Fortner: "No, we usually use... those counties that border a county of population 3 million or more is the usual language."

Williams: "Well, I don't ... either way, I think it's the same result at the end. Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Representative Andersson."

"Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll speak to the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, I didn't know anything about bifurcated title before this issue came before the Jud-Civ Committee, I believe it was in the spring, because we don't do that in this area of the state. Apparently we do do it in other areas of the state that are more rural. The reality is this Bill is a consumer protection Bill and I support it because of that. Imagine if you will, you're a home buyer, you're going to your closing, only to discover that instead of one title company working up all the paperwork, you now have to reconcile it with two. If any of you have been through a closing that's been anything but perfect, you'd recognize how difficult that is. So, in our area, in the area of the city and the suburbs, the Collars, this is a good idea. But, if an individual owner who wants to buy a house prefers not to do it this way, the statute allows it. They can go ahead and use their mortgages title company and do a bifurcated closing. But most of the time that's not going to happen, and in this area, it's not a good idea. So for me, this is strictly promoting a best practice in our area and we're not trying to foist that off on the other areas of the state where they do it a little differently. This is an example where we've developed a statutory structure that works well, because here, we created an opt out if you will. So consumers are

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

protected, but if they really want to have two title companies that are closing, they can. And in the areas of the state where they prefer doing it that way, they can do that, too. That's all this is. It's a good Bill. Protects the innocent in the purchasing of new homes. I would urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Ives for two minutes."

"Thank you, Madam Speaker. To the Bill. This is just terrible legislation. First of all, it does something that we really shouldn't be doing on almost any of our Bills. It sets up two different standards on how title insurance is sold in the State of Illinois. Why would we have one set of standards for Cook, DuPage, Will, Lake, and cane and let the rest of the counties do something completely different? The reason is, is because the main proponents of this, a company called PNTN, that was selling title insurance wanted to continue to basically have all the market share in this area. Now that particular company, PNTN, was just recently fined \$14 million for illegally doing... selling title insurance with attorney agents that were not even licensed by IDFPR. Yet, they were the major proponents of SB65. In fact, they pushed the Bill to continue their share... their market share. This is a terrible Bill. It forces a real estate buyer to purchase a title policy from a company chosen by the real estate seller. And that is actually a violation of RESPA. So passing this Bill we would find ourselves in violation of Federal Law. It exposes sellers to RESPA violations and themselves and their attorneys to malpractice claims. It creates a patchwork of regulation which with a practice of bifurcation that is

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

essentially not available then to consumers in the five counties that I named previously. So it prevents consumers actually from benefiting from the downward pricing that comes in the competitive marketplace. It's terrible law. It's terrible to not only allow for the bifurcation of title insurance fees, but why are we bifurcating the state into two different sets of laws? Please vote 'no' on this override."

Speaker Currie: "Representative David Harris for two minutes."

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

Speaker Currie: "The Sponsor will answer your questions."

Harris, D.: "Representative, the Department of Financial and Professional Services has worked this issue quite hard on behalf of the Governor saying that we should not override the Veto. Question I have is this, if... they maintain that it is violative of the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act, RESPA, why would a title company put themselves at risk of being violative of RESPA? Are they... I haven't heard from any of them that this is a terrible Bill. All I've heard from is the department."

Williams: "Yeah, you know, thank you for that question. I'm a bit confused about the department's opposition. I did meet with one of the representatives today and they did focus on the RESPA issue. But to me that's more of a philosophical conversation, the lot is absolutely not settled in this area. Under the Bill, it preserves the parties right to choose. It's consistent, in my opinion, with the consumer protections aspect of RESPA. Really, what the Bill does is codify current practice. And in this case when a seller obtains title insurance, and also the same company provides for the buyer's

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

title insurance, it provides a lower rate of cost wise and as well as stream line process. If you have two different companies there's great risk they're going to have problems at closing."

Harris, D.: "And... do the Realtors Association, do they have a position on the Bill?"

Williams: "They are neutral in the Bill."

Harris, D.: "They're neutral in the Bill?"

Williams: "Yes, the realtors are neutral."

Harris, D.: "So... real state attorneys, I haven't heard from any of them. I would assume they're neutral on the Bill."

Williams: "Thank you. The practitioners I've spoken with are fine with the Bill. I've gotten several emails myself and my office from people that didn't know I was sponsoring it, arguing in favor of it. It is the current practice in the majority of our most populist counties. It makes sense and it prevents a lot of problems down the road."

Harris, D.: "All right. Thank you. I'm running out of time. Ladies and Gentlemen, briefly to the Bill. If it's so violative of RESPA I can't see how a title company or a title attorney would put their practice at risk by violation of Federal Law. So, I can stand in support of the Bill."

Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Representative Keith Wheeler for two minutes."

Wheeler, K.: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Currie: "She will."

Wheeler, K.: "Representative, I'm looking at our analysis here, and it shows that the realtors are opposed to the Bill. Are you aware of that?"

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

- Williams: "My understanding is that the realtors are neutral on the Bill."
- Wheeler, K.: "Okay, I guess ours has a different answer. They're neutral as amended."
- Williams: "I'll await confirmation from the advocates. But that's my understanding as of this morning."
- Wheeler, K.: "Okay, thank you for the clarity there. Madam Speaker, should this Bill receive the appropriate votes I would request a verification."
- Speaker Currie: "The Chair notes your request. Further discussion, Representative Mazzochi for two minutes."
- Mazzochi: "Thank you, Madam Chairman. To the Bill. I have concerns about the Bill from a drafting perspective in the following sense. We are expanding Section 18.1 to cover products and services enumerated in Section 19 and yet, for the carve out that's intended to try codify the local practice in Chicago and some of the Collar Counties, we're only limiting the scope of that to title insurance. So I'm concerned that there may wind up actually being a mismatch between the local practice, if that's what you are trying to codify. Furthermore, to the extent that we are talking about products and services and activities of independent escrowees that could arguably be construed to cover attorney fees and to suddenly start saying that the attorney fees are going to be subjects to one set of rules in one jurisdiction and to a different set of rules in another. I have concerns about that as well. And, if the Sponsor will yield, I am curious whether you have a position as to whether subsection B is limited to title insurance only or to legal services?

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

Speaker Currie: "Representative Williams for a response."

Williams: "Oh, I thought you said, 'to the Bill'. Well, you know, if do... if that is an issue that we are happy to work in a trailer perhaps, but it is my understanding that the way we have written it has been purposely prepared in a way that will address and incorporate the current practice and I'm sorry you disagree with that. But to note to the prior Representative's question the realtors are neutral on the Bill, there have been several revisions perhaps your analysis is a bit out of date."

Mazzochi: "Sorry... what I was trying to get clarification on is when it... on the question of fees, does that include attorney fees?"

Williams: "One moment."

Mazzochi: "Because it's arguably potentially covered by products and services enumerated in Section 19."

Williams: "It's not the intention to cover attorney's fees. I don't believe it applies to attorney's fees."

Mazzochi: "Okay. And that's where I have a problem with the drafting it because arguably it could be cover under attorney fees."

Speaker Currie: "Would you bring your remarks to a close, you're up against the time limit."

Mazzochi: "Thank you. Because of the concerns that I have about some of the drafting issues and that it actually is changing policy I am not going to vote to override."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Reick for two minutes."

Reick: "Thank you Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield please?" Speaker Currie: "She will."

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

Reick: "Representative, are you portraying this Bill as a buyer of real estate protection Bill?"

Williams: "I think what I would characterize this Bill as, as an insurance that a consumer, when purchasing, is not pressured into utilizing a certain title company that may or may not be owned by the mortgage company. That is something that we've seen it to be a trend in other areas of the country. And the current practice of utilizing one title company, for both the buyer and seller, streamlines, offers... streamlines the process, offers less risk, so I would say yes."

Reick: "Okay. So, to the Bill."

Speaker Currie: "To the Bill."

Reick: "Basically, what you are saying is this provides protection for property buyers. A little practical information here, when a person purchases title insurance on the sale of a house, the seller is insuring the adequacy and enforceability of title. That is a seller's charge on the closing statement, that comes out of the seller's net proceeds. If the buyer's lender requests a title policy of lenders insurance that is additionally paid for by the buyer, but it is at minimal cost on a relatively common bill of purchase of say \$200 thousand yeah, as a broker or as an attorney agent I'm going to get a fee out of that, but it's going to come out of the seller's proceeds. The buyers charge for title insurance is minimal, a couple hundred bucks at the most. So this is a Bill that is... it's an answer in search of a question as far as I'm concerned. And as a McHenry County title agent... thank you for not including McHenry County. As a McHenry County title insurance agent, I cannot vote on this Bill.

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

- Speaker Currie: "Please bring your remarks to a close."
- Reick: "Thank you, Ma'am. I will not be voting on this Bill, but I wanted to pull information for folks. Thanks very much, Madam Speaker.
- Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Representative Willis for two minutes."
- Willis: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Currie: "She will."
- Willis: "Representative, can you tell me what was the reasoning behind the Governor's Veto?"
- Williams: "Again, I am unclear of what the reasoning was. There was an articulation I think of a philosophical difference of the appropriateness of how to find this language, but I disagree and feel that it's an important consumer protection measure."
- Willis: "And how many votes did this Bill pass Body the first time around?"
- Williams: "We had 60 votes, but we had been working to educate Members since that time and we feel positive about our results."
- Willis: "Okay. And you would actually put this Bill as a consumer protection Bill, correct?"
- Williams: "Absolutely. What we're finding now is when you don't utilize the same title company for both transactions, not only do you put the integrity of the transaction at risk, there is increased costs to the consumer, and we are concerned that the mortgage companies that may own title companies are looking at this as a potential new source of revenue and consumers eager to move forward with the closing will just

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

- agree, sure whatever the mortgage company wants me to do. This will protect those consumers and ensure they get the lowest cost option."
- Willis: "Especially if you are a first time buyer and aren't familiar with the process it's pretty overwhelming when you go to your closing."
- Williams: "Absolutely, 70, 100 pages is a typical closing."
- Willis: "Okay. Well, I certainly urge an 'aye' vote on this. I think this is a Bill that shows it is good consumer practice and I would urge this entire Body to vote with me on the override. Thank you very much."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Skillicorn for two minutes."
- Skillicorn: "Madam Speaker, I move the... call the question...
 previous question."
- Speaker Currie: "You're the last speaker, so I think it's now time for Representative Williams to close."
- Williams: "I'd appreciate a 'yes' on the override."
- Speaker Currie: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 65 pass the veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' This is final action and the Motion requires 71 votes. All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this Motion, there are 65 voting 'aye', 39 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present', and the Motion fails. Still on page 7 of the Calendar on the Order of Total Vetoes, we have Senate Bill 2589, Representative Will Davis for a Motion."
- Davis: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker, I certainly move to override the Governor's Veto of Senate Bill 2589 which is a

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

debt extension limit Bill on behalf of the Midlothian Park District. And as we debated it once before, just let me reiterate just, I think, a couple of important points of this. This effort is a voter led effort. The Village of Midlothian Park District put a referendum out there and 62 percent of its residents said that yes, we would like you to spend the additional resources to refurbish and rebuild our park districts. We all know park districts are our life blood of communities and they bring an important element to communities. And so they wanted to upgrade their facilities. They were told it would cost \$13 million to upgrade their facilities. Their current debt limit is \$5 million, which means that they will still move forward on trying to refurbish their parks. The difference is, do they go to the market one time and expend those resources to rebuild their park district or do they go to the market three times? Go once for 5 million, they pay that back, they go again for 5 million, they pay that back, and then they go again for 3 million to get to where they are trying to go. Presumably, over that period of time costs are going to go up, things are going to go up that is going to increase those costs onto the residents. So I know some people argue about the impact to the residents. If they go to the market, I don't think there is any doubt whether there is going to be that impact to the residents. The question is, do they do it once and have an impact or do they do it three times and have an impact? The Midlothian Park District Executive Director and their finance person both, we've met with the Governor's Office to try, in our opinion, to show them why the Veto was inappropriate. They

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

listened. I never heard back from them what they thought, maybe they did some outreach to folks on your side of the aisle, I don't really know. But nevertheless, I'd like to override the Motion to give the Midlothian Park District an opportunity to get what they need to create a better park district and a better environment for their residents in that community. I'll be more than happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Davis has moved to override the Governor's Veto of Senate Bill 2589 and on that, Representative Breen."

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

Speaker Currie: "He will."

Breen: "And, Representative, just so that... to clarify and make sure to reiterate, the park district voters have already approved a referendum to issue the 13 million in bonds, correct?"

Davis: "Correct."

Breen: "Okay, and you're going to extend that over 25 years. Is that right?"

Davis: "Yes."

Breen: "Okay. I think I supported you the first time around on this and I plan on doing it again. So, thank you."

Davis: "Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Representative David Harris."

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Madam Chair. Question of the Sponsor...

question of the Sponsor, please."

Speaker Currie: "The Sponsor will answer your questions."

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

Harris, D.: "Representative, the voters approved this. What was the margin of victory?"

Davis: "I believe 62 percent of the voters."

Harris, D.: "Sixty-two percent of the voters said yes that they were willing to allow the park district to float \$13 million worth of bonds?"

Davis: "Correct."

- Harris, D.: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I stand in support of the Bill and let me tell you why. The voters have approved it. Whether or not they do it in three tranches of \$5 million or five, five, and three, whatever, you know... or we know that the park district is going to barrow that money as approved by the voters. So rather than do it in tranches of 5 million, 5 million, and 3 million, especially as interest rates may be going up and it might cost the district even more money, it makes sense to do it all at once. The Governor's Veto, and you have to make the decision here, the Governor's Veto is valid in a concern that he has about forcing a property taxes or pushing a local government toward financial distress on debt. But the voters have already approved it, they know what the implication is going to be for their district, and their park district... or rather their property taxes. And because of that, I stand in support of the Bill and urge a 'yes' vote."
- Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Representative Skillicorn for two minutes."
- Skillicorn: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. When I look at this vote total here it passed by the slimmest majority. And I can tell you why that happened, is that people are weary of debt, they are weary of higher property taxes and let's just look at

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

what an accountant would say. You know, they would add up all of your debts and they write down the negative balance in red ink and then they'd write down the positive in black ink. So it's very simple. Black equals good, red equals bad. This is just going to raise property taxes on people and government should learn to spend within its means. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Davis to close."

Davis: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker and Members. I appreciate the comments from the other side of the aisle. And to the last speaker, I mean, I can't necessarily deny what you are... you know, in terms of the impact to the community, but again this is one time when the voters in that district said yes. Now, if the voters that voted for you to come back to the general of Springfield... to Springfield, even though they voted for you, and somebody said no, you would say let what the voters say stand. In this case, this is what the voters asked for. I think they well understood the risk. The Midlothian Park District did a great job in educating its community to give them all the information they needed to give them all the information they needed to move this issue forward. And with that I ask for your support to override the Governor's Veto."

Speaker Currie: "The question is 'Shall Senate Bill 2589 pass the veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' This is final action. The Motion requires 71 votes. All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this Motion, there are 75 voting 'yes', 30 voting 'no'; 0 voting 'present'. And this Motion, having

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

received the required Three-Fifths Majority, the Motion to override the Governor's Veto it prevails. And Senate Bill 2589 is declared passed notwithstanding the Governor's Veto. On page 3 of the Calendar on Senate Bills Second Reading, we have Senate Bill 1993, Representative Slaughter. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1993, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. This Bill is read a second time previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Slaughter, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Slaughter on Amendment 2."

Slaughter: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This Bill is regarding automatic juvenile expungement. House Floor Amendment #2 becomes the Bill, provides minor technical changes, as well as corrects drafting errors. I am happy to explain the Bill and answer questions on Third Reading. Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "Are there any further Amendments or Motions pending on the Bill? I'm sorry. Let's adopt the Amendment and we'll see whether people agree with you. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments or Motions?"

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

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

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1993, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Slaughter."

Slaughter: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1993 represents the second trailer

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

Bill to our landmark juvenile expungement law that the General Assembly passed in 2017. This law allowed the state to take a major step forward in regards to juvenile justice reform but since we've implemented this in January of this year, the state has needed to make some much needed clarifications and also provide a more standardized expundement process and approach for our law enforcement community. What's most critical to know at this juncture is that our law in 2017 did not provide clarity regarding how far back the state would go in regards to expunging these records. Anyone knows... who knows about juvenile justice in the State of Illinois knows that we created the first juvenile court back in 1899 out of fairness to the law community. Out of respect for the effort to adequately expunge records we don't want the law enforcement community to go all the way back to 1899. The law enforcement community did negotiate this Bill and they did come up with an agreed upon language to go back to the year 2000. It's important to also note that this Bill provides definitive guidelines, timetables, and grace periods for law enforcement to expunge these records and comply with the requirements in the Bill. Senate Bill 1993 makes a host of other reasonable technical and procedural changes all designed to make the law more manageable for law enforcement and still be fair to people who made mistakes as juveniles. One last thing I would say before we debate the Bill, and hopefully pass it, is as the Sponsor I want to express my appreciation and applaud the law enforcement community for coming together in collaborative manor. Senate Bill 1993 represents agreed upon language from the Illinois Police Chiefs Association, the

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

Illinois State Police, the Illinois Sheriffs Association, the Illinois States Attorney Association, and the Illinois Public Defenders. Thank you for your indulgence. I humbly ask for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Currie: "Discussion on the Motion? Representative Brian Stewart."

Stewart: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Currie: "He will."

Stewart: "So, Representative, I appreciate you bringing this Bill forward. Just to clarify for the record then, based on the language in your Bill, the legislative intent of this is to not modify the current practices of States Attorneys in their handling of juvenile records. Is that correct?"

Slaughter: "Yeah, that's correct."

Stewart: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Representative Breen."

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

Speaker Currie: "He will."

Breen: "Representative, just to clarify, we are... there were some concerns about both the long term records, but also the fact of keeping some records that may be needed in terms of litigation, as I understand it. Is that right? So if you had a false imprisonment or some other issue with the juvenile that you would keep those records for the two years that would be required for a federal court case. Is that right as well? Slaughter: "That's correct. You would be able to keep the records,

but those records would be quote unquote expunged."

Breen: "Right, but they won't be destroyed until the two years so that they can be used in a legal preceding if need be. And

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

then you also allow for collection agencies and the like to collect any debts due and owing that are related to those records?"

Slaughter: "That's correct."

Breen: "Okay. Again, seems like a good Bill, thank you for bringing it. Good clean up language and I intend to vote 'aye'."

Slaughter: "Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Slaughter to close."

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

Speaker Currie: "Representative Slaughter has moved for passage of Senate Bill 1993. All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'no', voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this measure, there are 72 voting 'aye'; 33 voting 'no'; 2 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having achieved the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Slaughter, for what reason do you rise?"

Slaughter: "I would like to vote 'yes' on my Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "The record will reflect your wishes. We now go to page 4 of the Calendar, Senate Bills Second Reading. Senate Bill 3102, Representative Feigenholtz. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3102, a Bill for an Act concerning business. This Bill was read a second time previous day. No committee Amendments. Floor Amendment 1, offered by Representative Feigenholtz, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Feigenholtz on Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 3102."

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Madam Chair. House Amendment 1 is an initiative of the Illinois Association of Behavioral Health. It's a clean up... trailer bill clean up that fixes some definitions of facility program and treatment in the Act. It is necessary so that the Attorney General's Office believes that in order to enact this they need this clean up. I'm happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Feigenholtz moves adoption of Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 3102. Seeing no discussion, all in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments or Motions?"

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

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

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3102, a Bill for an Act concerning

business. Third Reading of the Senate Bill."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you. I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Currie: "All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'.

Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record.

On this measure, there are 108 voting 'yes'; 1 voting 'no'.

And this Bill, having achieved the required Constitutional Majority, is here by declared passed. Same Calendar, Senate Bill 3549, Representative Costello. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3549, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. This Bill was read a second time previous day.

Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

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

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3549, a Bill for an Act concerning

regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Costello."

Costello: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Senate Bill 3549 allows IDNR to continue to regulate the pipeline infrastructure of the state after the passage of the U.S. Pipe Act. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Currie: "Seeing no discussion, all in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this measure, there are 110 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having achieved the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Clerk, the Adjournment Resolution. We don't have that one before us yet, but let's go to Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk Hollman: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 70, offered by Representative Hoffman. House Resolution 954, offered by Representative Butler. House Resolution 1330, offered by Representative McSweeney. House Resolution 1331, offered by Representative Costello. House Resolution 1332, offered by Representative Cavaletto. House Resolution 1341, offered by Representative Wallace. House Resolution 1342, offered by Representative McAuliffe. And House Resolution 1343, offered by Speaker Madigan."
- Speaker Currie: "Leader Turner moves adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. And the Chair would remind the Democratic Members of the 101st General

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

Assembly that there will be an immediate Democratic Caucus following floor action. Representative Cabello, for what reason do you rise?"

Cabello: "Thank you, Madam Chair. I rise for a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Currie: "For a point of personal privilege?"

Cabello: "Yes."

Speaker Currie: "State your point."

Cabello: "Ladies and Gentlemen, we have a special guest in the house today. Over on the Democratic side we have Mary Ann Abate from Rosecrance, she is retiring after helping several members of our community and throughout the state of addiction recovery. Mary Ann we wish you well, good luck."

Speaker Currie: "Thank you, Mary Ann. Representative Turner, for what reason do you rise?"

Turner: "Point of personal privilege, please."

Speaker Currie: "State your point."

Turner: "Thank you. Members of the Body, it has been a long week and over the past 24 hours opponents of Senate Bill 2641 have now come forward with proposals. I have already made accommodations for the State of Illinois, City of Chicago, General Motors, and the insurance industry. Today we met with Representatives from Allstate. With these last minute proposals and the insurances of Allstate, Senator Munoz, Senator Rezin, Representative Wehrli and I have decided to hold the Amendatory Veto override for further discussions. Senator Munoz, Senator Rezin, Representative Wehrli, and I intend to continue to move forward using Senate Bill 514 as

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

- a vehicle. I'll be in discussions with you all soon. Thank you."
- Speaker Currie: "Thank you. Representative Costello, for what reason do you rise?"
- Costello: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. A point of personal privilege, please."
- Speaker Currie: "State your point."
- Costello: "I am pleased to have here with me today as my Page for the day Hallie Schlemer. And... so Hallie was here when she was in fourth grade, then again sixth grade, and now she's a freshman in high school. She obviously loves what we do here in the General Assembly and I am very pleased to have her and her mother Karen back. So if we could all give her a welcome please."
- Speaker Currie: "Welcome. Representative Wallace, for what reason do you rise?"
- Wallace: "Thank you, I rise for a point of personal privilege."

 Speaker Currie: "State your point."
- Wallace: "Thank you. I would like to echo what Representative Cabello said in recognition of Miss Mary Ann Abate. It has been an absolute pleasure to work with you over the last several years. I hope you enjoy your retirement. And I'd also like to recognize my replacement Representative-Elect Maurice West who has joined us on the floor today. Please welcome him and I hope that you enjoy working with him as much as I hope you enjoyed working with me. And thank you for the time here with each and every one of you. I hope that you guys enjoy your next Assembly."

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

Speaker Currie: "Welcome indeed. Representative Ives, what reason do you rise?"

Ives: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise for a point of personal
 privilege."

Speaker Currie: "State your point."

"I'd like to congratulate the Wheaton-Warrenville South High School Boys Cross Country Team on their first place finish in the Class 3A Cross Country State Championships this November 3. They completed history by taking their first ever state title. They claimed that title by over 40 points which is an amazing amount if you follow cross country. The Tigers ranked as high as third in the nation during the season. Three team members, William Hellenstein, Scott Mason, and Jacob Cluckhorn placed in the top 15 overall in the State Championship. This is their second consecutive year that the Tigers have had a top three finish in the Class 3A Cross Country Tournament. The Tigers went on to compete in the Nike Regional Contest in Terra Haute, Indiana, racing against the top teams from Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Missouri, and Ohio. And the Tigers earned second place and qualified to compete in the Nike National Cross Country Championships in Portland, Oregon. A contest featuring the top 22 teams in the country. This is an incredible feat if anybody follows cross country. We want to give special recognition to head Coach Chris Kuntz, who's commended for helping lead these young men to a historical season and a championship. They went undefeated for the entire season. Congratulations to the Wheaton-Warrensville South High School Cross Country Team on a great job."

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

Speaker Currie: "Congratulations. Representative David Harris for what reason do you rise?"

Harris, D: "Point of personal privilege, please."

Speaker Currie: "State your point."

Harris, D: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the distinguished Lady from the 18th District represents Northwestern University. The equally distinguished Legislator from the 7th District is a graduate of Northwestern University, as is my son. And as you may know, Northwestern University, one of the premiere institutions of higher education in the State of Illinois, is playing this coming Saturday for the Big 10 Title in football and should they win, they will end up in the Rose Bowl. So... and on top of all that, the coach of the Northwestern University Football Team was named Coach of the Year by the Big 10. So here's to the Wildcats and a win on Saturday."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Skillicorn, for what reason do you rise?"

Skillicorn: "Madam Speaker, I'd like the Journal to reflect that had I had an opportunity to vote on Resolution 1225, I would have been a 'no'."

Speaker Currie: "The record will so reflect. Representative Helene Walsh, what reason do you rise?"

Walsh: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Currie: "State your point."

Walsh: "Today, I would like to honor Mundelein Chief of Police Eric Gunther. Chief Gunther has been named the 2018 Chief of the Year by the Illinois Association of Chiefs of Police. Chief Gunther is honored for his extensive service to the

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

community, his leadership in the police department, his leadership in the ILACP, and his leadership in battling the opioid epidemic in Lake County and around the Country. Chief Gunther was first hired by the Mundelein Police Department in 1995 and climbed through the ranks of investigator, sergeant, commander, and deputy chief. He was named the Mundelein Police Chief in 2013. Chief Gunther is recognized for helping to create the Lake County Opioid Initiative and creating the program 'A Way Out', an initiative that guides those with substance abuse issues and offers them treatment with substance abuse programs without fear of arrest. collaborate with the States Attorney's Office, the Coroner's Office, and a variety of local nonprofit providing wrap around services. Chief Gunther spearheaded the recently signed Senate Bill 3023 which encourages the implementation of programs like the Lake County Initiative throughout Illinois. As if that wasn't enough he also created the Latino Police Academy which has been used to open lines of communication and trust with the Mundelein Police Department and the Latino community. The program has been so successful that they have added a second class through the year. He leads a women's self-defense class twice a year and a day for helping senior citizens of the community and the citizen's academy. I am very proud to honor a chief who cares greatly for his community, is a leader in his department, and a true example of excellence in law enforcement. See a cop, thank a cop."

Speaker Currie: "Congratulations. Representative Swanson, for what reason do you rise?"

Swanson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Point of personal privilege."

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

Speaker Currie: "Make it brief."

Swanson: "Thank you, Ma'am. I'll do that. I would like to take this opportunity to introduce my honorary Page today, his name is Kaden Wilson. He's a senior at Galesburg High School. He plays varsity soccer, captain, he's also a varsity track captain, band, marching band, jazz band, Fellowship of Christian Athletes, and peer tutoring. He's also very active in his community with the church worship team and service projects, Knox Galesburg Symphony, National Honors Society, German Honors Society, National Merit, and the All State Musicians. Couple points I would like to make specifically, his parents are Major Chaplin Scott, his mother is Heather Wilson, and his dad currently serves in the Illinois Air National Guard. And to top it all off this young man will be attending the U.S. Air Force Academy starting after graduation his senior year of high school this year. So with me today is Cadet Kaden Wilson from the U.S. Air Force Academy. Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "Welcome. Representative Butler, for what reason do you rise?"

Butler: "A brief point of personal privilege."

Speaker Currie: "Your point."

Butler: "On behalf of the Route 66 Caucus I would like to invite everyone, Members, Members-Elect staff to visit my and Representative Jimenez's office, we have a large car hood there with a Route 66 logo that we are asking people to sign in honor of this month's birthday of Route 66 and there might be some birthday cake left today. So stop by today or tomorrow and sign the hood please."

150th Legislative Day

11/28/2018

Speaker Currie: "Thank you for the invitation. Representative Mayfield, for what reason do you rise?"

Mayfield: "Inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Currie: "State your inquiry."

Mayfield: "I have two questions. When do we receive our Calendar for the 101st and when do we receive the invitations for the inauguration?"

Speaker Currie: "Well we'll get the Calendar to the 101st when its ready and I anticipate that the invitations to the inauguration will be coming soon. And now, allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, Representative Leader Turner moves that the house stand adjourned to Thursday, November 29, at 10 a.m. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the House stands adjourned."

Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Second Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 21, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 514, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Senate Bill 563, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 1364, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 2744, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Senate Bill 2898, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Senate Bill 3174, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 3197, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 3402, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 3430, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Second Reading of these Senate Bills. They'll be held on the Order of Second Reading. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."